

DRAFT
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CITY HALL – CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2017 – 6:30 P.M.

Cumulative

Board Members	Attendance	June 2017-May 2018	
		Present	Absent
Leo Hansen, Chair	P	3	0
Catherine Maus, Vice Chair	P	2	1
John Barranco	P	3	0
Stephanie Desir-Jean	P	1	2
Howard Elfman	P	3	0
Steven Glassman	P	2	1
Rochelle Golub	P	3	0
Richard Heidelberger	A	1	2
Alan Tinter	P	3	0

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

Staff

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

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Hansen called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and all recited the Pledge of Allegiance. The Chair introduced the Board members present, and Urban Design and Planning Manager Ella Parker introduced the Staff members present.

Chair Hansen suggested that Items 3 and 4 be transposed on the Agenda.

Motion made by Mr. Tinter, seconded by Mr. Elfman, to change the order of these Items.

Vice Chair Maus pointed out that a majority of the public in attendance at tonight's meeting seemed to be present to speak on Item 3. Chair Hansen advised that he did not expect Item 4 to require lengthy discussion. Mr. Glassman noted that individuals intending to speak on Item 4 may choose to arrive at the meeting at a later time and could miss their opportunity to be heard if the order of the Items was switched.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 5-3 (Vice Chair Maus, Mr. Glassman, and Ms. Golub dissenting).

II. ELECTION OF BOARD CHAIR / VICE CHAIRPERSON

Motion made by Ms. Golub, seconded by Mr. Glassman, to nominate Catherine Maus as Chair.

Motion made by Ms. Desir-Jean, seconded by Mr. Tinter, to nominate Leo Hansen as Chair.

Vice Chair Maus requested that her name be withdrawn from nomination. In a voice vote, Chair Hansen was unanimously re-elected.

Motion made by Ms. Golub, seconded by Mr. Glassman, to nominate Catherine Maus for Vice Chair. In a voice vote, Vice Chair Maus was unanimously re-elected.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Mr. Glassman noted a correction to p.1: Jim Hetzel, and not Ms. Parker, introduced the Staff members present at the July 19, 2017 meeting.

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Mr. Glassman, to approve [as corrected]. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Glassman, seconded by Ms. Golub, to approve the minutes of the joint Planning and Zoning Board/Affordable Housing Advisory Committee workshop. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC SIGN-IN / SWEARING-IN

At this time all individuals wishing to speak on Agenda Items were sworn in. Chair Hansen advised that authorized individuals representing organizations are allotted five minutes of speaking time, while individuals representing only themselves have three minutes.

V. AGENDA ITEMS

Index

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1. Z17008* **	St. Thomas Aquinas High School Inc.
2. V17006**	St. Thomas Aquinas High School Inc.
3. R16066**	Riverwalk Plaza Associates, LLP
4. V16011**	The Las Olas Company Inc.
5. T17004*	City of Fort Lauderdale

Special Notes:

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

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

It was determined that Items 1 and 2 would be presented together.

1. CASE:	Z17008
REQUEST: * **	Rezone from Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/ Medium High Density (RMM-25) to Community Facility (CF)
APPLICANT:	St. Thomas Aquinas High School Inc.
PROJECT NAME:	St. Thomas Aquinas High School Parking Lot
GENERAL LOCATION:	2801 SW 12 th Street
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	Lots 1 through 12, Block 100, Westwood Heights, according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 6, Page 34, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida. Together with: Lots 1 through 4, Block 99, Westwood Heights, according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 6, Page 34, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida.
CURRENT ZONING:	Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/ Medium High Density (RMM-25)
PROPOSED ZONING:	Community Facility (CF)
CURRENT LAND USE:	Residential Medium-High Density
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	3
CASE PLANNER:	Florentina Hutt

2. CASE:	V17006
REQUEST: **	Right-of Way Vacation
APPLICANT:	St. Thomas Aquinas High School Inc.
PROJECT NAME:	St. Thomas Aquinas High School Parking Lot
GENERAL LOCATION:	A portion of SW 27 th Terrace between SW 11 th Court and SW 12 th Street
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	That portion of SW 27 th Terrace lying within Blocks 99 and 100, Westwood Heights, as recorded in Plat Book 6, Page 34, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida, bounded on the North by the south right-of -way of SW 11 th Court (also known as Happy Hoyer Street) on the east by the west line of said Block 99, on the south by the north right-of -way of SW 12 Street and on the west by the east line of said Block 100. Said lands situate in the City of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida.
CURRENT ZONING:	Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/ Medium High Density (RMM-25)
PROPOSED ZONING:	Community Facility (CF)
CURRENT LAND USE:	Residential Medium-High Density
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	3
CASE PLANNER:	Florentina Hutt

Disclosures were made at this time. Ms. Desir-Jean advised that she would abstain from voting on Items 1 and 2 due to a potential conflict.

Dawn Meyers, representing the Applicant, stated that Items 1 and 2 relate to a parking lot between St. Thomas Aquinas High School, an adjacent church, and other community uses. Item 1 requests rezoning of a parcel from RMM-25 to CF, which is consistent with surrounding uses. Item 2 requests vacation of a remnant portion of SW 27th Terrace, which has been fenced off for some time.

The consolidated parking lot will be improved by reducing the number of driveways to and from the parcel from four to two. It is being re-paved, and drainage improvements, landscaping, sidewalks, fencing, lighting, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements are being added. On-street parking improvements are planned for SW 28th Avenue. The lot will provide shared parking for both the school and the church.

At present, the parking lot includes 117 spaces. The planned reconfiguration will allow it to include up to 254 spaces.

Ms. Meyers addressed the vacation requested in Item 2, explaining that both the subject portion and a diagonal street have not been used to the north or south of the site for many years.

Mr. Tinter requested clarification of where access points for the parking lot will be located. Ms. Meyers replied that these points will be on SW 11th Court and SW 12th Street, with no access onto Riverland Road.

Ms. Meyers also clarified that the parking lot is being rezoned to CF rather than XP in order to maintain consistency with other surrounding uses. CF also allows for additional potential uses at a later date, as the school or other facilities may wish to expand in the future.

