

**INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
 CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
 CITY HALL – 8TH FLOOR
 100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
 FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
 FRIDAY, May 26, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.**

Cumulative

Board Members	Attendance	June 2016-May 2017	
		Present	Absent
Catherine Maus	N	3	1
Leigh Kerr	P	4	0
James Brady	P	2	2
Bradley Deckelbaum	P	4	0
Jason Crush	P	4	0
Mary C. Fertig	P	3	1
Peter Henn	P	4	0

Staff

Mr. Spence Spence, Assistant City Attorney
 Jim Hetzel, Principal Planner, Urban Design, and Planning
 Tyler LaForme, Planner I, Urban Design, and Planning
 Michele Jewel-Moore, Service Clerk, Urban Design, and Planning

I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Maus called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m. and all recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM / Approval of Minutes

As of this date, May 26, 2017, there are 7 appointed members to the Committee, which means 4 would constitute a quorum. At this time, there is a quorum.

Motion made Mr. Deckelbaum to approve the minutes from April 28, 2017, seconded by Peter Henn. In a voice vote the motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Chair Maus to approve Mr. Brady for a phone conference no one opposed. In a voice vote the motion pass unanimously.

III. AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Maus apologized to the committee for missing the April meeting and she asked where did the committee leave off on from the last meeting.

Mr. Deckelbaum indicated that little progress has been made and the committee is still at the start of the effort.

Mr. Henn answered by stating he agreed with Mr. Deckelbaum in which they haven't made much progress since the first meeting. However, two things came out of last meeting the Committee agreed to get public input on the ID Zoning and to have a public outreach meeting in October.

Mr. Henn also explained that on the positive side staff is now studying certain corridors that will be allowed to take in some of the flex units that will have more of a urban design to it and that may very well be one of the areas where the ID Zoning or PUD could be utilized.

Chair Maus reiterated the statement where the staff does not see any future ID or PUD projects if the challenges are not addressed.

Mr. Hetzel stated as it is written right now and if it doesn't change probably not.

Mr. Deckelbaum asked if that was due to process and the uncertainty.

Mr. Hetzel stated it's due to the applications that have already come in and have been withdrawn, that's not a good success rate.

Mr. Deckelbaum asked what is a reasonable timeframe for an ID zoning application to go through the system?

Mr. Hetzel stated the complexity of the application will determine the length of the timeframe and a year would be the average process for complex projects.

Mr. Henn stated it will probably also depend on the level of the community outreach for the project.

Mr. Hetzel stated from other projects the more streamline process would take about 3 to 4 months for application process. Applications requiring higher levels of approval takes about 6 to 7 months. Therefore, it depends on the level of the application.

Mr. Deckelbaum asked if the ID zoning application process is too extensive? He stated they have had two withdrawals because the process never ended.

Mr. Hetzel stated that was not the reason, they choose to go another route.

Mr. Hetzel and Mr. Crush gave examples of some previous projects that have gone through and explained how there where different processes. However, the timeframes where different for each project. Also, it depends on public outreach.

Mr. Hetzel advised the Committee that the resolution for forming the Innovative Development District Advisory Committee has a sunshine date of July 12, 2017. He stated that the Committee would have to come up with recommendations by that date or go back to the City Commission for an extension. He also stated that the City Commission will want to know why no progress was made and the Committee would need to have some type of structure and timeframe for addressing the issues.

Mr. Crush stated that he believes all the members of the Committee would make a recommendation to extend based on the last meeting where there was discussion to do public outreach in October.

Mr. Henn and Chair Maus agreed that more time was asked when the ID ordinance was created the first time.

Mr. Hetzel stated he would need the Committee to provide direction on the timeframe and their approach.

Mr. Henn claims he has been requesting a public community enhancement approach but some of the other members thought it sounded like a buy off and he does not know if them as a committee can agree on that. He knows many other jurisdictions including Miami have gone that route. However, he feels like they as a group did a very good job the first time with defining what is Innovative.

Mr. Crush explained the reason why he and Ms. Fertig wanted a public benefits meeting is because hearing from the public saying it's not enough benefits from previous ID projects that have come forth, It is very different from hearing what the public thinks is a public benefit. If it is going to be, another ID Zoning project it's going to have to depend on what the public feels is a public benefit.

