



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
700 NW 19 AVENUE, FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33311
WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 2025 – 6:00 P.M.**

Board Members	Attendance	Present	Absent
Michael Weymouth, Chair	P	10	1
Brad Cohen, Vice Chair	A	7	4
John Barranco	P	9	2
Brian Donaldson	P	10	1
Steve Ganon	P	11	0
Shari McCartney	P	10	1
Patrick McTigue	P	10	1
Jacquelyn Scott	P	4	1
Jay Shechtman	P	9	2

Staff

Karlanne Devonish, Acting Urban Design and Planning Manager
D'Wayne Spence, Interim City Attorney
Jim Hetzel, Principal Urban Planner
Michael Ferrera, Urban Planner III
Nancy Garcia, Urban Planner II
Yvonne Redding, Urban Planner III
Lorraine Tappen, Principal Urban Planner
J. Oppерlee, Recording Clerk, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Barranco, seconded by Ms. Scott, that we make a communication regarding proper facilities for City of Fort Lauderdale boards in general. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Weymouth called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

DRAFT

**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
700 NW 19 AVENUE, FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33311
WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 2025 – 6:00 P.M.**

Board Members	Attendance	Present	Absent
Michael Weymouth, Chair	P	10	1
Brad Cohen, Vice Chair	A	7	4
John Barranco	P	9	2
Brian Donaldson	P	10	1
Steve Ganon	P	11	0
Shari McCartney	P	10	1
Patrick McTigue	P	10	1
Jacquelyn Scott	P	4	1
Jay Shechtman	P	9	2

Staff

Karlanne Devonish, Acting Urban Design and Planning Manager
D'Wayne Spence, Interim City Attorney
Jim Hetzel, Principal Urban Planner
Michael Ferrera, Urban Planner III
Nancy Garcia, Urban Planner II
Yvonne Redding, Urban Planner III
Lorraine Tappen, Principal Urban Planner
J. Opperee, Recording Clerk, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Barranco, seconded by Ms. Scott, that we make a communication regarding proper facilities for City of Fort Lauderdale boards in general. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Weymouth called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Motion made by Mr. Ganon, seconded by Mr. McTigue, to approve the minutes for the April meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

III. PUBLIC SIGN-IN / SWEARING-IN

Any members of the public wishing to speak at tonight's meeting were sworn in at this time.

Motion made, and duly seconded, to make the Staff recommendations part of the record for each Item. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

IV. AGENDA ITEMS

Index

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1. UDP-Z24004* **	816 NW 3 rd Ave LLC, 819-821 NW 2 nd Ave LLC, Lot19 NW 2 Ave LLC, Shalommax LLC, and WSC Coastline Properties LLC
2. UDP-Z24006* **	New Hope Development Corporation
3. UDP-P23002**	Florida Department of Transportation
4. UDP-S24028**	Blue Skies Realty Investment Inc.
5. UDP-P24005**	Calvary Chapel of Fort Lauderdale Inc.
6. UDP-S24067**	Cypress Creek Associates Limited Partnership
7. UDP-S24071**	Hummingbird Divisions, LLC
8. UDP-S23035**	Hariohm Realty, LLC
9. UDP-L24005*	North Broward Hospital District
10. UDP-L25001*	North Broward Hospital District
11. UDP-S24072**	North Broward Hospital District

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.

1. CASE: UDP-Z24004

REQUEST: * ** Rezoning from Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density (RMM-25) District to Northwest Regional Activity Center-Mixed Use East (NWRAC-MUe) District

APPLICANT: 816 NW 3rd Ave LLC, 819-821 NW 2nd Ave LLC, Lot19 NW 2 Ave LLC, Shalommax LLC, and WSC Coastline Properties LLC

AGENT: Jason S. Crush, Esq., Crush Law, P.A.

GENERAL LOCATION: Between NW 2nd Avenue and NW 3rd Avenue, North of NW 8th Street

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Progresso 2-18 D Lot 30 To 41 Blk 261 & Progresso 2-18 D Lot 12 To 19 Blk 261

ZONING DISTRICT: Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density (RMM-25) District

PROPOSED ZONING: Northwest Regional Activity Center-Mixed Use East (NWRAC-MUe) District

LAND USE: Northwest Regional Activity Center

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 2 – Steven Glassman

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: Progresso Village Civic Association, Inc.