Mr. Glassman pointed out that no members of the Melrose Manor or Riverland civic associations attended the Applicant's required public participation meeting. He asked if the Applicant held any discussions with representatives of these organizations. Ms. Meyers replied that the presidents of both associations were emailed and invited to the public participation meeting, although they did not attend. Neither party stated any objections to the project.

Florentina Hutt, representing Urban Design and Planning, stated that the request in Item 1 is for rezoning from Residential Multi-family Mid-rise Medium Density (RMM-25) to Community Facility (CF). The rezoning will affect a 2.67 acre parcel to allow for parking lot expansion to serve St. Thomas Aquinas High School. Surrounding properties are designated CF and Community Facility-House of Worship (CF-H). Staff recommends approval of the request.

Ms. Hutt addressed Item 2, right-of-way vacation for a portion of SW 27th Terrace between SW 11th Court and SW 12th Street. The request was reviewed by the Development Review Committee (DRC) and all comments have been addressed. Staff finds that the subject portion of the right-of-way is no longer needed for public purpose.

This Application is also subject to the City's Public Participation Ordinance and was addressed at the same meeting as Item 1. Staff recommends approval of the request with the following conditions of approval:

- Any City infrastructure, known or unknown, found to be within the vacated area shall be relocated at the expense of the Applicant, and the relocated facilities shall be required to be inspected and accepted by the City's Public Works Department
- Any other utility infrastructure, known or unknown, found to be within the vacated area shall be relocated at the expense of the Applicant, and relocated facilities shall be required to be inspected and accepted by the applicable utility agency or service provider
- 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 vacations have been met and a copy of the recorded certificate must be provided by the Applicant to the City

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

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Mr. Tinter, to approve Item 1. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0. (Ms. Desir-Jean abstained. A memorandum of voting conflict is attached to these minutes.)

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Mr. Elfman, to approve Item 2 with Staff conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0. (Ms. Desir-Jean abstained. A memorandum of voting conflict is attached to these minutes.)

It was determined that Item 3 would be heard in order, prior to Item 4.

3. CASE:	R16066
REQUEST: **	Site Plan Level III Review / Social Service Residential Facility (SSRF) Level IV with 209 units (SSRF units), 192 residential units (Independent living), 1,619 square feet of retail/restaurant space and 16,722 square feet of office space.
APPLICANT:	Riverwalk Plaza Associates, LLP
PROJECT NAME:	Riverwalk Residences of Las Olas
GENERAL LOCATION:	333 N New River Drive East
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	Wheeler's sub. blk. B Ft. Lauderdale 3-59 D lot 25 less W 15 for ST,26,27 & riparian rights, 28 & riparian rights.
ZONING DISTRICT:	Regional Activity Center – City Center (RAC-CC)
CURRENT LAND USE:	Downtown Regional Activity Center (D-RAC)
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	4
CASE PLANNER:	Randall Robinson

Disclosures were made at this time. Ms. Desir-Jean advised that she would abstain from voting on Item 3 due to a potential conflict.

Courtney Crush, representing the Applicant, stated that the subject property is located in the Downtown Regional Activity Center (Downtown RAC) – City Center. This zoning area includes high density and intensity with no parking requirements. The Applicant is currently processing a Site Plan, which has been reviewed and approved by City Staff.

The request is for a portion of the building. The entire project will eventually go before the City Commission to request allocation of residential dwelling units, which must conform to the City's Downtown Master Plan.

The request is for two permitted uses in the assisted living portion of the building. The first is 192 residential dwelling units, which will be restricted to owners of the age of 55 or older. The second proposal is for a ground level that interacts with the sidewalk to the north of Riverwalk, including a gourmet market. The Applicant requests a conditional use finding and approval for assisted living units. Ms. Crush emphasized that the facility will not be a nursing home or hospital, but will be similar in design to many residential buildings currently existing in Downtown Fort Lauderdale.

The Applicant has requested 209 assisted living units, which are before the Board in order to determine if intensive uses should have distance separations. The conditional use criteria for Social Service Residential Facilities (SSRFs) require these facilities to be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and to mitigate the impact of the proposed use on abutting properties. The Applicant must also evaluate traffic generation for this use and address any additional effects associated with design.

As an assisted living community, the facility will house residents who may require care on a daily basis, although they will not require the level of medical supervision as a skilled nursing facility. Ms. Crush characterized the proposed facility as having a resort-style environment, which provides the opportunity for residents to receive assistance. For this reason, certain uses are requested within the building, such as dining rooms and amenity decks. Delivery spaces and emergency access will be internalized in the facility. The project also includes a proposed enhanced streetscape for North New River Drive and a pedestrian link to the northbound area of the property.

Another consideration for design review was the project's garage, which the Applicant has proposed to wrap on the south side with active use. Spaces will be included for visiting doctors. Mechanical equipment for dining rooms and other facilities will be located in enclosed roof space or on the west side of the building.

The property's design, which is not specific to the assisted living component, considers two residential neighbors to the east. Because orienting the building north to south would create additional blockage of views, the Applicant transitioned the building's orientation from east to west. It has narrow depth against the property line, which allows the Applicant to address criteria for vertical open space.

Ms. Crush advised that the building has been redesigned after conversations with its neighbors regarding its orientation, uses, and façade. It is projected to generate an additional 921 traffic trips. The building will also provide multimodal opportunities, as prospective tenants will be informed that very few of them may bring cars to the facility; instead, they will be provided with private drivers, shuttle services, and other alternative

transportation options. Employees of the facility will be provided with free bus passes. The building will have an all-valet garage.

Ms. Crush concluded that the City's Comprehensive Plan encourages diversity of housing in the Downtown area, which is intended for high-density development. She provided the Board members with a letter from neighboring properties addressing construction management, reimbursement, and insurance, noting that the Applicant has also reached out to the Downtown Civic Association and the Riverwalk Board.

Ms. Golub requested additional information on the project's memory care units. Ms. Crush replied that these are included in the assisted living facility and are not intended for residents who have other serious medical conditions in addition to memory impairment. Of the 209 assisted living units, 57 will be memory care units with potentially 87 beds. These units will be located on two floors with additional security and a nursing station.

Ms. Golub continued that no operator has been selected thus far for the development. Ms. Crush confirmed that the developer plans to hire a management company for this purpose.