Mr. Hetzel stated what staff needs is some quantified elements if you have those in there the public may respond more positive. He feels the reason why the previous projects did not go through is because they did not have standard or a

quantified element that the public can say we approved this as a public process.

Mr. Crush stated that staff presented material in the previous meeting regarding limiting building heights around 10% of the normal zoning code, but the committee did not agree with the limitation percentage.

Chair Maus stated that maybe the numbers are wrong. However, she believes it is a good idea.

Mr. Bradley disagrees with the quantified standard because it should be highly objective standards.

Mr. Crush stated they all have to face facts at this point in the ID ordinance because if they were to go to the City Commission and say its fine the way it is, there may never be another ID Zoning coming to the City. However, if they create a mechanism for someone to come in with a zoning district that is existing on the property to propose a project within certain parameters that would work there better the ID Zoning could be used than they will have to set certain criteria.

Mr. Crush stated he agreed with Mr. Deckelbaum on they should be able to propose what they want but in reality it would be three years to process an application.

Mr. Crush also stated that Mr. Henn made a point before regarding the Super-Majority. He believes that is where they left off before that a developer can define their own scope of what they feel is innovative because the super-majority is a very hard hurdle to overcome. He used the beach as an example; to say you can do a development with a higher impact which is a higher level of review and you can do something more like ask for density and/or height bonuses if you meet certain criteria and get certain points.

Mr. Henn stated they all agreed to not remove the super-majority and maybe they can just go back to the performance criteria of if you get 3 out 5 you are ok, but 4 out of 5 will be more effective.

Mr. Henn spoke about performance zoning where you only look at total impacts it's like when you do a project and there's a baseline but if you go beyond that baseline, as long as you are migrating through improvements to the public realm or public infrastructure. He states it's almost a way to quantify the project from an impact point of view for performance for the area it's allowed.

Mr. Hetzel stated that in the neighborhood comparability section, it's difficult to make connections and justifications and quantify as much. He believes context driven is more appropriate when dealing with development applications, which he believes is more favorable by the public.

Mr. Henn thinks they should focus on scale, mass, and volume. He used Vancouver to explain how you could use a tradeoff for height and/or density. He stated that goes back to performance and asked is there a way for Urban Design criteria to say what each property should have on it.

The Committee questioned how would you quantify that volume or mass rate is?

Mr. Hetzel stated you would have define the design elements for the open space and public realm criteria more detailed.

Mr. Henn asked staff if they think the public is protected with the neighborhood comparability ordinance and the Super-Majority in the process.

Mr. Hetzel stated yes, however, gave some examples from the Bahia Mar, which met the criteria for the ID Zoning. He explained how volume and height works.

Mr. Spence stated your tradition zoning district is like painting by the numbers, however, the ID Zoning , the way it is written gives a person a blank canvas to say draw your lines in which you want to paint and we will consider it. But, now the question is should you have a couple of lines there to guide them and is it context driven. If you are given a blank canvas to create regulations, how do you give them lines in the since of height and other restrictions that meets criteria.

Mr. Spence stated he believes the Committee is wrestling with a one size fit all or a customize zoning district.

Mr. Hetzel stated he looked at the notes from the previous committee for ID Zoning and asked was there a tier level discussed such as time and certain levels for public improvements and public realm?

Mr. Deckelbaum stated how do you evaluate a level of public improvement because it's not necessary an acreage.

Mr. Hetzel explained how at each tier you would do certain things and as you go up it gets more intense.

Mr. Henn stated they spent a lot of time trying to define what is innovative. However, if he can go back to what Mr., Deckelbaum said about the timeframe, one of his criticisms with the City process in general requires a lot of dollars but thinks the design process is concept after concept. He asked is there is a way for the ID Zoning process where you get before an elected official and you have one public outreach meeting but you are not going in with a complete set of plans which is kind of like a test because you have a lot at risk until you get through the process.

Mr. Crush stated he means designing the building envelope before you design the building.

Mr. Hetzel stated you could do a structure of some sort, which talks about the density, mass, volume and public realm of the building before moving on with more details.