CASE PLANNER: Nancy Garcia

Disclosures were made at this time.

Courtney Crush, representing the Applicant, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the request, which proposes rezoning of a parcel in the City's Northwest Regional Activity Center (NWRAC) from RMM-

25 to NWRAC-MUe. The rezoning would make the subject lots consistent with the underlying land use designation of NWRAC.

Ms. Crush recalled that Regional Activity Centers (RACs) were created as redevelopment areas within the City. In 2014, the City created several new zoning districts, some of which are located along Andrews Avenue and intended to have a higher density and more intense use. Other districts east of I-95 and 9th Avenue are meant to have lower intensity.

The project's surrounding zoning districts include B-3, which is the City's most intense business zoning district and has a maximum height of 150 ft., as well as RAC-MUe, which has a maximum height of 120 ft. The subject property is currently zoned RMM-25, which is Residential Mid-rise Multifamily Medium Density, with a permitted density of 25 dwelling units per acre and a maximum height of 55 ft. The proposed NWRAC-MUe zoning has a maximum height of 65 ft. and no density regulation. It allows residential, mixed, and retail uses. The Applicant plans residential development on the subject parcel in order to meet the NWRAC's goal of providing affordable housing.

NWRAC zoning requires any future Site Plan to conform with the NWRAC Master Plan, which includes design criteria prioritizing streetscapes, building form, architectural features, scale, and other specifications. The Applicant has met with residents of the Progresso Village Civic Association and discussed how a NWRAC-MUe project could be realized. The Applicant envisioned independent buildings with access divided between NW 3rd Avenue and NW 2nd Avenue. Feedback from neighbors also indicated interest in stepping back the buildings.

Rezoning criteria include the following:

- The proposed zoning district is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan
- The rezoning would not adversely impact the character of development in or under the area for consideration
- The character of the area is suitable for the uses permitted in the proposed zoning district

Ms. Crush concluded that the Application meets these criteria for rezoning and implements the City's plans for the NWRAC as well as the goals of the Northwest Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) in which the property is located.

Mr. Shechtman asked how many units could be placed on the subject parcel if a different project were proposed on the site. Arthur Bartholomew, Applicant, clarified that form-based density means there is no density cap per acre: the number of units would be determined by how many can fit onto the site with parking and height as additional considerations. He estimated that there could be approximately 100 units on the site.

Mr. Ganon requested clarification of the existing density on the parcel today. Ms. Crush replied that most of the property is currently vacant, with duplexes and a quadruplex on a portion of the site. The total acreage is 1.67 acre. Mr. Ganon estimated that the current site could house roughly 35 to 40 units under its existing RMM-25 zoning.

Ms. Scott commented that the Planning and Zoning Board (PZB) would not see the project proposed for the site if the rezoning is granted, as plans would not come back to the Board. She pointed out that the permitted uses proposed for the site are more intense than residential, although the site is located near single-family residential properties. Ms. Crush confirmed this, but noted that the site is and has

been a multi-family zoning district, which the City took into account at the time it was incorporated into the NWRAC. She advised that this provided a mechanism to redevelop the site appropriately for a RAC.

Ms. Crush also confirmed that should the rezoning be approved and the project moved forward, plans would go through the City's Development Review Committee (DRC) process, which requires extensive public participation as well as review by City Staff. The plans would be subject to call-up by the City Commission for additional oversight.

Ms. Scott asked what could be done with the subject property under the NWRAC Master Plan. She observed that permitted uses in the proposed district include communication tower structures, public health facilities, and social service residential facilities, among others. Acting Urban Design and Planning Manager Karlanne Devonish explained that the NWRAC Master Plan provides design standards for development of the parcel. The site could be developed with the uses cited by Ms. Scott if they meet those design standards; however, Ms. Devonish clarified that those more intense uses require conditional approval, which would bring them back to the PZB.

Ms. Scott observed that the site resembles spot zoning due to its location in the middle of an existing neighborhood. Ms. Crush replied that since the City created the NWRAC, individual property owners have rezoned their properties, which was the intent behind the creation of the NWRAC. She reiterated that the Application is consistent with rezoning criteria, and that the site is surrounded by more intense zoning districts. She concluded that the requested zoning district is more appropriate for the area than other more intense uses.