Ms. Golub also noted that it is the Applicant's position that the Planning and Zoning Board is not asked to comment on the design or compatibility of the project, or certain other aspects. Ms. Crush advised that the Application before the Board is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; conditional use criteria, including neighborhood compatibility, are also before the Board. The project is required to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Tinter noted that the Applicant's trip generation projections are very close to the 1000-trip threshold that would generate a traffic study. He pointed out that the facility is expected to include 16,200 sq. ft. of office use, and the formula applied to the calculation allowed the Applicant to take credit for a larger volume of traffic than trip generation rates. Had this method been used, the number of trips generated would have totaled more than 1000, and a more thorough traffic analysis would have been performed as a result. He asked why the Applicant chose the alternative formula rather than trip generation rates.

Benjamin Restrepo, representing the Department of Transportation and Mobility, observed that one reason additional analysis was not required was the nature of the assisted living facility, as many of the older residents would not be driving during normal a.m. and p.m. peak hours. For this reason, he was comfortable using the selected formula rather than trip generation rates. Mr. Tinter asserted that the development will include 401 total units, including independent living units as well as assisted living and memory care units.

Chair Hansen asked the average age of individuals giving up their vehicles. Ms. Crush reiterated that not all residents of the facility will have the option of bringing their cars, even in the independent living units. The facility is intended for residents who choose to live in an urban environment and use alternative means of transportation. Mr. Tinter commented that the traffic study provided to the Board does not fully document these details.

Michael Carr, also representing the Applicant, explained that one reason the Application does not include a full traffic study is that the net total trips, including the reduction for the existing office building, are 969 trips without internalization. The Applicant also considered the level of service and capacity of North New River Drive according to Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) standards. At peak p.m. hours, the project is anticipated to provide only 4.5% of this total capacity.

Mr. Tinter noted that the Broward County Planning Council considers 3% of capacity to be sufficiently significant to trigger mitigation if the level of service of a roadway is poor. He concluded that the formula suggests that an office development of 0 sq. ft. would generate 78 trips, which does not make sense.

Mr. Glassman commented that at many assisted living facilities, many parking spaces are taken up by various types of employees as well as residents, as well as by ambulances. Ms. Crush replied that the Applicant has taken care to provide an appropriate number of parking spaces for employees. There are expected to be 160 employees at the facility over three shifts. She reiterated that the project will provide free bus passes to employees as well as the 65 employee parking spaces. Six spaces will be provided for visiting doctors or nurses and 15 spaces for guests among the facility's 178 spaces. All parking will be valet parking.

Mr. Glassman noted that the Board members were provided with copies of a contract reflecting the support of the Water Garden condominium development, dated July 26, 2017. Ms. Crush explained that this was provided to reflect that the Applicant had worked with the condominium regarding design orientation and construction management of the project.

Mr. Glassman asked how often the Applicant met with representatives of the Water Garden. Ms. Crush replied that they held five such meetings, including meetings with the entire building membership.

Mr. Glassman also addressed discrepancies between the Application and the Staff Report with regard to the building's setbacks. Ms. Crush advised that this may be due to the "layering" of the ULDR, Downtown Master Plan, and New River Master Plan requirements: setbacks may differ depending upon the point from which they are measured, such as the curb or the property line.

Regarding conditional use, Mr. Glassman requested additional information regarding access and roadway capacities on adjacent roads, as well as the type of vehicular traffic anticipated by the project. He was not certain that the uses planned for the building would reduce the number of trips within the Downtown area. Ms. Crush replied that assisted living generates less traffic than most other uses, such as hotels, condominiums, or institutional buildings.

Mr. Glassman also asked how residents of the building might meet the City's stated goal of contributing to urban activity during off-hours and weekends. Ms. Crush stated that residents would be drawn to the attractions available in the Downtown area, and observed that the facility will constitute a vertical community of individuals who have chosen to live there due to its location.

Mr. Glassman asserted that this characterization misconstrues the assisted living aspect of the environment, pointing out that senior citizens already living Downtown contribute to the urban environment. He did not feel independent living and assisted living or memory care buildings shared the same level of participation in an urban area, as many residents of the proposed facility may not leave their building. Ms. Crush replied that the facility provides a choice for residents rather than a step down in health or activity, with the exception of the memory care unit.

Mr. Glassman addressed the 1619 sq. ft. of ground floor retail space, requesting clarification of how this space will be used and why it does not meet the 15,000 sq. ft. design guideline requirement. Ms. Crush stated that this space will be a gourmet market, which will be convenient for residents on the north side of the New River. She was not aware of a minimum requirement for amenity uses within the Downtown RAC. Mr. Glassman noted that the Downtown Master Plan guidelines include activation of ground floors with 15,000 sq. ft. of space.

Mr. Glassman moved on to adequacy and neighborhood compatibility, asking how adverse effects of the project such as shadows, traffic, noise, or other visual nuisances would be mitigated. Ms. Crush replied that the property is platted, which constitutes a significant base for adequacy. The Applicant has also addressed traffic issues to the satisfaction of City Staff and is not expected to generate a large number of trips. The Site Plan reflects two existing curb cuts on the property, and the Applicant plans to integrate active use, such as the ground floor market, into the design of the valet garage.

Mr. Glassman expressed concern for the project's construction management, asking where trailers, ingress, egress, and street closures would be located. Ms. Crush advised that the Applicant has already met with construction partners to discuss these issues. The first level of the garage will be a "double-high" level, which will allow trucks to enter the property rather than using traffic lanes. The Applicant will also coordinate with neighboring properties regarding direction of trucks, hours of construction, and

coordination of schedules, as well as staging on the property. The Applicant is discussing the possibility of employee parking at a nearby City garage.

Mr. Tinter commented that the project's narrative confirms State licensing for assisted living facilities cannot be obtained until the building has been constructed. He asked what would happen in the event that the project cannot obtain this licensing. Ms. Crush responded that the Applicant has significant experience with projects of this nature and understands their requirements, which provides a certain comfort level with the process. Mr. Tinter stated that he was concerned the building could be constructed and then remain vacant if the appropriate licensing is not obtained.