Mr. Deckelbaum stated if they were going to tread on some dangerous grounds and go with the quantifiable elements, which the staff subjected. Would a process of by which preliminary application that only goes to staff level and they are scoring it and saying anything over 7 would be presumed to be meeting all of the standards, have to go to City Commission to vote. However, staff has already created all of the standards and says if you keep going on this path most likely the project will be approved.

Mr. Hetzel stated the code would have to be pretty structured in what the pre-approval would be.

Mr. Crush stated he likes Mr. Henn idea were you design the envelope with public benefits and if the public agrees with the public benefit it becomes a DRC Application without spending all of the money and time designing the building.

It was stated the process would be like the DRI process.

Mr. Deckelbaum questioned if there were a process that would work for all projects.

Mr. Henn stated it's like getting the Master Plan approved and you come back in later with everything else. He stated do not feel bad for the development community because the worse thing is when you go down one path and then you go down a different path and then the architect wants one amount and someone else wants this amount.

The Committee asked Mr. Spence what does he think would be the process for the City Commission to approve an envelope without defining the envelope without designing the building with setbacks, height, and mass and include the public benefit.

Mr. Henn stated if the community does a form base code what you are really doing is agreeing that it looks one way but it's not exactly like that. He stated when form base codes are approved they do not go back through elected officials; they go through DRC maybe a P&Z review. He stated they are done everywhere and are popular.

Mr. Hetzel stated it goes back to context driven and it would not have to go back to that form.

Chair Maus asked which envelope would that apply to. Mr. Crush stated to each particular property.

Mr. Spence asked so technically when the first site plan comes forward what would be the things the Commissioners would consider when approving or denying the project.

Mr. Crush stated it would be substantial deviation because you would not be able to build outside the envelope. Mr. Spence asks so this purely will be aesthetics. Mr. Crush stated the envelope would include rezoning, mass, height, density and define public benefit. He stated DRC has a call up. He also stated you would not, but you will have the uses too. They will have to define public space and public realm. Mr. Crush stated the developers pay a lot of money to a consultant to review the traffic study, the City pays an outside consultant to review that traffic study and Transportation Mobility signs off on it. He stated everybody signs off on it to say it has met the criteria.

Mr. Hetzel stated when those types of projects go through the public approval process there is normally approval process for mass, volume, and density. The discussion from the public will be how you could do that without knowing what the impacts are.

Mr. Crush stated you would not, but you will have the uses too. They will have to define public space and public realm.

Mr. Hetzel stated thinking about the other ID Zoning projects that have come forth the big topics were open space, public realm, building height and traffic. He stated you are basically asking the City Commission to approve this volume this building form and that can get into as Mr. Spence said certain approval rights. So the public may say how can you do that because it is not a full

application and how can you give a preliminary approval to something that does not have a complete traffic analysis.

The Committee discussed traffic impact would be and those are issues that should not be a part of a technical review.

Mr. Hetzel stated he just don't know effective it would be from the public prospective.

Mr. Spence stated process wise the ID Zoning could work. He is thinking about how our city has been cultured and what it means in thinking about it in phases, in improving the envelope what type of entitlements would the developer gain in the first end of the process verses the second end. He states when he thinks about the community culture individuals would to be able to visualize the project. He asked so they get the envelope approved and down the road the site plan comes forward and then the opposition to that is, what are the criteria for the approvals that are attached for a pre-app.

Mr. Henn stated if you have a process improvement, you have to exercise your rights in a certain timeframe before it expires. If so, you have the right to move forward. When you have gone the first process, then you can now make the commitment to spend dollars.

Mr. Hetzel stated as a reviewer he would struggle with not having enough information, but it would depend on the details of what is being put forward. Therefore, from a design review prospective it would be difficult to put the project before the Commissioners unless it is flushed out a little bit more.

Mr. Crush used the Downtown RAC as an example and stated they look at unlimited height, which is defined, by the FAA, four plates, and TAM looks at traffic.

Mr. Hetzel stated when they review an application there are a set of Master Plan guidelines that staff has to do a technical review on.

Mr. Crush stated it is suggested and not required.