Mr. Shechtman requested clarification of how the proposed rezoning would not be spot zoning. Ms. Crush replied that the zoning criteria are consistent with the Land Use Plan, with no adverse impacts as well as compatibility with building form and primary uses.

Ms. Scott asked why the City does not change the zoning of parcels itself instead of having applicants bring forward these types of requests. Ms. Devonish advised that the City had tried to rezone all parcels with a land use of NWRAC; however, there had been insufficient consensus to rezone the full area including inner blocks. Only major corridors were rezoned at that time. Property owners are coming forward and rezoning their parcels over time.

Mr. Donaldson commented that the Board may wish to consider sending a communication to the City Commission suggesting that they revisit the full rezoning of the NWRAC.

Ms. Crush pointed out that the addition of retail uses is discussed in the NWRAC Master Plan as well as the CRA Plan, both of which identify neighborhood-serving retail as a goal in addition to more housing.

At this time Chair Weymouth opened the public hearing.

Kelli Russell, private citizen, stated that she owns property in the subject neighborhood and does not feel fully safe staying there, particularly at night. She added that her property serves as an Airbnb rental when she is not present, and clients have cancelled their stays there. She felt the proposed project would bring new energy to the space.

Edgar Sainz, private citizen, advised that he is a property manager in the subject area. He felt rezoning the property would increase value for surrounding owners and bring in long-term tenants. He added that existing vacant lots contribute to an unsafe environment for residents.

Alexander Florence, private citizen, stated that he is a resident of the Progresso Village neighborhood. He preferred that the parcel be developed for houses rather than large buildings.

Mr. Donaldson asked if Mr. Florence would be satisfied if the permitted height remains 55 ft. rather than 65 ft. Mr. Florence replied that there would be additional changes accompanying height if the project is approved, and he was not in favor of opening up the neighborhood to ground floor businesses when there are empty storefronts.

J.J. Hankerson, president of the Progresso Village Civic Association, advised that the Association voted down the proposed project. He requested that the Board recommend denial of the rezoning request.

Jason Ross, private citizen, stated that he is in favor of the proposed rezoning, which he felt would have an overall positive impact on the surrounding neighborhood by providing affordable housing.

With no other individuals wishing to speak at this time, Chair Weymouth closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Ms. Crush addressed comments regarding affordable housing, pointing out that the City preferred mixed use to industrial use in this section of the NWRAC. The current RMM-25 zoning has not been viable for residential projects, as the parcels have remained vacant for several years. The proposed project would provide housing for more residents, although not an extremely large number. She concluded that the Applicant planned for the project to be respectful to its neighbors.

Mr. Donaldson asked how affordable housing is defined in terms of the proposed project, including the parameters that would be used to guarantee affordability. Ms. Crush replied that the term "affordable" can be broadly defined, pointing out that Broward County considers a household making roughly \$89,000 to qualify for some level of affordability.

Mr. Bartholomew, Applicant, advised that he planned to speak to the CRA to seek funds for infrastructure improvements in exchange for allocating a number of affordable units. He added that if a project is built on a high-rise scale, it is able to offer cheaper units.

Ms. Scott asked if the project could not be developed with RMM-25 zoning. Ms. Devonish confirmed that RMM-25 zoning permits residential development. Mr. Ganon observed, however, that the parcel has had this zoning designation for some time and nothing has been developed there, which suggests financial difficulties in moving forward under RMM-25 zoning.

Ms. McCartney asserted that the City cannot continue to allow neighborhood space to remain undeveloped while advocating for more affordable housing in Fort Lauderdale. She felt the project is necessary in order to provide more affordable housing, characterizing it as a first step.

Mr. Shechtman asked what the other Board members thought of the preservation of a cluster of uses in the subject neighborhood. He suggested there may be less intense zoning districts which would also allow for development of a mixture of alternative uses. He added that his concern was for how uses

permitted by the requested zoning would be compatible with surrounding uses and zoning districts while preserving the integrity of the residential neighborhood.

Mr. Barranco advised that the NWRAC was created with the intent of redevelopment, which has occurred slowly over time. He recalled that there was similar resistance to redevelopment and rezoning in the South RAC. He concluded that the proposed project meets all rezoning criteria and should be approved.

Chair Weymouth added that while he understood concerns with the inclusion of commercial or retail use on the subject parcel, financial plans for the site would not work without them.