Mr. Tinter continued that he also had questions regarding setbacks and sidewalks along New River Drive, noting that plans depict a "half right-of-way" for New River Drive. He asked if this right-of-way would be dedicated for East New River Drive. Ms. Crush replied that there are no plans to do so.

Ms. Parker confirmed that the setback is typically determined from the existing property line, and nothing can be built in the future right-of-way. When evaluating the Application against the Downtown and New River Master Plans, the New River Master Plan shows the specific dimensions of SE 3rd Avenue. Ms. Crush added that the Applicant will expand the sidewalk along East New River Drive in order to create a consistent width of sidewalk, which will be nearly 20 ft. in width. This will be dedicated to the City as an easement.

Randall Robinson of Urban Design and Planning reported that the request is for Site Plan Level III review with conditional use for an SSRF Level IV. The facility will include 209 SSRF units, with 192 independent living residential units, 1619 sq. ft. of retail/restaurant space, 16,722 sq. ft. of office space, a 178-space parking garage, and a 42-story tower with 4 levels of parking.

Under conditional use criteria for SSRFs, the project must take into account the impact of the project on abutting properties. Riverwalk Residences has been designed to mitigate this impact through its orientation and siting. The parking garage eliminates the need for surface parking, and stormwater discharge will meet all State, County, and City engineering standards. On-site vehicular movement is internalized, including deliveries and visitors. No offsite parking is proposed. Service and emergency vehicles access the building through its internal loading areas.

The garage and service areas are located inside the building, and the façade is designed to fully screen the garage from street-level view. The project's tower is oriented in a way intended to reduce its effects on surrounding properties. Its floor plates are less than the preferred maximum floor plates listed for residential buildings in the Downtown Master Plan. To prevent light pollution, shielding is provided for garage lighting. Mechanical equipment noise will be muffled in order to comply with the City's Noise Ordinances.

Another conditional use criterion refers to access, traffic generation, and roadway capacities. Because mixed uses will exist in a single building, the project will meet the goal of reducing the number of automobile trips within the Downtown area, generating 921 net new trips after applying credit for the existing office building.

The third criterion requires the Applicant to demonstrate that the location of the use or structure is not in conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan, which states the City must recognize the importance of including higher-density residential development in its Downtown area to generate urban activity during off-hours and weekends. As the City's population ages, these alternative residential options should be provided for senior residents who desire an active urban lifestyle while having access to assisted living care as needed. The project will provide one such option and increase the diversity of housing choices within the Downtown area.

Conditional use criteria also require off- or on-site conditions to reduce the impact of permitting a use or structure, as well as incorporation of on-site improvements to minimize any adverse effects that may result from that use or structure. Riverwalk Residences is located in a high-intensity central Downtown area intended to accommodate and support a wide range of uses. The project has mitigated the potential adverse effects of noise, traffic, and lighting by using street lighting, containing parking within an enclosed garage, and serving a residential population that does not produce excessive noise. It provides a housing option not currently found in the Downtown area.

Mr. Robinson concluded that the project is consistent with the goals, permitted uses, and development intensity established for the RAC land use designation. The City's Comprehensive Plan specifically recognizes the importance of including higher-density residential development in the Downtown area to generate greater urban activity. The project will not affect the character of its zoning district, as there is no other SSRF in the district or within close proximity.

Regarding neighborhood compatibility, Mr. Robinson advised that consideration must be given to the recommendations of the adopted neighborhood Master Plan in which the proposed development is located. In this case, the appropriate documents are the Downtown Master Plan and Downtown New River Master Plan. The project was evaluated for its compliance with the design principles of these plans and was found to exceed the setback requirements of the New River Master Plan while virtually meeting its stepback requirements. He described several features of the proposed project which also comply with these principles.

Mr. Robinson noted that the project will be reviewed by the City Commission for compliance with the Master Plans in order to allocate sufficient residential dwelling units. There is no parking requirement in this portion of the Downtown RAC; however, 178 spaces are provided in the project's garage. Net new vehicle trips total 921 daily trips during peak hours. The project complies with streetscape guidelines, including

landscaping and other pedestrian amenities, for the Downtown RAC. It continues to implement the Riverwalk Plan in a manner consistent with the City's revitalization efforts.

Mr. Glassman referred to the City's Comprehensive Strategic Utilities Master Plan, noting that a wastewater pumping station near the Downtown area is described as near its maximum capacity. He requested information on the timeline of City improvements to this pumping station or the construction of an additional station, explaining that his concern was for whether or not the improvements or new station would be implemented before the project comes online. He noted that not all DRC comments related to wastewater facility capacity have been fully answered.

Mr. Robinson replied that while he had discussed this issue with City Engineering Staff, he was not provided with a completion date for the proposed new pumping station. He was advised that the Applicant must obtain County permits in order to proceed with plans for utilities. Ms. Parker added that stormwater/wastewater and other utility capacities are addressed through the technical review accompanying the DRC process before a project advances to the Planning and Zoning Board. The fact that representatives of technical disciplines have signed off on the project implies that these adequacy issues have been addressed.

Mr. Glassman suggested that in the future, final DRC comments could be included in the members' backup materials. Ms. Parker replied that Staff is considering the addition of these comments to the materials provided to advisory bodies.

Vice Chair Maus asked if the Applicant is seeking modification of the project's west side setback. Mr. Robinson confirmed this. Vice Chair Maus also asked if the traffic study that would have been generated by a calculation of more than 1000 trips might have required the Applicant to participate in traffic mitigation measures to alleviate traffic in the area. Mr. Robinson confirmed this as well.

Vice Chair Maus asked if Staff would object to the addition of a condition relating to a traffic study. She pointed out that she would like the City Commission to be presented with the alternative methodology described earlier by Mr. Tinter. Ms. Parker advised that the Department of Transportation and Mobility has signed off on the plans and taken the subject location into consideration, including the proximity of alternative modes of transportation.

Ms. Crush stated that the Applicant has no objection to revisiting their traffic methodology with City Staff and supplementing it as Staff or the Board feels appropriate.

Mr. Tinter asked if the Applicant would be willing to meet a condition of approval that, prior to the Application going before the City Commission, the Applicant submit a more

detailed traffic study that specifically considers New River Drive and NW 2nd Avenue. Ms. Crush confirmed that the Applicant could meet this condition.

