

DRAFT
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS – 1ST FLOOR
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2012 – 6:30 P.M.

Cumulative

Board Members	Attendance	June 2012-May 2013	
		Present	Absent
Patrick McTigue, Chair	P	4	1
Leo Hansen, Vice Chair	P	4	1
Brad Cohen	P	2	0
Stephanie Desir-Jean	P	4	1
Michael Ferber	A	4	1
James McCulla	P	4	1
Michelle Tuggle	P	5	0
Tom Welch	P	4	1
Peter Witschen	P	4	1

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

Staff

Ella Parker, Acting Urban Design and Planning Manager
D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
Anthony Fajardo, Urban Design and Development
Tom Lodge, Urban Design and Development
Yvonne Redding, Urban Design and Development
Mohammed Malik, Chief Zoning Examiner
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Ms. Desir-Jean, to request that Staff develop a process that would not require Items such as 17R12A and 18R12A, both of which relate to sign approval, to come before the Planning and Zoning Board. (Streamline the review process for signage, especially in the Downtown and beach areas, to be done at Staff level, as well as certain small impact uses such as Office in the residential office districts, which currently require the Board's review.)

Index

	<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1.	17R12A**	1 E Broward Boulevard

2. 18R12A** 200 E Broward Boulevard
3. 41R11** Las Olas Property Management, LLC
4. 50R12** Certain Properties, LLC
5. 12Z12** * Key Village Charter School
6. 1P12** St. Jerome Catholic Church and School
7. 10P12** Ninth Street Property, LLC / French Village
8. 11P12** Ninth Street Property, LLC / French Village
9. 4T12* Neighborhood Compatibility
10. 5T12* Adult Gaming Centers
11. 11T12* Photovoltaic Solar Systems
12. Communication to the City Commission
13. For the Good of the City

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.

~~Chair McTigue called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. The Chair introduced the Board members, and Acting Urban Design and Planning Manager Ella Parker introduced the Staff members present. Attorney Spence explained the quasi-judicial process used by the Board.~~

~~It was noted that Items 1 and 2 were inadvertently mislabeled, and were not quasi-judicial Items.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Welch, seconded by Ms. Tuggle, to approve the minutes of the September 19, 2012 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.~~

~~Attorney Spence noted a correction to the July 18, 2012 minutes: p.3, Item 2 should state "Ms. Parker clarified that the 40 ft. easement noted by Mr. Lochrie would actually be a 27 ft. easement." He requested that the Board move to approve this correction to the previously adopted minutes.~~

~~**Motion** made by Vice Chair Hansen, seconded by Mr. McCulla, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.~~

1.	<u>1 E Broward Blvd</u>	Yvonne Redding	17R12A
	Request: **	Sign Approval pursuant to ULDR Sec. 47.22.4.C.13.I	
	Legal Description:	S J BROWNS SUB S 1/2 Lot 12 Block 14 Fort Lauderdale 3-145-D, Lots 1 thru 6 Less Pt for road as described in OR 12022/880	
		Fort Lauderdale B-40 D S 1/2 Lot 11 Less S 40 & Less N 17 1/2 for streets & Less Pt as described in OR 12022/880 for road, Block 14	
	General Location:	-1 E. Broward Blvd.	
	District:	-4	

~~Nick Milano, representing the Applicant, stated that the request is to approve a Site Plan Level 3 permit for two signs: a monument sign, set back 35 ft. from the property line, and a "#1" ground sign which designates the building as 1 East Broward Boulevard.~~

~~Yvonne Redding, representing the Department of Sustainable Development, explained that these signs would differ from the existing Code in the downtown area. The #1 sign is 11 ft. 6 in. rather than 5 ft. in height, while the monument sign will be a multi-tenant sign.~~

~~There being no 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.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Mr. McCulla, to approve.~~

~~Mr. Witschen commented that items of this nature should not be required to come before the Board.~~

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

2.	<u>200 E Broward Blvd</u>	Yvonne Redding	18R12A
	Request: **	Sign Approval pursuant to ULDR Sec. 47.22.4.C.13.I	
	Legal Description:	SPERRY'S SUB Block C STRANAHANS SUB Block 14, Fort Lauderdale 2-8 B, Lots 1, thru 5, Less RAW and Lots 20 thru 22, Less E 15 for Street	
	General Location:	-200 E. Broward Blvd.	
	District:	-4	

~~Steve Tilbrook, representing VVUSA City LP, explained that the Applicant is seeking sign permits similar to those described in Item 1. The two multi-tenant ground signs are within size requirements for the district and are set back 9 ft. 6 in. from the property line. The height of the sign is 73 in. and the width is 63 in.~~

~~Ms. Redding advised that two existing ground signs would be replaced by the proposed multi-tenant signs, which are not currently permitted by Code. She added that the Board may approve signs that differ from Code requirements in the downtown area.~~