Mr. Shechtman asked if there is a zoning category other than RMM-25 that offers greater intensity but does not allow commercial uses. Ms. Devonish replied that the next step up from RMM-25 would be RMH-60. It was clarified that RMH-60 permits much greater height, and that its underlying land use is typically high-rise residential, which she was not certain would be compatible with NWRAC land use.

Ms. Scott asked if it would be possible to tie the rezoning to residential use only for the proposed project. Interim City Attorney D'Wayne Spence stated this could not be imposed by the Board as a condition of approval, as the Board's role with the subject Application is to make a recommendation to the City Commission regarding approval or denial of the rezoning request.

Ms. Devonish advised that the maximum height permitted by RMH-60 zoning is 120 ft. to 150 ft., with conditional use to allow up to 200 ft.

Motion made by Ms. McCartney, seconded by Mr. Barranco, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP-Z24004, based on finding of facts and the facts in the City Staff Report and the testimony today, finding that it meets the criteria, and the approval is subject to the conditions included in the Staff Report. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-2 (Ms. Scott and Mr. Shechtman dissenting).

2. CASE: UDP-Z24006

REQUEST: * ** Rezoning from Residential Multifamily Low Rise/Medium Density (RM-15) District to Northwest Regional Activity Center - Mixed Use west (NWRAC-MUw) District

APPLICANT: New Hope Development Corporation

AGENT: Vince Prince, Landamerica Holdings & Investments Group, LLC

ADDRESS: 1325 NW 6th Street

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lincoln Park, Pb 5, Pg 2, Lots 9 and 10, Block 1

ZONING DISTRICT: Residential Multifamily Low Rise/Medium Density (RM-15) District

PROPOSED ZONING: Northwest Regional Activity Center – Mixed Use west (NWRAC-MUw) District

LAND USE: Northwest Regional Activity Center

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 3 – Pamela Beasley-Pittman

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: Durrs Community Association

CASE PLANNER: Yvonne Redding

Disclosures were made at this time.

Vince Prince, representing the Applicant, explained that the Application seeks the rezoning of a single lot on Sistrunk Boulevard. The lot's current zoning is divided between RM-15 and NWRAC-MUw, which

makes it a nonconforming use. The Applicant wishes to unify the parcel's zoning under NWRAC-MUw, which is consistent with the Future Land Use Map as well as Staff's recommendation.

Mr. Prince added that the Applicant has submitted a second application for DRC review which is tied to the rezoning of this parcel. That second application would construct nine workforce housing units on top of a structured parking facility which would serve both New Hope Baptist Church and the Lee Mizell YMCA.

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

Mr. Barranco commented that the zoning and legal description accompanying the Application do not extend to the center line of the roadway. Attorney Spence stated that the zoning will be considered to extend to the center line in accordance with the Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) although the graphics do not depict it as such.

Motion made by Ms. Scott, seconded by Mr. McTigue, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP-Z24006, based on the following findings of fact, the City Staff Report, based on testimony here by the Applicant, the Board hereby finds that the Application meets the applicable criteria of the ULDR cited in the Staff Report. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

3. CASE: UDP-P23002

REQUEST: ** Plat Review

APPLICANT: Florida Department of Transportation

AGENT: Cypress Creek Leaseholder, LLC and Elizabeth Tsouroukdissian, Pulice Land Surveyors

PROJECT NAME: Cypress Creek West Plat

ADDRESS: 6000 - 6150 North Andrews Avenue

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lightspeed Broward Center Plat 177-32 B Parcel A

ZONING DISTRICT: General Business (B-2) District

LAND USE: Uptown Urban Village – Transit Oriented Development

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 1 – John Herbst

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: N/A

CASE PLANNER: Nancy Garcia

Disclosures were made at this time.

Nectaria Chakas, representing the Applicant, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the Application, which requests plat approval for an existing Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) park-and-ride lot on Cypress Creek Boulevard. The subject property is divided between the cities of Oakland Park and Fort Lauderdale. It is part of the Uptown Land Use Plan Amendment area approved by the PZB and the City Commission, in which all land use has been changed to Transit-Oriented Development (TOD). The property was rezoned in April 2025 by the City Commission.