Ms. Golub observed that while comments within the backup materials refer to a guideline requiring 60 ft. of separation between the project's towers, roughly one-third of this distance is planned. Mr. Robinson responded that the Applicant has sited the building in a manner he believes to have the least significant impact on other structures around it. While towers on a single lot require 60 ft. of separation, single towers must be 30 ft. from the property line, which would allow any towers on adjacent lots to conform to this requirement as well.

Mr. Robinson continued that because both the tower and the pedestal are rectangles, the perpendicular orientation to the river would block more westward views than the current proposal. For this reason, Staff finds the proposed siting of the tower to have less of a negative impact than the perpendicular alternative.

Ms. Golub asked if the building cannot realize greater setbacks because it is too big for the site. Mr. Robinson explained that the project as presented is believed by the Applicant to be necessary in order to realize a return on investment.

Mr. Barranco asked if the project's architect could build a similar structure for conventional apartments in the Downtown area. Mr. Robinson stated that a more conventional residential building would likely include a greater number of younger residents who were more likely to retain and drive their cars, resulting in a higher ratio of parking spaces to residents in order to be successful. He noted, however, that there is no parking requirement in the Downtown RAC, so the developer would have to provide the parking that s/he felt would be sufficient to the development.

Mr. Barranco also asked if the traffic study for a more conventional building would result in a higher number of trips generated for the same reason. Mr. Robinson agreed. Mr. Barranco asked what process the more conventional development would be subject to within the Downtown RAC. Mr. Robinson responded that a non-residential building would go through the DRC process and Site Plan Level II review, with the 30-day option of City Commission call-up. A residential building would also be subject to DRC and Site Plan Level II review; however, residential projects in the Downtown area are required to go before the City Commission for allocation of units. Parking would, in both instances, be determined by the developer, possibly in conjunction with the lender.

Mr. Barranco asked if the building would be actively monitored to ensure compliance with its agreement with the neighboring property. Ms. Crush stated that pre- and ongoing construction inspections will be conducted.

The Board took a brief recess from 8:44 p.m. to 8:55 p.m.

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

Malcolm MacInnes, private citizen, stated that he is a resident of the Water Garden condominium and is supportive of the proposed project, which provides necessary housing for the City's aging population.

Sharon Miller, private citizen, asserted that a multi-story Social Service Residential Facility would not provide an opportunity for senior citizens to take advantage of Downtown living, but would require many services for its residents and provide limited parking with one entrance and exit. She felt the resulting building would conform to neither City Code nor the appropriate Master Plans.

Richard Eychner, private citizen, advised that the proposed project violates the design guidelines, neighborhood compatibility requirements, and intent of the New River Master Plan. He felt the density and intensity of taller buildings threatened the quality of the local lifestyle.

Stephen Strum, private citizen, commented that the proposed SSRF would adversely affect all buildings on New River Drive. He noted that New River Drive is a two-lane roadway that cannot be expanded, and that traffic for staff, doctors, emergency vehicles, deliveries, and other services could contribute to congestion.

Shari Steinbaum, private citizen, felt the magnitude and location of the project were inappropriate for a vulnerable population. She did not agree that residents in assisted living units would need only minor assistance. She expressed concern for residents in the event of a need for fire and rescue services.

Kit Denison, private citizen, stated that he has been a member of the City's Economic Development Advisory Board. He felt many older residents of Fort Lauderdale would appreciate the opportunity to live in a building such as the proposed project.

Stan Eichelbaum, President of the Downtown Fort Lauderdale Civic Association, asserted that residents of the Downtown area are in favor of smart development. While he confirmed that the development team has been very cooperative in working with members of the surrounding community, he cited concerns including the wind vortex on New River Drive, entry to the Water Garden, and potential marine implications. He also expressed concern for the parking shortfall of the building, particularly during visitation. He recommended that the developer be required to post bond or other cost remediation for the repaving of New River Drive.

Harold Friend, private citizen, stated that the availability of a building that offers independent living, assisted living, and memory care can remove uncertainty from the lives of residents as they age. He encouraged providing these individuals with access to active lifestyles.

John Gehrig, President of the Aqua Luna Las Olas Condominium Association, characterized the proposed active adult living project as a missing element in Downtown Fort Lauderdale. He pointed out that there are limited options for senior residents who could benefit from assisted living facilities.

Wingate Payne, private citizen, stated that she is a resident of Downtown Fort Lauderdale. She opposed the project, which she felt would place vulnerable residents at risk, and pointed out the sizable increases in Downtown residential dwelling units in recent years. She also expressed concern for infrastructure in this area.

Sandy Swanson, private citizen, advised that she is a resident of the Water Garden. She asked that the Board make a wind study by the Applicant a condition of approval. She also cited the reduced setback as a concern, as it would block units opposite the tower.

Jim Dockerty, private citizen, addressed the senior housing aspect of the project, stating that current trends in senior housing create residential units in urban corridors and walkable sites. He emphasized the need to provide the aging population with the same opportunities available to other residents.

Alan Blender, private citizen, stated that the City should ensure there is sufficient housing and culture for residents of all ages. He felt the project would be a welcome addition to Fort Lauderdale.

Ina Lee, private citizen, felt the project was designed for residents who want to maintain an active and vibrant lifestyle, take advantage of what Downtown Fort Lauderdale offers, and do not need to own cars.

Salvador Gavilan, private citizen, spoke in favor of the project, as it provides both independent living and assisted living.

Lenny Steinbaum, private citizen, observed that few individuals in their 50s or 60s are interested in giving up their cars. He opposed the project, which he felt would be unsafe for its residents in the event of emergencies, particularly if they are physically or cognitively impaired.

Tory Watson, private citizen, referred to studies by the Urban Land Institute (ULI), which have found that city living is preferable for older individuals because of the proximity of both amenities and necessities.

Sherman Whitmore, private citizen, stated that assisted living provides senior citizens with a healthier lifestyle.

Dennis Beaulieu, private citizen, spoke in support of the project, which he felt would fill a need not presently met in the Downtown area.