~~Mr. McCulla noted that the City's sign Code is currently under revision, and asked if the proposed signs would be permitted by the revised Code. Ms. Parker said Staff is currently reviewing specific sign Code criteria, and hopes to bring revisions before the Board in late 2012 or early 2013.~~

~~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.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Mr. Witschen, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.~~

3.	<u>Las Olas Property Management, LLC.</u>	Yvonne Redding	41R11
	Request: **	Site Plan Level IV - Restaurant/Bar	
	Legal Description:	Lot 14, Block 6, LAS OLAS BY THE SEA, according to the re-amended plat as recorded in PB 1, Pg 16, PRBC, less the south 20 feet thereof.	
	General Location:	235 Almond Avenue	
	District:	-2	

~~Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on this Item were sworn in.~~

~~Steve Carbone explained that he is an owner of the business at this location. The property formerly housed a hair salon and a realty company; the owners have made this into a single unit, where they plan to operate a bar and grill.~~

~~Ms. Desir-Jean requested more information on the business. Mr. Carbone characterized the restaurant as a “mom and pop” establishment. He added that the request was approved 7-0 by the Board of Adjustment and is endorsed by the Central Beach Alliance.~~

~~Ms. Redding advised that the Applicant appeared before the Board of Adjustment because they did not meet the measurement requirement for their liquor license. A parking bond for \$28,000 has been posted with the Department of Transportation and Mobility, as the location does not currently provide its own parking.~~

~~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.~~

Motion made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Mr. Witschen, to approve.

~~Mr. McCulla asked if the Application required specific approval to open a restaurant and bar in a resort area. Ms. Parker confirmed this, stating that certain uses are designated within the area; those not designated are left to the Board’s discretion to determine whether or not the uses are tourist-related. She recalled that the Board has previously requested a review of these uses, with the possibility that some may be approved without presentation before the Board.~~

~~Mr. McCulla suggested that Staff review the liquor license distance requirement in addition to the list of approved uses.~~

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

4. **Certain Properties, LLC.**

Yvonne Redding

50R12

Request: **

Site Plan Level III – Change of Use: 850 square foot Single Family Dwelling to Office Use, Planned Residential Office (ROC), pursuant to ULDR Sec. 47-5.60.E

Legal Description:

The west 30’ of Lot 3 and the east 35’ of lot 4, Block 31, SOUTH RIVER SECTION OF CROISSANT PARK, according to PB 8, page 20, BRPR.

General Location:

300 SW 12th Street

District:

4

~~Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on this Item were sworn in.~~

~~Michael Madfis, representing the Applicant, explained that the request is for a change of use to residential office (ROC). The property conforms to current zoning requirements and will also conform as an office to new zoning requirements. The Development Review Committee (DRC) has approved the Application.~~

~~Ms. Redding stated that the property is in the ROC zoning district, which requires that any change of use or new use must come before the Board as Site Plan Level 3. The Applicant proposes to change an 850 sq. ft. single-family dwelling to an office. They will provide parking and all other requirements for office use within this zoning district.~~

~~Ms. Tuggle requested more information on the proposed use. Mr. Madfis advised that it will be a professional bail bonds office.~~

~~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.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Mr. Welch, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.~~

5. **Key Village Charter School**

Yvonne Redding

-12Z12

Request: ** *

Rezone from Mobile Home Park (MHP) to Community Facility — School (CF-S), pursuant to ULDR Sec. 47-24.4

Legal Description:

WESTWOOD HEIGHTS 6-34 B, lot 6 thru 19, 20 less east 14 & less there from ext area of - 25 rad arc lying in se corner, block 38

Address:

2740 SW 4th Court

District:

-3

~~Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on this Item were sworn in.~~

~~Attorney Spence clarified that emails must be disclosed for quasi-judicial items, as they are considered *ex parte* communication and may be intended to provide information that could influence a member's decision. Board members are asked to ensure that Staff receives a copy of any such emails as part of the record.~~

~~Gus Carbonell, representing the Applicant, stated that the request would rezone a 2-acre property, which is presently zoned as a mobile home park. The surrounding location is zoned B-2 and includes warehouses, restaurants, schools, repair shops, and other businesses. A charter school, which will have a maximum of 600 students, is proposed for this location.~~

~~Mr. Carbonell noted that this Item was presented three times to the Melrose Manors Homeowners' Association, and was presented once to the nearby Riverland community as well. The land use is allowed, as schools are intended to be near residential neighborhoods. The school will be open, by law, to any student residing in Broward County. A traffic study was conducted for the site by both the Applicant's and the City's traffic engineers. A stacking area is designated for parents dropping off and picking up their children, and a separate bus area and bicycle parking are designated as well.~~

~~The proposed school would be a single-storey building with 29 classrooms. The closest neighbors to the site are a two-storey apartment building and a church. Mr. Carbonell showed a landscape plan, noting that over 30% of the site would be landscaped. All buffer yard requirements will be met, and drainage has been addressed to contain water on the site. He concluded that most of the vehicular traffic will enter from and exit to 27th Avenue.~~