Mr. Hetzel stated where they see the focus on based on previous discussions are with and single family neighborhoods and where would these applications come from so that may help in looking at context driven.

Mr. Henn stated where are the people going to go that come into the City in the next 10 to 15 years. In addition, working backwards from that the code may not allow those people to fit in the volume the code allows if you are going to

take all of the single-family neighborhoods off, so staff should be pushing the ID Zoning more if they are going to find a house for everybody.

Mr. Hetzel stated he has shared with the Committee that staff is trying to focus on where that population growth would go in a sustainable way have some mobility connection.

Mr. Crush stated that that is a good idea and he knows staff will work hard on it and come up with a plan everyone could look at but he thinks it is outside of the scope of what they are doing.

Mr. Hetzel stated they do not have a code yet.

Mr. Henn stated the project they are doing would have to go under some code.

Mr. Hetzel stated they would end up having to come up with a mixed-use category.

Mr. Henn stated he sent Mr. Hetzel and Mr. Spence something from Boulder Colorado where they are working on their public enhancement criteria for public benefit and one thing they gave as an option was not just the public realm, because they have serious public housing issues. So, if you are willing to add more height and provide affordable housing we can do that. He stated when you go beyond putting in certain things, at what point do you ask who the public is, who is the community and what are public benefits and is it macro to that property.

Mr. Hetzel stated that is a very good question. Due to flex is not an automatic approval.

The Committee stated it's not a big market for long term affordable housing anywhere and it seems to be an issue.

Mr. Hetzel, stated he knows it's 4:00 pm. However, wanted to get some comfort on the item regarding request to the City Committee on the extension of the committee.

Mr. Crush asked Mr. Hetzel about timing and where the public meeting would be. In addition, they need to discuss the month which Mr. Henn stated for October 2017. In addition, they have discussed having the public meeting down stairs.

Committee stated the reason they need an extension is for the public meeting in the fall to get a wider segment of what public benefits should be.

Mr. Henn stated them, as a committee would to decide if they will be meeting in the summer.

The Committee continues to discuss the time, date and place where the meeting will take place. They agreed to have the public meeting in the Commission Chambers.

Mr. Hetzel stated he would check on time, date and place where they will be able to have a public meeting. He asked besides the public meeting is there anything else they would like for him to convey to the City Commission for extending the date.

Mr. Crush stated they used the first four meetings doing an in depth analysis and discussion on what they think about the ID ordinance and are developing strategies to move forward to make any changes they may deem necessary in the future.

Chair Maus stated they took 6 months to come up with the original ordinance they are kind of back to square one and they need another 6 months.

Jim stated he would get some dates together to plan something in October.

The Committee stated the time should be around 6:00 or 6:30 pm.

Mr. Hetzel stated once the time and place is set they can do the public outreach portion.

Mr. Henn stated in August & September meetings they would have to focus on items for the public meeting.

Chair Maus asked if everyone be there in August, September.

Mr. Henn stated he would be there in August, September, June, and July he will not.

Chair Maus & Mr. Crush stated they would not be there in July.

Motion was made by Mr. Crush and seconded by Mr. Henn to cancel July 2017, meeting based on availability. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hetzel stated they would have to ask for the extension in the June due to the Sunshine expiration date of July 12, 2017. He asked if they would still like to discuss item 3, which was the continuation of the ID Zoning.

The committee stated that what they were discussing already.

Mr. Henn stated that if they were successful moving forward one of the recommendations the board would make is to change the name from Innovative Development.

Mr. Crush agreed.

Chair Maus asked about setting agenda for the next meeting.

Chair Maus asked Mr. Hetzel about something he stated previously, that he would not be comfortable reviewing pre-application.

Mr. Hetzel stated he would need to see more of the structure of what the plan is for.

Chair Maus stated like what, material or the form itself?

Mr. Hetzel stated whatever that is.

Mr. Crush asked how would Mr. Hetzel review an application that came in and he is just given a green box to check off.

Mr. Hetzel stated it depends on the project size for instance staff would want to see if there is 20% open space if that was one of the requirements.

Mr. Crush stated there will not be any requirements and just details describing the building.

Mr. Hetzel stated you would have to define the 20% public realm on the bottom floor, which will have impact on that building.