Plat approval would allow a mixed-use building to be located on the property. It would also allow up to 345 mid-rise units and 6000 sq. ft. of commercial use. These uses are consistent with the current zoning and land use.

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

Motion made by Mr. Donaldson, seconded by Mr. McTigue, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP-P23002 based upon the following findings of fact and the facts in the City Staff Report, based on the testimony heard by the Applicant, that the Board hereby finds that the Application meets the applicable criteria the ULDR cited in the Staff Report. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

4. CASE: UDP-S24028

REQUEST: ** Site Plan Level III Review: 22-Unit Multifamily Residential Development with Modification to Building Length, in Central Beach Regional Activity Center

APPLICANT: Blue Skies Realty Investment Inc.

AGENT: Joseph B. Kaller, Kaller Architecture

PROJECT NAME: Granada Condos

ADDRESS: 3003, 3011 and 3015 Granada Street

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lauder Del Mar 7-30 B Lot 8 To 13 Blk 8

ZONING DISTRICT: A-1-A Beachfront Area (ABA) District

LAND USE: Central Beach Regional Activity Center

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 2 – Steven Glassman

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: Central Beach Alliance HOA

CASE PLANNER: Nancy Garcia

Chair Weymouth advised that the Applicant has requested deferral of this Item to the June 18, 2025 meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Barranco, seconded by Mr. McTigue, to defer. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

5. CASE: UDP-P24005

REQUEST: ** Plat Review

APPLICANT: Calvary Chapel of Fort Lauderdale Inc.

AGENT: Joselyn Aldas, Keith

PROJECT NAME: Calvary Chapel of Fort Lauderdale Plat

ADDRESS: 6330 NW 31st Avenue

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Portion of Section 8, Township 49 South, Range 42 East

ZONING DISTRICT: Parks (P) District and Community Facility/House of Worship and School (CF-HS) District

LAND USE: Parks and Open Space, Community Facility

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 1 – John Herbst

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: N/A

CASE PLANNER: Jim Hetzel, AICP

Disclosures were made at this time. Mr. Barranco recused himself from hearing or voting upon this Item.

Nectaria Chakas, representing the Applicant, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the Application, which requests plat approval of a property purchased by the Applicant in 2011. Buildings currently

located on the site are slated for demolition and an elementary school will be constructed on the property.

The site is 9.9 acres and includes a zoning boundary, as the property has divided land use and zoning. The western portion, which includes buildings, is zoned Community Facility/House of Worship and School (CF-HS), while the eastern portion, which includes athletic fields, is zoned Parks and Open Space (P). The proposed plat includes two parcels due to this divided land use and zoning, although the site and its campus will operate as a single cohesive site.

The Applicant requests a waiver of the Code provision requiring all parcels within the plat to have direct access to a public right-of-way. The Code provision would require the Applicant to build a public street from NW 31st Avenue to the Parks parcel, which the Applicant does not feel is necessary as the site will operate as a single entity. The property has never been previously platted.

The plat note restriction will allow for grades K-8 elementary and middle school, although the site will be geared toward elementary school-age children. The plat restriction on the Parks parcel will be limited to recreational uses. A Site Plan will come before the Applicant at a later date.

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

Motion made by Ms. Scott, seconded by Mr. McTigue, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP-P24005, based on the following findings of fact, the facts of the City Staff Report, and/or based on testimony heard by the applicable criteria of the ULDR cited in the Staff Report, and granting the waiver from the requirement for the private street. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0. (Mr. Barranco abstained. A memorandum of voting conflict is attached to these minutes.)

6. CASE: UDP-S24067

REQUEST: ** Site Plan Level III Review: Parking Reduction Request

APPLICANT: Cypress Creek Associates Limited Partnership

AGENT: Aaron Kosh, Bohler Engineering FL, LLC

PROJECT NAME: Cypress Creek Station - Target

ADDRESS: 6331 North Andrews Avenue

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Cypress Creek Station 161-34 B Por Par A

ZONING DISTRICT: Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial Business (B-3) District

LAND USE: Uptown Urban Village – Transit Oriented Development

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 1 – John Herbst

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: N/A

CASE PLANNER: Michael Ferrera

Disclosures were made at this time. Ms. McCartney recused herself from hearing or voting upon this Item.