~~Ms. Tuggle commented that she is a resident of the surrounding area, and there are two K-8 schools within walking distance of the neighborhood. She asked if the proposed school will be a Florida public charter school. Mr. Carbonell confirmed this, stating that the school will be regulated by the Broward County School Board. He characterized charter schools as offering different programs for students and being run in a manner similar to a business, with the principal having authority to hire teachers.~~

~~He advised that there are presently three parties interested in operating the school, and asserted that the facility is not intended to be an alternative school for troubled students.~~

~~Ms. Tuggle asked how the school could expect to attract students, as the schools in the area are very close to one another. Mr. Carbonell stated that the school is intended to provide choice in education, as parents would have the option of sending their children to a public, charter, or private school within the same neighborhood.~~

~~Hernan Leonoff, also representing the Applicant, clarified that he would not be the operator of the school. The operator would be selected during a later phase of the project after site plan approval.~~

~~Ms. Tuggle asked why the Applicant would want to develop a school at this location. Mr. Leonoff stated that charter schools are "schools of choice," and only receive funds from the school board "if the kids show up." It is intended to offer an alternative to parents who find the charter school's curriculum more attractive than other schools.~~

~~Ms. Tuggle explained that she would like to know how the Applicant determined that this particular neighborhood could support another school. Mr. Leonoff said demographics are studied to help identify the right operator for each charter school, and added that all 15 charter schools developed by the Applicant are successful.~~

~~Ms. Tuggle observed that several charter schools have recently closed due to lack of attendance and/or funds. Mr. Leonoff said charter schools are presented to the school board, which grants a charter; the proposed school must then find a location. He agreed that not all operators are running their programs efficiently, which can result in schools shutting down. He asserted, however, that the Applicant deals with reputable operators who have not experienced this problem.~~

~~Ms. Tuggle asked if the proposed school presently has a charter at the location, or if the Applicant would have to apply for a charter. Mr. Leonoff replied that the Applicant's role is to find a location that will support a charter school and then engage in a lease contract with an operator. The Applicant provides the facility, but does not operate the school or determine its curriculum.~~

~~Ms. Desir-Jean requested clarification that the Applicant is simply the developer who constructs the building. Mr. Leonoff confirmed this. Ms. Desir-Jean asked how it was determined that this particular area needed a charter school. Mr. Leonoff said the area's demographics have been reviewed to determine the number of children from the ages of five to nine. The Applicant then studies the existing facilities to decide if they are up to the standards that could be offered by a competitive facility.~~

~~Ms. Desir-Jean asked if the Applicant had become involved with the surrounding community to hear residents' input. Mr. Carbonell said he had attended three meetings of the local civic association, and kept residents informed that the Applicant was working with the City on a traffic study to ensure that all necessary criteria are met. He noted that while some residents had expressed a desire to see single-family homes constructed in the area, the location was zoned B-2 and adjacent to a single-family neighborhood.~~

~~Ms. Desir-Jean asked if there is support from the neighborhood associations. Mr. Carbonell said he had presented the proposal to roughly 15 people each time he attended a community association meeting, although he had not requested a~~

vote. He added that he felt there may have been some misinformation about the proposal, which could have resulted in opposition to the plans.

Mr. Cohen asked if the building would remain on the site if the proposed school went out of business. Mr. Leonoff said the Applicant would try to find an alternative use for the building. He asserted that the Applicant was open to placing limitations on the site so an alternative school could not be placed at this location.

Vice Chair Hansen asked if the school would serve meals on-site in a cafeteria. Mr. Carbonell said most schools have a meal program through which meals are delivered to the site and warmed before they are served. He noted that Code does not require a loading zone for the proposed facility; however, the circular driveway that accommodates buses could also accommodate deliveries later in the day. He showed the location of this entrance and exit on the site plan. Both bus drop-offs and deliveries would take place across the street from neighborhood residences.

Vice Chair Hansen requested more information on the number of classrooms. Mr. Carbonell said of the 29 proposed classrooms, there would be four specialty classrooms for art, music, science, and other uses. He showed the location of an outdoor recreational area on the site plan, noting that this includes a half basketball court and a green area. The loop area surrounded by the circular driveway could also be chained or cordoned off later in the day for additional recreational use.

Ms. Tuggle asked if buses would enter the facility through 4th Place. Mr. Carbonell explained that buses would drop off students at a doorway on the side of the school. He referred again to the site plan, showing the dedicated driveway for the drop-off area and the entrance area for buses.

Mr. Carbonell advised that there would be 33 parking spaces on the site, which would be five more spaces than Code requires. He added that there is a 20 ft. setback from the property line to the nearby apartment building, which may not be used for any purpose other than landscaping. There will also be a 5 ft. concrete wall separating the facility from any adjacent property.