Bruce Lane, President of the Water Garden Association and its Board of Directors, clarified that the Applicant has already provided the Water Garden condominium with a wind tunnel study, which is currently under review. The Water Garden's Board of Directors voted in favor of the revised Site Plan and does not oppose the project. He asserted that the majority of residents support their Board's decision. The Applicant's team worked closely with the Water Garden to mitigate many of their concerns.

Mr. Glassman requested clarification of the Board of Directors' vote on the project. Mr. Lane replied that the vote to negotiate an agreement with the developer was unanimous; when the agreement was finalized, the Board voted 3-2 to approve it. The Board also sent a survey to residents of the Water Garden proposing multiple positions on the development and requesting to know the owners' preferences. More than 50% of owners responded, recommending that the Board seek to negotiate a favorable settlement. All Board meetings were open to the membership unless those meetings dealt with litigation.

Solomon Schoonover, private citizen, stated that the proposed facility would allow senior citizens to both maintain a vibrant social life and receive necessary care.

John Ropes, private citizen, advised that he is the principal owner of the existing four-story building next to the Water Garden condominium. He pointed out that an active adult facility would benefit the Riverwalk area and its residents. He concluded that he had sold the property due to the nature of the project.

John Temple, private citizen, explained that he is a business partner of previous speaker John Ropes. He congratulated the Applicant's team on the project.

Linda Carter, President and CEO of the Community Foundation of Broward, pointed out that the greatest problem facing an aging population is isolation, and noted that Broward County is home to the fastest-growing concentration of the 85-years-and-older population. She emphasized the importance of keeping the needs of this population in mind when making planning decisions.

Ira Futterman, Secretary of the Water Garden condominium's Board of Directors, stated that some of the comments made earlier by the Board president were not accurate. He asserted that he has seen no minutes of the Board meeting at which decisions were made regarding the settlement agreement. He added that the full Board was not present for all negotiations with respect to the settlement; instead, only two Directors were allowed to be present. He did not state a position for or against the development.

Mr. Glassman asked if Mr. Futterman meant to state that the agreement was not properly ratified or official. Mr. Futterman explained that the agreement has not been

incorporated into the minutes of the meeting, nor were dissenting legal views. The Board has not met since July 2017. He did not know the reason the full Board might not be allowed to meet with attorneys discussing the settlement.

Steve Rifkin, private citizen, advised that he is a resident of the Water Garden condominium. He was not in favor of the project, as he did not feel a high-rise building or an SSRF was appropriate for the proposed riverfront site. He noted that there are already several multi-story buildings in the area.

John Bordeaux, private citizen, observed that his main concerns with the project are its size, scale, and scope, including the project's side and rear setbacks from property lines and the vertical distance from the Water Garden condominium tower. He did not feel the proposed use was appropriate in the Downtown location and the project itself does not comply with the Downtown Master Plan. He submitted his written comments into the record.

Elias Nasem, private citizen, felt the number of individuals who would visit residents of the proposed facility has been greatly underestimated. When considered in addition to the number of employees' and service vehicles accessing the property, he felt the result would be a line of vehicles on the roadway.

Jeremy Shir, attorney representing the Water Garden condominium, addressed the allegations made by Mr. Futterman, asserting that to his knowledge, all Board meetings were properly noticed and complied to guidelines. He added that the settlement between the Applicant and the Water Garden is valid and binding, and the Board worked with the Applicant for nearly one year on the agreement.

Ms. Golub referred to the wind analysis provided to the Water Garden, requesting clarification of what would happen if the study proved the project would have adverse effects on the condominium. Mr. Shir confirmed this, adding that he has not yet thoroughly reviewed the wind analysis, which was just received the previous day.

Debbie Picker, private citizen, stated that she also lives at the Water Garden condominium. She referred to the responses of the Applicant's architect to DRC comments, some of which included the phrase "discussed with DRC Staff and deemed acceptable." She felt this meant the project was allowed to circumvent existing guidelines and asked if the Planning and Zoning Board was "a rubber-stamp agency."

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

Ms. Crush addressed Mr. Tinter's earlier question regarding State licensing, noting that it is possible to obtain a conditional administrative license from the State at the time a building permit is issued. She advised that conditional approval is issued by a State agency to an applicant that agrees to meet certain conditions.

Ms. Golub expressed concern with this possibility, pointing out that the Board has never been asked to approve a facility when an operator was not present to make assurances regarding prospective approval. Ms. Crush replied that the Applicant is qualified to indicate the likelihood of approval if a conditional license is acquired and the proper protocols are followed.

Mr. Tinter characterized conditional approval as similar to the pre-application approval provided by FDOT. He suggested that the Board might require conditional approval to be acquired prior to the issuance of the project's building permit, and asked if the Board could also require the Applicant to come back before them if significant changes are made to the project at a later time.

Assistant City Attorney Gus Ceballos advised that the Board could make no such condition, as there would be no way to enforce it. If conditional use is approved, the Applicant cannot be required to come back before the Board for minor design changes. He pointed out that the Board is asked to approve the use of the facility, not other factors such as the allocation of units.

Ms. Crush proposed that if there are minor changes to the density or intensity of the site at a level requiring amendment, the Applicant would be willing to come back to the Board.

Ms. Golub asserted that if the Applicant cannot acquire approval to build the project with the proposed 209 SSRF units, they should not be allowed to proceed with the project. Chair Hansen pointed out that should the Applicant not receive approval, they may still build another development in the Downtown RAC: they are only before the Board due to the conditional use.

Ms. Parker clarified that the Application does not request flex units: the request is for 192 independent living residential units and 209 SSRF units. Only the 209 SSRF units are before the Board for conditional approval. The City Commission must review the plan in order to allocate residential units within the Downtown RAC.

Ms. Crush concluded that the proposed project is of an appropriate size for the Downtown core area, and is compatible because it meets or exceeds conditional use requirements and is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. The only plan for the building that is inconsistent with Code is the turning of the building's orientation by 90 degrees.

Mr. Glassman asked if Staff has reviewed information regarding the "Venturi effect." Mr. Robinson replied that the ULDR makes no reference to this phenomenon, adding that Staff does not conduct wind studies.

Mr. Glassman also asked if there are any requirements regarding the eight hotel units included in the proposed project. Mr. Robinson advised that there are no requirements for these units, as hotel rooms are not allocated and do not figure into density calculations. There is also no affordable housing requirement related to the project.