Mr. Crush asked where did 20% open realm, open space come from the original ID discussions? Because it is very confusing and there is no open space requirement in the RAC-CC

Chair Maus stated that they are proposing a zoning opportunity that deviates from the existing zoning and why are we going to let you build something different?

Mr. Crush stated that is why he and Mr. Henn suggested a pre-review to say this is what we can do instead of saying 20% of this or that.

Mr. Hetzel stated you need to develop a structure of whatever the intent is which will come from the committee. He stated for instance if it's public benefit it would need to be part of the plan due to that the built form.

Mr. Crush stated they should have a conversation on that after they decide what public benefit is. They will have the Super-Majority and find if you have public benefit you will get the Super-Majority.

Mr. Hetzel stated still believes that the public will need to see some kind of structure and he knows from the staff point of view he would need to see something of a reality.

Mr. Crush gave an example of a rezone they did from a B-1 to Rm-25 where they did a conceptual plan. He stated the ID will have green space and would be more detailed than an RM-25.

Mr. Hetzel the RM-25 has development standards.

Mr. Crush stated instead of a lot of plans the ID would be four pages of criteria such as: height, landscaping, and what will be the public benefit once they get a definition of what that is.

Mr. Hetzel stated if they had language in the ID ordinance which resembles language in the RM-25 zoning it may work. However, he believes it is two separate zonings.

Committee went on to discuss the differences between the two zonings.

Chair Maus stated at the next meeting they would need to beef up the proposal.

Mr. Crush stated he is suggesting that staff does not review the proposal or staff does review it and send it on if it meets the criteria and it goes to P&Z and City Commission.

Mr. Deckelbaum stated instead of rezoning a property from B-1 to RM-25, they are rezoning it to? The zoning which is a new zoning district which carries the same types of standards as a RM-25 and that is what ID is and that would go to the Super-Majority process and the others would go to normal processes.

Mr. Hetzel stated such as a preliminary review standard guide?

Mr. Crush stated instead of saying my minimum open space 20% the open space percentage would be adjusted according to the property you are building on. If community supports that, you get your Super-Majority and you continue forward and design your project.

Mr. Hetzel stated it sounds to him like someone is proposing something based on some kind criteria

Mr. Spence asked so you are proposing to write the criteria give what setbacks, height would be for this particular property, and saying is this ok with you and then design your building based on that.

Mr. Crush stated no neighborhood compatibility and no Super-Majority call.

Mr. Spence states we need to consider when we are looking at the legislation process we're looking at amending the zoning code, we are looking at a range plan and staff are looking at the different criteria and doing various analysis to determine the setbacks, size and height. He can understand the reservation that staff has when reviewing project by project having to do that level of analysis determining whether that criteria is fit for that property in that neighborhood.

Mr. Deckelbaum left the meeting.

Mr. Hetzel claims that ID or whatever you propose is based on those criteria that established in the ID ordinance now so that is what staff has to go by.

Mr. Spence states Mr. Crush is offering what the ID Zoning is now, which are setbacks, height, or any of that. The developer proposes all of that and what they fascading it, providing you with the criteria first before providing the details of the design.

Chair Maus stated her question is with every example Mr. Crush made the public loves it and it wins by a Super-Majority vote and what if the public doesn't love it?

Mr. Crush stated you don't get your rezoning unless you get your Super-Majority and you did not spend a lot on plans.

Mr. Spence stated Chair Maus mentioned it earlier the intent of the ID is to do something different and having the whole package in front of them is what presents that argument. He states It shows them you can do something other than what the current zoning can do.

Mr. Crush stated as if Mr. Henn stated they are going to change the name and take innovative out of it because each person's idea of innovative is different and how about just rezoning as the name.

Mr. Spence stated he understands where staff are being a little cautious about usually when they are looking at creating a whole new zoning district they are going into a lot of planning practices and theories so he gets were that concern is when you come to a blank slate, the general context that the developer brings to see if it works in that neighborhood.

Mr. Hetzel went over some zoning districts and setbacks and what was being proposed to say you have to rationally you should be able to connect the two to come up with a planning package.

Mr. Crush stated when you do a rezoning you don't.