Mr. McCulla advised that the Board members had received copies of a transmittal including 111 signatures from the neighborhood in opposition to the project. He asked that Mr. Carbonell address the specific issues to which the neighborhood residents were opposed, stating that the first issue was the possibility that the school could devalue the residents' properties. Mr. Carbonell replied that good schools typically raise property values. He stated that he did not know the grades given to the public schools in the area.

~~Mr. McCulla moved on to the concern regarding traffic flow in and around the neighborhood, requesting clarification that buses and/or trucks would be directed past neighborhood houses. Mr. Carbonell confirmed this, although he noted that trucks were unlikely to visit the facility on a daily basis, and buses would drop off students and then leave the site. He added that there were not likely to be more than two buses coming to the site due to the estimated size of the facility; many of the 600 students are expected to walk or bike to school from the neighborhood.~~

~~Mr. McCulla asked if Mr. Carbonell had met with the Melrose Manors Homeowners' Association. Mr. Carbonell reiterated that he had met with this group three times, recalling that there was "hardly any reaction" to the proposed school. He said he was very surprised to learn of the document and signatures in opposition to the project, and felt it was the result of a miscommunication.~~

~~Ms. Redding stated that the request is for rezoning from the current Mobile Home Park designation to Community Facility — School, which is allowed by the medium/high residential land use. The site plan is expected to come before the Board later in the year.~~

~~Ms. Desir Jean asked if a mobile home park had been located on the site. Ms. Redding said it had, although the parcel had been vacant for many years.~~

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

~~Jerry Covington, President of the Melrose Manors Homeowners' Association, stated he was speaking against the proposed rezoning on behalf of this organization. He pointed out that there are three elementary schools within one-half mile of the proposed charter school. The Association felt that should the property be redeveloped, it would further erode the property values within the neighborhood. Mr. Covington also expressed concern about flooding in the neighborhood, as residents are concerned that the addition of a new concrete structure would exacerbate this tendency.~~

~~He continued that the Association is also concerned for the property rights of the homeowners adjacent to the proposed school, as it did not seem that 600 students could be brought to the area while still allowing these residents convenient access to their homes. Mr. Covington concluded that most of the residents opposing the school live near the proposed school.~~

~~While Mr. Carbonell had attended meetings of the Homeowners' Association and discussed these concerns, Mr. Covington stated that they were not addressed to the members' satisfaction. They did not vote in favor of or in opposition to the~~

school at any time. He noted that the Association serves a large community, and the vote in opposition to the rezoning was unanimous.

Mr. McCulla asked why the Association felt the school would devalue nearby homes. Mr. Covington replied that the members had asked questions regarding an alternative school, as they were aware of recent problems facing some charter schools in Broward County. Should the proposed school fail, the Applicant would have the option of renting out the property as a school which "receives students that have issues and problems." This concern had been expressed to Mr. Carbonell. Mr. Covington noted that no offer to restrict the property's use had been made at that time. Mr. McCulla observed that the Applicant had stated earlier they were willing to accept a restriction that would prohibit an alternative school.

With regard to flooding, Mr. McCulla explained that any water falling onto the property must be retained on-site according to Broward County regulations, which meant the property could not contribute to flooding within the neighborhood. He asked if addressing these issues would alleviate the Association's concerns, or if they remained opposed to the project. Mr. Covington stated that at present, the Association was still opposed.

Mr. McCulla asked if the Association might feel differently if a traffic study showed the impact of the project would be minimal. Mr. Covington pointed out that "minimal" was not defined, and pointed out that many children from outside the neighborhood might attend the school, which would have a tremendous impact on the amount of traffic coming through the neighborhood.

Mr. McCulla asked if postponing the Item in order to give the Applicant time to present the traffic study to the residents might be useful. Mr. Covington asserted that there are real estate professionals and attorneys in the Homeowners' Association who have expressed these concerns, particularly regarding property values.

Mr. Cohen asked if the current use of Mobile Home Park would add to property values within the neighborhood. Mr. Covington advised that in recent years, a presentation was made to the Association regarding the construction of townhouses on the property. This proposal was more readily accepted than the proposed school; however, he agreed that the Association would not be in favor of continued use of the site as a mobile home park.

Mr. Cohen asked how many members of the Association had voted unanimously against the project. Mr. Covington said there were 27 members present.

Willie Dudley, longtime resident of 4th Court, stated that he is a former educator and school principal, as well as an area director supervising charter schools. He

~~observed that the property in question is a small parcel, and stated that it would not be possible to have two buses and 600 students on the property. He added that he was concerned about the impact the proposed school would have on other nearby schools, as well as the traffic it would bring into the surrounding community, and stated that the community would prefer townhouses or single-family homes, as there was no need for another school in the area.~~

~~Mr. Cohen asked if there was anything the Applicant could do to address Mr. Dudley's concerns. Mr. Dudley stated he was staunchly against the proposed school.~~

~~Charles King, private citizen, stated that he was very much in favor of rezoning the site in order to remove the possibility of a trailer park, and pointed out that many cities no longer zone areas for trailer parks. He also felt the nearby schools would not be affected by the addition of another facility unless they were unsuccessful schools.~~

