

**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS – 1ST FLOOR
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 2013 – 6:30 P.M.**

Cumulative

Board Members	Attendance	June 2013-May 2014	
		Present	Absent
Patrick McTigue, Chair	P	2	0
Leo Hansen, Vice Chair	P	2	0
Brad Cohen	P	1	1
Stephanie Desir-Jean	A	1	1
Michael Ferber	P	2	0
James McCulla	P	2	0
Michelle Tuggle	P	2	0
Tom Welch	A	1	1
Peter Witschen	P	2	0

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

Staff

Ella Parker, Urban Design and Planning Manager
Bob Dunckel, Assistant City Attorney
Eric Engmann, Urban Design and Development
Tom Lodge, Urban Design and Development
Todd Okolichany, Urban Design and Development
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

Index

	<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1.	8Z12** *	New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church, Inc. / New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church
2.	9Z12** *	New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church, Inc. / New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church
3.	10Z12** *	New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church, Inc. / New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church
4.	11Z12** *	New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church, Inc. / New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church
5.	2P13**	New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church, Inc. /

6. 3P13** New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church
New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church, Inc. /
New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church
7. 65R12** New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church, Inc. /
New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church
8. 37R13** Multi-Tenant Restaurant Building
9. 8P13** James Bradley Fazio / 1200 North Federal Plat
10. 9T13* City of Fort Lauderdale
11. 2T13* Downtown Units Land Use Plan Amendment
12. Communication to City Commission
13. For the Good of the City

Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on these Items were sworn in.

Hope Calhoun, representing the Applicant, stated that Planning, CRA, Engineering, and Sustainable Development Staff have met multiple times with the Applicant regarding the Application. The Applicant has also reached out to residents of the subject area and members of the nearby neighborhood association.

She explained that the purpose of the Application was for the expansion of the existing New Mount Olive Missionary Baptist Church, which will include the addition of a chapel and more parking. The proposal would rezone the parcels of property owned by the church, which she identified on a visual rendering. The property is bordered by two existing single-family homes that are not part of the rezoning request.

The Church's intent is to provide parking for the expanding facility, renovate the existing 30,000 sq. ft. church building, and add a family life center. The Church presently has 1400 members. The expansion plan will add a new sanctuary, which will seat approximately 1900 people. An open meditation area and chapel will also be added. The chapel will seat approximately 200 people.

Ms. Calhoun stated that all the parcels the Church is seeking to rezone are presently zoned RMM-25. The first four Applications request the rezoning of these parcels to CFH, Community Facility-House of Worship. The next Application requests the vacation of a 15 ft. alley. The Church owns the property on both sides of this alley, with the exception of the single-family homes, as previously noted. The purpose of the alley vacation is to accommodate the facility's expansion and provide pedestrian connectivity from the street to the new chapel. The Applicant has met with the owners of both single-family homes, who are supportive of the proposed development and have signed the vacation Application.

The next Application seeks the right-of-way vacation of a 10 ft. alley. Ms. Calhoun identified the parcels owned by the Church and the City on the rendering, noting that additional lots in this area are owned in trust. The Applicant has met with the Trustee,

who did not indicate any disagreement with the Application. The plans are to improve the alley where it is surrounded on both sides by Church-owned property. A pedestrian easement and improvements will be provided along the vacation. The portion of the alley in which the Church does not own both sides of the right-of-way will remain unimproved.

Ms. Calhoun noted that the final Application is a site plan. She recalled that the existing church is roughly 30,000 sq. ft. in size and can hold up to 1400 people; the proposed expansion would increase the property to 41,000 sq. ft. and have a seating capacity of 1900. It will not change the footprint of the existing building, but will change the use. Improvements will be made to the dining hall and provide a meeting place for church members. The chapel, which will seat 200 people, is adjacent to the existing facility. In addition to the two proposed surface parking lots, improvements made within the right-of-way include landscaping, pavement, and street connectivity.

Ms. Calhoun observed that the existing sanctuary is 50 ft. in height. The new facility will be constructed to the same height. She noted that current Code limits the height of structures within the area to 35 ft. In addition, parking calculations were made along two different scenarios at the request of Staff, in order to examine the “worst-case scenario” of providing parking for 1900 seats.

She added that while Code requires 475 parking spaces for the facility, the additional surface lots will provide 443 spaces, leaving a deficit of 32 spaces. However, Ms. Calhoun pointed out that an additional 50 on-street spaces are within 700 ft. of the facility. Members may also walk or take existing shuttle service from the surrounding neighborhood to the church. Code allows the use of grass drive aisles, as the parking lots themselves will be paved.

Ms. Calhoun concluded by showing the elevations of the proposed facility, noting that some setback variances will require the Application to go before the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Ferber requested clarification of the approvals sought from neighboring properties for the vacation listed in Item 6. Ms. Calhoun explained that the Applicant met with the Trustee of this property, which is presently held in trust. The Trustee had indicated that s/he not opposed to the vacation, but was not comfortable signing onto the vacation as a representative of the trust. Other surrounding properties are City-owned. The Application has gone before the City’s Property and Right-of-Way (PROW) Committee and Development Review Committee (DRC) for approval.

Mr. McCulla requested clarification of the setbacks for which the Application will go before the Board of Adjustment (BOA). Ms. Calhoun showed the location of these setbacks on the visual rendering, noting that a portion of the chapel encroaches 5 ft. into the setback on 9th Avenue. A portion of the overhead entryway and choir loft also extend into the setback. These extensions do not reach the ground.

Mr. McCulla asked how the Board could be expected to approve a nonconforming site plan. Attorney Dunckel explained that the approval would be subject to the BOA granting the requested variances. If the variances are not granted, the Application would come back before the Board.

Tom Lodge, representing Urban Design and Development, stated that the Applicant proposes to expand a house of worship, which is subject to a Site Plan Level 3 permit. The request is for a 45,493 sq. ft. floor area and a height of 51 ft. 1 in., while the maximum floor area and height permitted by Code in a CFH zoning district are 10,000 sq. ft. and 35 ft. respectively. The Application will go before the Board of Adjustment on August 14, 2013 to request three setback variances for the property.

Mr. Lodge continued that the Applicant requests four separate rezonings from RMM-25 to CFH in order to accommodate new parking for the proposed facility. The Applicant also requests two right-of-way vacations for 10 ft. and 15 ft. Staff recommends approval of the Items with the conditions stated in the Staff Report.

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

Attorney Dunckel advised that the Board must vote on each Item separately.

Motion made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Mr. Witschen, to approve Item 1 subject to Staff conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Motion made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Mr. Witschen, to approve Item 2 subject to Staff conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Motion made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Mr. Witschen, to approve Item 3 subject to Staff conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Motion made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Mr. Witschen, to approve Item 4 subject to Staff conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Motion made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Mr. McCulla, to approve the vacation request as per Staff's recommendation for Item 5. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Motion made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Mr. McCulla, to approve Item 6, the vacation, subject to Staff conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Motion made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Mr. McCulla, to approve site plan, Item 7, subject to the Board of Adjustment as the Attorney said. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.