Dwayne Dickerson, representing the Applicant, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the Item, which requests Site Plan approval with a parking reduction. The subject site is zoned B-3 with a future land use of Uptown Urban Village – Transit-Oriented Development (UUV-TOD). The property is just over 22.7 acres in size.

The request would redevelop the site by demolishing an existing movie theater and salon in the shopping center to make way for a Target that will be over 121,000 sq. ft. in size. The Applicant also requests a parking reduction of 11.5%, which Mr. Dickerson noted was reduced from the original proposed reduction of 15% in cooperation with City Staff. The parking reduction makes the Application subject to Site Plan Level III review, which requires PZB approval.

Mr. Dickerson showed the Site Plan, pointing out that the shopping center currently has three existing access points onto Andrews Avenue as well as one access point onto Cypress Creek Road. These include right-in/right-out, left-in/left-out, and full access points. All of these access points will remain as they are.

Mr. Dickerson advised that the Applicant plans to make additional site improvements within the shopping center to improve the overall experience. They worked with Staff to enhance the safety and efficiency of the pedestrian and vehicular experiences throughout the site, including the following:

- Addition of two new pedestrian access connections to the public right-of-way on Andrews Avenue
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) upgrades, including curb ramps, crosswalks, and ADA-compliant parking stalls
- New vehicular and pedestrian circulation in the parking area to allow an access opening into the parking area, reducing conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians
- Upgraded traffic control signals and signage
- Additional pedestrian crosswalks

Although the property is zoned B-3, it is located within the UUV-TOD area. The Applicant has chosen to implement some of the requirements for that zoning district to its planned architecture, as well as hardscape improvements, new paver entry areas, enhanced landscaping, and a plaza.

Mr. Dickerson reviewed the two new pedestrian access areas from Andrews Avenue directly into the site, which will lead into the plaza. Significant traffic controls will be added, with signage and crosswalks, directly in front of the store. Vehicles can enter the parking area without having to enter the front space, reducing conflicts with pedestrians.

The elimination of the movie theater and addition of retail resulted in a reduction of more than 2,300 total daily trips on the site. The existing use generates 9269 trips, while the proposed use would reduce this number to 6958.

The Applicant's parking study showed a parking requirement of 1,588 spaces; however, Staff identified a requirement of 1,592 spaces. Mr. Dickerson stipulated to the use of Staff's calculation and requested a parking reduction of 11.5%, which would bring the number of spaces to 1,409. He advised that the Applicant's parking analysis projected the weekday peak parking demand at 1,237 spaces, with weekend peak parking demand of 1080 spaces. The requested 1409 spaces would provide a surplus of over 100 spaces.

The ULDR also considers whether or not conditions are conducive to shared parking due to the mix of uses on the site. The proposed shopping center includes commercial, retail, health club/gym, restaurant, medical office, and general office uses, which have non-concurrent peak hours.

Mr. Dickerson concluded that the Applicant provided community outreach meetings, although these were not attended by any individuals with concerns or opposition. The Application is compatible with the City's Comprehensive Plan and satisfies all ULDR requirements.

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

Motion made by Mr. Donaldson, seconded by Mr. McTigue, to approve adoption of the Resolution approving a Site Plan Level III for Case Number UDP-S24067, based upon the following findings of facts, and the Board hereby finds that the Applicant meets the standards and requirements of the ULDR and the criteria for the proposed use and the site solution and subject to all conditions in the City Staff Report. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0. (Ms. McCartney abstained. A memorandum of voting conflict is attached to these minutes.)

7. CASE: UDP-S24071

REQUEST: ** Site Plan Level III Review: Parking Reduction Request

APPLICANT: Hummingbird Divisions, LLC

AGENT: Andrew Schein, Lochrie & Chakas, P.A.

PROJECT NAME: 3501 NW 54th Street Warehouse Addition

ADDRESS: 3501 NW 54th Street

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Linpro Lonestar Park 124-12 B Tract A

ZONING DISTRICT: Commerce Center (CC) District

LAND USE: Employment Center

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 1 – John Herbst

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: N/A

CASE PLANNER: Karlanne Devonish, AICP

Disclosures were made at this time.

Andrew Schein, representing the Applicant, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Item, which requests Site Plan Level III approval with a parking reduction. The site is currently occupied by a warehouse which plans to expand its use.