~~Ms. Tuggle commented that the schools in the surrounding area are all performing schools, some of which have national reputations. She added that she was concerned about bringing 600 students onto the small parcel, and noted that schools in Broward County are closing due to lack of attendance. Mr. King said this was because charter schools are growing and traditional schools are shrinking.~~

~~Ms. Desir-Jean asked if Mr. King was a resident of the neighborhood. Mr. King replied that he was not. Ms. Desir-Jean asked if he would send his children to the proposed charter school. Mr. King said he did not believe he would, although he would be in favor of a charter school in his own neighborhood.~~

~~Gwendolyn Dudley, private citizen, asserted that the schools in the Melrose Manors community were not failing schools, and included public, magnet, and private schools. She noted that magnet schools may also attract students from anywhere in the district, and pointed out that it is already difficult to access or exit the neighborhood due to school traffic.~~

~~Ms. Dudley stated that she did not feel the community was in need of another school. She added that the streets in the surrounding community, including 27th Avenue, would have difficulty accommodating more school traffic. She concluded that if a charter school fails, the remaining facility is often rented for office or storage space, which would not be appropriate for a residential neighborhood.~~

~~David Ayala, longtime resident of the neighborhood, stated that he works for the Broward Sheriff's Office, although he was speaking as a private citizen. He observed that the existing crime rate in the neighborhood is "not fantastic," and the addition of more people coming into the area may increase the occurrence of~~

~~crime. There is also an existing speeding issue with traffic in the neighborhood. He concluded that he would not consider sending his own child to the proposed school.~~

~~As there were no other 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 Spence advised that the Board is required to determine whether or not the public testimony they have heard proves the Application meets or does not meet the criteria found in the Code. In addition to adequacy and neighborhood compatibility requirements, Section 47-24-4-B sets forth three additional requirements:~~

- ~~• The proposed zoning district must be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan;~~
- ~~• Substantial changes in the character of the development in or near the area under consideration must support the proposed rezoning; and~~
- ~~• The character of the area proposed must be suitable for the uses permitted in the proposed zoning district, and is compatible with the surrounding districts or uses.~~

~~Attorney Spence continued that if the testimony heard by the Board does not support any of these criteria, denial of the Application is required. He added that conditions or restrictions may not be placed on the use of the property during a rezoning, as this would be equivalent to amending the ULDR.~~

~~He concluded that the Board is asked to consider the impact of the proposed zoning district when these criteria are evaluated, rather than the impact of a specific project.~~

~~Ms. Desir-Jean requested clarification of whether Community Facility zoning was specific to a school. Ms. Parker explained that this category includes "school-type uses," and advised that Staff found the Application is consistent in terms of the land use and the surrounding uses, which include B-2 and RMM-25.~~

~~Ms. Tuggle asked if the Application fell within the scope of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Parker replied that the comprehensive plan allows medium/high residential land use, which permits community facilities.~~

~~Mr. Witschen stated that he did not agree with Staff with respect to compatibility, as most of the property abuts single-family homes. He felt the issue was also one of adding a relatively intense use onto a small parcel, and concluded that the traffic generation was also likely to create an issue.~~

~~Vice Chair Hansen observed that while the site plan appeared to be a good attempt to show how the proposed facility would work, he felt it attempted to fit too much into a small site. He concluded that the surrounding residential neighborhood is not at all supportive of the project.~~

~~Mr. McCulla remarked that he did not feel it was appropriate to base a decision on a preliminary site plan, which is not required for rezoning. While he advised that he respected the neighborhood's opinion, he also did not believe the project could be found incompatible in a neighborhood where several schools were already located. He concluded that the other issues raised by the neighborhood were "debatable, a matter of opinion, or refutable."~~

~~Mr. Cohen stated his primary concern regarding compatibility was related to the increase in traffic. While he believed a school would be a good use for the property, he did not feel two buses would be realistic to bring a portion of 600 students to the facility.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Ms. Tuggle, to deny, based on compatibility standards and tests that [Attorney Spence] set [forth]. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-2 (Mr. Cohen and Mr. McCulla dissenting).~~

~~Attorney Spence clarified that the **motion** would be understood as a recommendation that the City Commission deny the Application.~~

6. St. Jerome Catholic Church and School Thomas Lodge 1P12

Request: **

Plat Approval

Legal Description:

The southeast ¼ of the northeast ¼ of the northeast quarter of section Twenty-One (21), Township Fifty (50) east, all lands lying in the City of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida.