Mr. Hetzel stated in rezoning you are not creating all of the standards.

Mr. Crush stated it's the same thing.

Mr. Spence stated you are actually talking about making the legislation. He states you are writing a customized zoning district, which in theory sounds ok. But, at the time should be put in context to understand why you are asking for this setbacks and this height. So you are saying its easy for him because the job has already been done and the zoning would be RM-15 that has been vetted, that's been approved by the City Commission and you know it was reviewed by staff and they went through whatever criteria there was and now his job is to apply that to the context of the property. However, now staff has to look at both of those situations.

Mr. Crush stated he gets it and elaborated on it.

Mr. Hetzel stated on his previous job the process for PUD you have the rational standard, then the concept plan, and then you were subject to give formal site plans which had a technical review by staff; they had to meet those perimeters within the PUD.

Mr. Deckelbaum stated that's what Mr. Crush was talking about you meet the criteria first and what goes to the public officials is to set the criteria for staff to review.

Chair Maus asked why are you asking for that particular criterion?

Mr. Crush stated because we would have to provide a narrative of what we are asking for and a presentation to P&Z and he gives some examples on why.

Chair Maus stated she does not think they can draft an ordinance that will allow you to create anything you want on any piece of property without clarifying.

Mr. Hetzel stated that's what they did with the PUD if you were deviating or going way from the code you had to justify why establish it and if it got approved that was your new standard. Therefore, when the site plan came in the City Commission has already approved it.

Mr. Crush stated he is going back to something Mr. Henn said the first time around was whatever is proposed by the ID is approved by City Commission no matter what because it is a Super-Majority vote. So to streamline this whole yes or no process you would say here's my zoning and this is what I propose for example instead of RM-25 I want do this and then straight to City Commission with visuals, green space, I will not build outside these perimeters, I got neighborhood presidents here they love it. Let us get out of there in about 3 months and if it is approved then we spend a year doing the plans going to DRC and going through the process.

Mr. Crush stated the way the ID is writing now the City Commission approves it no matter what but, both Bahia Mar and Galleria it took multiple years, meetings and then you get to the end of the road, and it like this is not what we talked about two year ago.

Mr. Hetzel stated the rational connections in there and they would have to be thought through. He stated stated you have it now with the ID Zoning but have to be some structure there.

Mr. Crush stated it comes down to rather the City Commission will vote yes or no based on the public input.

Mr. Henn asked lets assumed we created a new zoning categories and let's call it RMH-100 it has a 300 ft. maximum height a minimum 5 ft. setback, and a minimum 5ft open space, that's all the criteria anyone owns a piece of property needs in theory has the right to petition their local government for a result and it may get killed one way or the other.

Mr. Henn went on to say they are not going to just give that away just because someone walks in the door you would need justification, so now you do your renderings not a full set of drawings just enough to get the public aboard then you do your justification it's not just the developer to do the plans because he will hire a planner to work with you for the justification. Also, we don't call it ID

and staff reviews all the criteria, they even meet the code for neighborhood compatibility.

Mr. Henn states you are not going from an RH-60 to an ID we are going from whatever address to the new zoning code RMH-100 which is the same concept with less criteria but it will be going higher level and you would have to have some good justifications to get to that and the reality you have your four votes but most people are not going to give you that wave unless it's a justification.

Chair Maus asked Mr. Spence legally if the City Commission denies an application that came in under those auspices then what happens with regards to the to the a pallet criteria.

Mr. Spence stated it is determine whether it follows the residual requirements of law and accompany statues of the law.

Mr. Hetzel stated when the committee is thinking this through they think about the development community or the property owner would use.

Mr. Crush stated he does not think they should vote on anything like that today.

Mr. Henn stated a good developer is willing to put money on the project.

Mr. Hetzel stated think about if you were a resident and there was a project Coming in your community or near your community it will be an easier argument and it was context driven because that will dictate the scale size and mass, if you get the buy in from the public, you will get the approval from the Commissioners.

Mr. Henn stated then that could be one of the criteria's of this new zoning code that staff gets to give their opinion in staff report whether it is context driven.

Mr., Henn asked Mr. Hetzel given your corridor approach don't you think you as the planning department will have to change your context to a new vision today due to what might have been from years ago.