Mr. Tinter asked if the 30 ft. separation between towers is a requirement or a guideline from a Master Plan. Ms. Parker clarified that this separation is a guideline from the New River Master Plan. Staff uses this plan as a guideline when reviewing projects in the Downtown area, although it is not considered prescriptive and principles are interpreted in light of particular circumstances and conditions.

Mr. Tinter observed that the Staff Report lists the eastern setback requirement for the building at 0 ft., although the guidelines suggest 30 ft. Mr. Robinson pointed out that the Downtown Master Plan takes no position on side or rear setbacks; for towers, the Downtown Master Plan requires 60 ft. of separation. This means a single tower on the parcel should be at least 30 ft. from the property line(s), so when adjacent parcels are developed and their towers are also 30 ft. from the property lines, the result is 60 ft. of separation.

Mr. Robinson continued that the choice was whether to abide by these guidelines or to abide by the New River Master Plan guidelines recommending that the tower be perpendicular to the river. If the building had been sited in a perpendicular orientation, however, it would have blocked most of the westward views from the Water Garden.

Mr. Tinter asked if the 6 ft. 2 in. setback requires approval of a variance. Mr. Robinson explained that this was not the case, as the setback is recommended in a Master Plan rather than required by the ULDR. The Master Plan's purpose is to meet the intent of creating a high-density Downtown with an active pedestrian realm. How this intent is achieved is less important than the plan's specific guidelines.

Ms. Parker added that the Master Plans are tools used to create the design standards that apply to projects. These guidelines are measured against the contexts, dimensions, and character of individual projects.

Mr. Tinter stated again that he felt the Applicant's traffic analysis and its methodology are flawed; however, he did not disagree with the conclusion reached by the analysis.

Ms. Golub commented that while she did not take issue with the proposed use, she was troubled by the combination of services, infrastructure, traffic, and their effects on New River Drive. She felt there are too many uncertainties related to the project for which there were no answers at present.

Chair Hansen noted that the size of the site and its proximity to the Water Garden contribute to some of the issues raised. If the only issue were the conditional use, he did not feel there would be significant objection.

Mr. Barranco felt it is important to include the proposed use Downtown to contribute to a more vibrant area and include different types of housing and uses. He did not feel the proposed conditional use would bring any negative effects to the site.

Mr. Tinter suggested that the condition he proposed earlier would request additional analysis of the segment of New River Drive from 2nd Avenue to Las Olas Boulevard. While he felt this analysis would also show fewer than 1000 trips generated by the proposed project, he did not feel this was sufficient reason not to undertake a traffic study.

Chair Hansen asked if the Board members also wished to attach the condition of a wind study. Ms. Golub replied that she would like to see a condition related to parking as well as adequate staffing within the building. Mr. Tinter felt that staffing should not be a concern.

Mr. Elfman asked what condition could be made regarding a wind study. Chair Hansen suggested that upon review, the wind study should ensure that the project creates no adverse conditions for the adjacent building. Ms. Parker pointed out, however, that there are no Code requirements that specifically address wind studies, which means the City may have no technical authority to act upon the findings of the study.

Motion made by Mr. Tinter, seconded by Mr. Elfman, to approve the conditional use and the Site Plan that has been presented to [the Board], with the conditions that are included in the Staff Report and conditioned on completing a traffic study of New River Drive and 4th Avenue between Las Olas and Las Olas.

Ms. Parker explained that Site Plan review is part of the conditional use request.

Mr. Tinter restated his **motion** as follows: **motion** to approve Item 3 with conditions, Staff recommendations, and the completion of a traffic study before it comes before the City Commission.

Ms. Golub proposed that a condition be added regarding the acquisition of conditional approval before permits may be pulled for the project. Attorney Ceballos advised that Code already addresses this issue for SSRFs. Ms. Golub asked if a condition requiring the acquisition of an operator for the facility could be attached to the **motion** instead. It was the decision of the Board that this was outside their purview.

Ms. Parker requested additional clarification of the condition. Mr. Tinter stated that a traffic study to address conditions on New River Drive and SE 2nd Avenue would be completed prior to the City Commission meeting.

It was determined that the **motion's** language would include the phrase "completed, submitted, and approved by Staff" in reference to the traffic study.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 4-3 (Vice Chair Maus, Mr. Glassman, and Ms. Golub dissenting). (Ms. Desir-Jean abstained. A memorandum of voting conflict is attached to these minutes.)

Ms. Desir-Jean rejoined the Board at this time (10:54 p.m.).

4. CASE:	V16011
REQUEST: **	Right-of-Way Vacation
APPLICANT:	The Las Olas Company Inc.
PROJECT NAME:	Las Olas Walk Right-of-Way Vacation
GENERAL LOCATION:	Alley located within the existing Himmarshee Canal, east of Federal Highway, south of SE 1 st Street, west of SE 8 th Avenue, and north of SE 2 nd Street
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	110' of the 10' alley adjacent to lots 5,6,11,12 & 10'-wide portion lots 4 & 13 Blk D, Edgewater Addition, PG 123, DCR.
CURRENT ZONING:	Regional Activity Center – East Mixed Use (RAC-EMU)
CURRENT LAND USE:	Downtown Regional Activity Center (D-RAC)
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	4
CASE PLANNER:	Randall Robinson

Disclosures were made.

Robert Lochrie, representing the Applicant, explained that the request is for the vacation of an alley/right-of-way vacation which was originally platted in 1912. Despite the plat, this area has never served as an alley or street. In 1933 its western portion was vacated by the City Commission.

The subject area is a portion of the Himmarshee Canal, which dead-ends at the western edge of the property. The canal is only 2 to 3 in. deep at this location, with poor water quality. The proposed project is a 7- to 8-story mid-rise multi-family residential development. Because the Himmarshee Canal is intended to be the primary amenity of this project, significant enhancements to the canal are planned, including widening, reconfiguration, new seawalls, red mangroves, riprap, a new dock/overlook area, new aeration, and a fountain feature. The developer also plans to provide public pedestrian access easements through the property.