General Location:

2601 SW 9th Avenue

District:

4

~~Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on this item were sworn in.~~

~~Mark Robbins, representing the Applicant, stated that the request was to re-plat a 10-acre site, as it was not platted in the past. Right-of-way dedications in accordance with City Code would accompany the plat.~~

~~Mr. Robbins added that he would like to amend the County plat note for the record: the school's square footage would be increased from 19,500 sq. ft. to 20,000 sq. ft.~~

~~Tom Lodge, representing the Department of Sustainable Development, stated that the Application is consistent with Objective 5 of the future land use element, which requires consistency with Broward County platting regulations. Staff supports a positive recommendation for approval.~~

~~There being no 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.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Vice Chair Hansen, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.~~

~~At the request of the Applicant, Items 7 and 8 were heard together. It was clarified that the two Items would be voted upon separately.~~

7. Ninth Street Property, LLC / French Village Thomas Lodge 10P12

Request: ** **Vacation of Right-of-Way**

Legal Description: A portion of SE 8th Street and SE 2nd Avenue additional thoroughfare, North and East of and adjacent to Parcel "A", PAT'S PLAT, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 154, Page 5, of the public records of Broward County, Florida.

General Location: North side of SE 9th Street between SE 2nd Avenue and Andrews Avenue.

District: 4

~~APPROVED (8-0) WITH THE FOLLOWING STAFF CONDITIONS:~~

- ~~1. The applicant dedicates a 5-foot pedestrian sidewalk to the City, as provided on the site plan for the associated "French Village" multi-family residential project;~~**
- ~~2. Any utilities required to be removed, replaced or relocated, shall be done so at the applicant's expense, and as approved by the City Engineer. All improvements constructed within the easement shall conform to City engineering standards; and~~**
- ~~3. The vacating ordinance shall be in full force and effect on the date a certificate, executed by the City Engineer, is recorded in the public records of Broward County, Florida. The certificate shall state that all conditions of the vacation have been met. A copy of the recorded certificate must be provided to the City.~~**

8. Ninth Street Property, LLC / French Village Thomas Lodge 11P12

Request: ** **Vacation of Right-of-Way**

Legal Description: A portion of SE 9th Street additional thoroughfare, South of and adjacent to Parcel "A", PAT'S PLAT, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 154, Page 5, of the public records of Broward County, Florida.

General Location: Southwest corner of SE 8th Street and SE 2nd Avenue

District: 4

APPROVED (8-0) WITH THE FOLLOWING STAFF CONDITIONS:

- 1. The applicant dedicates a 5-foot pedestrian sidewalk to the City, as provided on the site plan for the associated "French Village" multi-family residential project;**
- 2. Any utilities required to be removed, replaced or relocated, shall be done so at the applicant's expense, and as approved by the City Engineer. All improvements constructed within the easement shall conform to City engineering standards; and**
- 3. The vacating ordinance shall be in full force and effect on the date a certificate, executed by the City Engineer, is recorded in the public records of Broward County, Florida. The certificate shall state that all conditions of the vacation have been met. A copy of the recorded certificate must be provided to the City.**

~~Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on this Item were sworn in.~~

~~Robert Lochrie, representing the Applicant, stated that the request would vacate portions of a right-of-way that were dedicated by plat in 1993. He showed photos of the area, noting that one portion of the vacation is in Item 7 and the second portion is in Item 8. The request would vacate a 5 ft. area originally dedicated as right-of-way; a 5 ft. pedestrian easement would be dedicated back in the location of the former right-of-way. The site will be developed as a uniform site, which means 5 ft. around the entire site will be dedicated to create a uniform property line.~~

~~The proposal is consistent with the Downtown Master Plan, which requires very specific setbacks from the center line of the street. The City's Property and Right-of-Way Committee unanimously recommended support for the request.~~

~~Vice Chair Hansen asked why the property line was not uniform in the first place. Mr. Lochrie explained when the property was platted, it did not include all the portions of property that have presently been assembled. He advised that instead of a dedicated right-of-way, the City's preference is now for a 5 ft. easement, which will be provided if the Application is approved.~~

~~Mr. Lodge stated that the Application meets the criteria found in ULDR Section 47-24-6, Vacation of Right-of-Way. Staff has proposed the following conditions:~~

- ~~• The Applicant must dedicate a 5 ft. pedestrian sidewalk to the City, as provided on the site plan, for the associated French Village Multi-Residential Project; and~~
- ~~• Any utilities being required to be removed, replaced, or relocated shall be done at the Applicant's expense, and approved by a City Engineer. All improvements constructed within the easement must conform to City engineering standards.~~

~~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.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Mr. Witschen, to approve Item 7 with Staff conditions as presented.~~

~~Mr. Lodge clarified that the conditions apply to both Items 7 and 8.~~

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

~~**Motion** made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Mr. Witschen, to approve Item 8 with Staff conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.~~

9. Neighborhood Compatibility

Anthony Greg Fajardo

4T12

Request: *

~~Revision to Section 47-25.3, Neighborhood Compatibility, of the Unified Land Development Regulations to exempt park, open space and conservation areas from the requirements of a buffer yard~~

General Location:

~~City Wide~~

District:

~~All Commission Districts~~

~~Anthony Fajardo, representing the Department of Sustainable Development, explained that this Item is an Ordinance pertaining to neighborhood compatibility~~