Mr. Hetzel stated in the Commission workshop for year and a half they are trying to decide where they will concentrate first and trying to figure out how to do 18 thousand flex units in different zones in the city. He explained the different things they would have to look for down the road. He stated context driven projects helps streamline the process it dictates the mass and volume.

Chair Maus asked is that what he means by context driven she thinking of when someone's does rendering and filling in the spaces with blocks.

Mr. Hetzel answered yes, the depth of the lot, size, what is next which rather dictate the mass and volume of it.

Mr. Crush stated that is exactly what they mean when they said designing the envelope except without the full P&Z or DRC, but they would know if it is acceptable with the Commission and public before that.

Mr. Hetzel stated it needs to be a length .why you are asking for something is context driven.

Mr. Henn showed a picture stated they took an added an existing overlay of what was there and showed the proposal it could be done for \$2500 and not 2.5 million.

Chair Maus asked Mr. Crush your context driven pre-application submittal will it include a reason why you are building out the pre-existing code on that property.

Mr. Crush stated yes but you would not know what that reason is unless you see the property.

Chair Maus it cannot be I would like to build 200 units and the current zoning code does not allow it.

Mr. Crush stated no, no narrative would have that.

Committee gave some examples of what a narrative would say.

Chair Maus stated it should be more than that.

Mr. Crush stated he has explained it want does she want?

Mr. Hetzel stated when you do a rezoning you have to have a comp plan, which will have mass, and density.

Mr. Henn stated it would have to be constant with a comp plan

Mr. Deckelbaum asked if there were any mechanism to building this legally other than plans.

Mr. Crush stated height.

Chair Maus stated there would be a bombard of applications to come in under this code, which will basely throw the whole code out of the window.

Mr. Spence stated lets go back to where you started from he know they don't the term innovative but, that exactly why they put it in there. You get back to why you are using and you go back to the existing code because it is an innovative project. However, it has to be something more to justify going outside of the existing code.

Mr. Hetzel stated for him it hard to answer questions because the structure will have to be defined a little more and going back to his old job with the PUD book it gave them structure at the development standard and if they deviated they justified it at that point and they came back with site plans later.

Mr. Crush stated that exactly what they are talking about and asked if Mr. Hetzel had a copy of that?

Mr. Hetzel stated he would attempt to get a copy.

Mr. Crush asked if it was something in the code or something they used as a review?

Mr. Hetzel stated it was an adopted code and it tells you the minimum of what you have to address.

Mr. Henn stated what they have will not go away but they would just tweet some of the words innovative.

Mr. Crush went into to more reasons of justifications to Chair Maus and explained it depends on what the developers would like to do and stated it a context base justification.

Chair Maus stated so anybody can come in and said everybody will come in.

Mr. Crush stated why that is a bad thing.

Chair Maus stated because we have a zoning code.

Mr. Hetzel said you could define the intent more.

Chair Maus states it has to be intent.

Mr. Henn stated it would have to be a justification back to good planning, design by definition of neighborhood compatibility because everything is context based.

Mr. Crush stated he only has a problem with neighborhood compatibility because everybody uses it.

Mr. Henn read a section from the ID code and stated from that section it not needed because you cannot go away from that. He stated a lot of the code is old and if it was up to the planners to would go with a form base driven code.

Chair Maus asked Mr. Hetzel if there was anything else needed from them.

Mr. Hetzel stated not right now.

Chair Maus adjourned the meeting at 5:00 pm.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No Public Comments

SET AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING – June 30, 2017

Committee will define the scope of the questions for the public meeting.

Mr. Hetzel stated they would need to discuss what they need from staff regarding presentations, structure of the meeting, and any materials as well.

Committee asked Mr. Hetzel to provide PUD book from Coconut Creek, which defines the structure of the development standard to use as an example.

IV. COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION

Motion by Chair Maus to request for an extension for the committee for 6 months from the City Commission, seconded by Mr. Crush. In a voice, the motion passed unanimously.

Committee agreed to ask for a six-month extension due to having a public outreach meeting in October 2017, to gain a wider segment,

Staff is to look for dates, time, and where the public meeting will be.

FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.