Mr. Lochrie showed a rendering of the project's Site Plan, including the location of the subject property. The Applicant has worked with neighboring properties, including the Venezia condominium, Himmarshee Court, and an individual neighbor.

Mr. Glassman asked if the project has been approved by the City's Historic Preservation Board (HPB). Mr. Lochrie confirmed that the project appeared before this advisory body for review and comment on August 7, 2017, although comments and materials from this meeting were not included in the Board's informational materials. HPB comments will be forwarded to the City Commission in reference to the Site Plan.

Mr. Robinson of Urban Design and Planning stated that the request is for vacation of a 110 ft. alley right-of-way totaling approximately 1100 sq. ft. He noted a scrivener's error in the Staff Report on p.2, which should be corrected to "only a submerged portion of the alley is proposed to be vacated to allow for the construction of the Las Olas Walk development."

The proposed development will provide public access to the waterfront through a pedestrian access easement. Mr. Robinson clarified that no boat launching facilities will be included at this location.

Review criteria for right-of-way vacation are as follows:

- The right-of-way or other public place is no longer needed for public purposes
- Alternate routes, if needed, are available
- Closure of the right-of-way provides safe areas for vehicles
- Closure of the right-of-way shall not adversely affect pedestrian traffic
- All utilities located in the right-of-way or other public place have been or will be relocated, pursuant to a relocation plan

Mr. Robinson pointed out that the second, third, and fourth conditions are not applicable to the request, as the right-of-way in question has been underwater since it was platted. Letters of no objection have been received from all franchise utilities and the Applicant is coordinating the address of existing facilities and future service.

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

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Ms. Golub, to approve with Staff conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

5. CASE:	T17004
REQUEST: *	Amend Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) Sections 47-20.3.A.4, (Parking Reduction and Exemptions) Review Process and Section 47-20.3.F, Northwest-Progresso-Flagler Heights Community Redevelopment Area to establish a parking reduction process for

the Central City Community Redevelopment Area (CRA). This would allow parking reductions for non-residential properties in this area to be processed through the Administrative Review Process. This would also simplify the parking reduction process in the Northwest-Progresso-Flagler Heights Community Redevelopment Area. The amendment also allows on-street parking abutting these non-residential properties to count towards that property's parking requirements.

APPLICANT: City of Fort Lauderdale

PROJECT NAME: Central City CRA Parking Reduction Process

GENERAL LOCATION: Central City Community Redevelopment Area

CASE PLANNER: Jim Hetzel

Jim Hetzel of Urban Design and Planning explained that the proposed Amendment would amend ULDR Sections 20.3.A.4 and 47-20.3.F to allow a simplified parking reduction process for non-residential properties located in the Central City Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA). A similar provision exists within the Northwest Progresso-Flagler Heights CRA. Its intent is to assist businesses in the area by allowing on-street parking along 13th Street within the boundaries of the Central City CRA to count toward property owners' parking requirements.

Mr. Hetzel advised that many existing buildings and uses along the subject corridor would not be able to meet the City's parking requirements, therefore stifling economic growth within the area. Other improvements are underway for a City project within the Central City CRA, including removal of a traffic lane and providing additional parking amenities, which would be supported by the Amendment.

Mr. Glassman asked if the proposed changes have been successful within the Northwest Progresso-Flagler Heights CRA. Mr. Hetzel replied that while the change has not been used extensively in this area, it has affected a percentage of parking. Ms. Parker added that it has been helpful for smaller projects within buildings that do not meet parking requirements.

Mr. Glassman asked for the reason behind an individual objection to the Amendment which was raised at the May 3, 2017 Central City Alliance meeting. Mr. Hetzel replied that he did not know the specific reason for the objection.

Mr. Tinter asked if the Amendment could preclude a developer from using other means of seeking a parking reduction. Mr. Hetzel confirmed this.

Ms. Golub asked if the Amendment would include a cutoff date. Mr. Hetzel replied that it would become a permanent part of Code. The City's intent is to "jump-start" the Central City CRA effort with this Amendment as well as potential zoning changes. Ms. Parker noted that the same Amendment already applies within the Northwest Progresso-Flagler

Heights CRA. Mr. Hetzel continued that the Amendment only allows applicants to meet a certain percentage of their non-residential parking requirements.

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

Tim Smith, President of the Central City Alliance, requested that the Board approve the Amendment.

Katharine Barry, President of HOMES, Inc., explained that 11 years ago, this agency chose to focus on 13th Street and has worked closely with the neighborhood on several revitalization projects. She characterized the Amendment as “a step on the way” to further revitalization.

Mike Vonder Meullen, Chair of the Central City CRA Advisory Board, addressed the single objection raised at the May 3, 2017 Central City Alliance meeting, stating that this concern addressed residential development. He emphasized the CRA’s work toward redevelopment of the subject area, pointing out that existing parking requirements often serve to make redevelopment cost-prohibitive. He requested that the Board support the Amendment.

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

Motion made by Mr. Glassman, seconded by Ms. Desir-Jean, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

VI. COMMUNICATIONS TO THE CITY COMMISSION

None.

VII. FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

Ms. Parker distributed a document reflecting the recommendations reached during the recent joint workshop between the Planning and Zoning Board and the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC). She noted that the Board recommendations will be included in an upcoming presentation to the City Commission.

Mr. Hetzel recalled that during the discussion of unified flex units, it was clarified that the City would still have a pool of affordable housing units that could be allocated anywhere within the City, including on the barrier island or within the beach area.

Mr. Glassman asked if there would be further discussion of transfer development rights with regard to affordable housing. Mr. Hetzel replied that when these rights are transferred, there must be designated receiving areas. Identifying these areas can

present a challenge. Transfer development rights were ultimately omitted from the workshop's recommendations due to the complexity of this identification.

Mr. Hetzel continued that transfer development rights may be included in the ongoing discussion as a point of clarification; however, they may not be included in the recommendations to the City Commission. He explained that identification of receiving areas can slow the affordable housing development policy update, which is tied to certain City efforts, such as the Uptown project, that involve land use amendments.

Motion made by Mr. Tinter, seconded by Mr. Elfman, to approve moving the recommendations forward to the City Commission. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

It was noted that the regular Board meeting for the month of September will be held on Monday, September 18, 2017.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

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

Chair

Prototype

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