~~requirements. When non-residential uses are within 100 ft. of residential uses, they must be reviewed pursuant to the criteria of Section 47-25.3, Neighborhood Compatibility. When they are contiguous to residential uses, they are required to provide a 10 ft. buffer yard and a 5 ft. wall.~~

~~As defined in the ULDR, Parks, Open Space, and Conservation Areas are considered non-residential uses. This means a buffer yard would be required when these uses are contiguous to residential uses as an unintended result to adequately buffer commercial uses from residential uses. Staff believes that Parks, Open Space, and Conservation Areas should not be enclosed by solid walls; they also believe the standard vegetation requirement is not necessary, as vegetation is an integral part of these uses.~~

~~Mr. Fajardo continued that the condition requiring walls and vegetation creates places for hiding and may provide an invitation for graffiti and garbage collection. Staff recommends exempting these three non-residential designations from the buffer yard requirements by excluding them from the buffer yard provision.~~

~~Mr. Fajardo clarified that the 5 ft. wall and buffer yard would no longer be required; however, as non-residential uses, they must continue to meet neighborhood compatibility requirements, which will allow Staff to conduct an ad hoc analysis on each compatibility issue as it is presented. This means the opportunity to buffer these uses with a yard or wall will remain if necessary; however, Staff does not feel it is a necessity in all cases.~~

~~Mr. Cohen asked whether this revision would affect any future zoning designations other than Parks, Open Space, or Conservation. Mr. Fajardo clarified that the ULDR categorizes golf courses as Open Space; Parks and Conservation Areas are defined terms. If, during the review process, Staff determines that there is a need for an additional buffer area, they may make this requirement.~~

~~Mr. McCulla asked if Staff might consider proposing some standards to be used in determining whether specific parks should require some type of buffer. Mr. Fajardo explained that the Board may make this recommendation to the City Commission, and reiterated that Staff may still require additional buffering as part of neighborhood compatibility; the only change proposed by this Item is removing the standard requirement for a buffer wall and landscaped yard. He noted that most other cities within the State of Florida do not require a buffer, but allow parks to stand on their own.~~

~~Vice Chair Hansen observed that this Code change would allow any private citizen who would prefer a wall to build one on his or her own property, and to control the wall's appearance, height, ventilation, and other features. If the wall is instead erected by the City, that individual would have no choice in what the wall~~

~~looks like. Mr. Fajardo cited Holiday Park as an example of this, pointing out that most of the fencing around this park was built on private property.~~

~~Chair McTigue asked if Staff will have the flexibility to determine whether a required wall must be a block wall, a chain-link fence, or another type of structure. Mr. Fajardo said they would have this flexibility if this particular subsection of Code is removed.~~

~~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.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Mr. Welch, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.~~

10. Adult Gaming Centers

Anthony Greg Fajardo

5T12

Request: * **Revision to Chapter 15 of the Code of Ordinances, Sections 47-6, 47-18 and 47-20 of the Unified Land Development Regulations to establish Adult Gaming Centers as a use subject to specific criteria**

General Location: City Wide

District: All Commission Districts

Mr. Fajardo stated that this Item would define Adult Gaming Centers as a new use within the City. These centers have requested to establish themselves within the City limits in recent years and at various locations. They use sweepstakes, governed by Florida State Statute 849.094, which regulates game promotion in connection with the sale of consumer products or services as a method to allow these centers.

Under the direction of the City Commission, Staff has drafted specific criteria in order to take a proactive approach to this use, as only minimal regulation exists under current Code. The proposed Ordinance would define Adult Gaming Centers and establish definitions for owners, operators, permittees, electronic gaming devices, and existing adult gaming centers. The use would be permitted under conditional use approval in the CB, B-1, B-2, and B-3 zoning districts.

A distance separation of 1000 ft. would be required between each adult gaming center, with a 750 ft. separation between these centers and establishments selling alcohol and a 500 ft. separation between these facilities and schools, residences, houses of worship, parks, libraries, or day care facilities. The facilities would be restricted to use by adults 18 years of age or over, and would be permitted to operate between the hours of 9 a.m. and 11 p.m., seven days per week.

In addition to these criteria, the existing adult gaming facilities already in use within the City would be required to submit under new application and fee requirements. They would also be subject to inspection requirements, specific signage criteria, and all operational standards as stated in the Ordinance. Parking requirements are proposed for stand-alone adult gaming centers, with one space per two gaming devices; if the facility is part of a strip mall, the same requirement applies, although no more than 10% of overall parking could be dedicated to this use.

Mr. Witschen asked if Adult Gaming Center is currently a permitted use within the cited districts. Mr. Fajardo confirmed this, explaining that there are presently no specific criteria for this use.

Vice Chair Hansen requested further clarification of what would be considered an adult gaming center. Mr. Fajardo explained that these facilities are similar to an internet café: users purchase an allotted amount of time on the computer, as well as a number or code to be scanned that is associated with a prize. Users may or may not win. He added that many of the regulations developed for this use are based upon outreach to other municipalities to learn how the facilities are regulated elsewhere.

Mr. McCulla asked if these regulations would apply to another business, such as a convenience store or newsstand, that installs a gaming machine. Mr. Fajardo said the business would have to meet State regulations and requirements, as well as all requirements of the proposed Ordinance, such as parking and distance regulations.

Mr. Cohen requested clarification of a restriction on window tinting at these facilities. Mr. Fajardo replied that this would allow the activities inside the facilities to be visible from the outside, as there have been crime-related issues at these locations in some parts of the country. Hours of operation were also based on the regulation of this use in other municipalities.

Ms. Tuggle asked if the gaming devices would be monitored even if they are added to another use, such as a convenience store. Mr. Fajardo confirmed this, pointing out that the facility would need to meet both State and City criteria. An attendant must be on duty and annual permit renewal and inspection would be required.

Ms. Desir-Jean asked which other municipalities were contacted with regard to their regulation of this use. Mr. Fajardo said these included West Palm Beach and other municipalities within south Florida.

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

Charles King, private citizen, stated that this Item was recently discussed at a City Commission meeting as a use in rural areas, where it has attracted concern at the State level. He added that sweepstakes and gambling are defined as two separate terms by the State of Florida.

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

Motion made by Vice Chair Hansen, seconded by Mr. Witschen, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-2 (Mr. Cohen and Mr. McCulla dissenting).

11. Photovoltaic Solar Systems

~~Anthony Greg Fajardo~~

11T12

Request: *

~~Revision to Chapter 9 of the Code of Ordinances and Sections 47-19, 47-21 and 47-35 to allow the installation of Photovoltaic Solar Systems subject to specific permitting and zoning criteria~~

General Location:

~~City Wide~~

District:

~~All Commission Districts~~

~~Mr. Fajardo explained that this initiative is based upon a grant from the Department of Energy. It will establish standardized criteria by which photovoltaic solar systems may be installed in both residential and non-residential structures. Part of the initiative includes an interlocal agreement, which was entered into in September 2012, that establishes permitting for these systems.~~

~~The intent is to make photovoltaic systems comparable to other forms of energy by the end of the present decade. The grant proposes standard criteria so individuals may go through a web-based permitting process to install these systems. Broward County has developed a model ordinance to be adopted by Fort Lauderdale and other participating municipalities.~~

~~The proposed amendment would define rooftop photovoltaic systems, establish these systems as a permitted accessory structure in all zoning categories, and limit height to 5 ft. for flat roofs and no higher than the roof peak for pitched roofs. The amendment also includes permitting fees, maintenance, and landscape criteria.~~

~~Ms. Desir-Jean asked if consideration would be given to the appearance of the systems, perhaps on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Fajardo said there is no such consideration in Broward County's model ordinance, nor in the proposed ordinance presented today. He explained that he was not certain how this~~

~~requirement would affect the impact or permitting associated with the systems. Should the Board recommend this consideration to the City Commission, Staff would need to discuss it further with Broward County.~~

~~Vice Chair Hansen observed that the Code definition of a flat roof does not include parapets, which meant a 5 ft. height restriction might lessen the effectiveness of the system. He noted that should the proposed ordinance refer to another device, such as a water tank or air conditioning unit, the restriction would likely state that the device must not be visible from the sidewalk or another similar requirement. Mr. Fajardo said current Code would require the system to be at the same height elevation as mechanical equipment. Vice Chair Hansen asked if this meant the photovoltaic system would be restricted to 5 ft. Mr. Fajardo confirmed this, noting that this restriction could create a potential conflict.~~

~~Vice Chair Hansen asked if the proposed ordinance could include a reference likening the system to a mechanical feature. Mr. Fajardo advised that while the Board may make this recommendation, the intent was to have all participating municipalities use the same criteria, so applicants could submit a single application for a web-based permit. He added that solar technology is rapidly changing, which means it would be difficult to predict what these devices would look like in the future.~~

~~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.~~

~~**Motion** made by Vice Chair Hansen, seconded by Mr. Welch, to approve, with the added stipulation that [solar devices] could also be at a height that would be screened by [a] parapet. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-2 (Mr. Cohen and Mr. McCulla dissenting).~~

~~12. Communication to the City Commission~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Ms. Desir-Jean, as it relates to the first two cases, request to ask Staff to come back with a process that wouldn't bring those two [Items], 17R12A and 18R12A, to this Board, and there be some DRC or some other process.~~

~~Ms. Parker advised that Staff has communicated the Board's previous recommendations to move these items forward.~~

~~13. For the Good of the City~~

Planning and Zoning Board

October 17, 2012

Page 24

~~Attorney Spence clarified that when a rezoning is denied, such as in Item 5, the Application stops at the Board level. If the Applicant wishes the Item to proceed, he or she must appeal the Item.~~

~~There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.~~

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