The Applicant plans to beautify the property by adding landscaping. The existing warehouse is on the east side of the property, with a proposed warehouse to the north. The existing building is nonconforming, as it does not meet setback requirements. The Applicant does not propose any changes for that building. The new building will meet all ULDR requirements.

Mr. Schein continued that the basis for the requested parking reduction is that the use requires less parking than what is specified in Code. He acknowledged that this is a subjective determination which requires a methodology meeting between the Applicant and the City's transportation reviewer. In this case, the Applicant's parking study showed that at peak times, nine spaces would be required on the site. There are currently three to four cars at the site at any given time. No new employees are expected. The project generates a total of five p.m. peak hour trips. The site provides 15 spaces, and the City engineer agrees with the Applicant's analysis.

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

Motion made by Mr. Ganon, seconded by Mr. McTigue, to adopt the Resolution approving a Site Plan Level III, Case Number S24071, based on the following findings of fact, the facts in the City Staff Report, and testimony heard by the Applicant, and the Board hereby finds that the Application meets the standards and requirements of the ULDR and criteria for the proposed use at the cited Resolution; we approve the Application subject to all conditions in the City Staff Report. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

8. CASE: UDP-S23035

REQUEST: ** Site Plan Level IV Review: 75-Room Hotel with 984 Square Feet of Ancillary Bar, Dimensional Modifications to Tower Stepback, Tower Separation, Increase in Floor Area Ratio (FAR), and Request to Pay the Central Beach Parking Facility Fee in Lieu of Parking in the Central Beach Regional Activity Center

APPLICANT: Hariohm Realty, LLC

AGENT: Stephanie J. Toothaker, Esq.

PROJECT NAME: 42 Hotel

ADDRESS: 3001 Alhambra Street

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lauder Del Mar 7-30 B Lot 23,24 Blk 6

ZONING DISTRICT: A-1-A Beachfront Area (ABA) District

LAND USE: Central Beach Regional Activity Center

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 2 – Steven Glassman

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: Central Beach Alliance HOA

CASE PLANNER: Karlanne Devonish, AICP

Disclosures were made at this time.

Stephanie Toothaker, representing the Applicant, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the item, explaining that the subject site is located in a portion of the Central Beach area where development is encouraged. She noted the heights of a number of surrounding projects, stating that the Applicant has met with neighbors throughout the process. The site's land use is Central Beach RAC and its zoning is ABA, which is consistent with surrounding zoning.

The project proposes a 15-story boutique hotel with 75 rooms and 47 parking spaces. The Applicant has requested a number of bonuses, including the following:

- Floor area ratio (FAR) bonus of 20% as determined by a point system
- Tower stepback modification on the west and south sides
- Minimum tower separation modification of 20 ft. rather than 30 ft.

The 47 parking spaces will be valet parking only. The subject area also allows for the purchase of public parking, with a public parking garage currently under construction with 77 spaces as part of a project across the street. The garage is expected to be complete in early 2026.

The proposed project is expected to generate 26 net new trips, which did not require a full traffic or parking study. It meets water and sewer capacity requirements.

The project meets the 20 ft. ground floor setback requirement on all sides and exceeds the open space requirement of 2,200 sq. ft., providing 6,081 sq. ft. The developer has opted for underground parking, which allows for greater pedestrian connectivity at the ground level. ADA requirements are met, and deliveries are scheduled for either early morning or late night. All loading/unloading will be internal to the site.

Ms. Toothaker showed ground floor views of the site, noting architectural details including the lobby. The project complies with almost all technical aspects of Code aside from the requested bonuses. She pointed out that the site meets the design compatibility bonus system related to the FAR ratio, as it complies with structure height, street wall length, setbacks, and stepbacks. The project provides habitable space on all levels from the ground floor to the rooftop.

The project incorporates a drainage plan which provides on-site drainage using plant systems. Because parking is underground and the ground floor is open, providing substantial open space, the site also meets requirements for a design compatibility bonus. 75% of the front façade at ground level along a right-of-way consists of active uses. The ground floor includes a lobby, gym, and outdoor plaza.

Because the site includes some constraints, the Applicant has requested that the 15 ft. front stepback be eliminated. Staff concurred that sufficient justification was provided for this request. The 20 ft. tower separation is due to the proximity of a parking lot behind the site which serves a building to the east.

Ms. Toothaker advised that the Applicant met with neighbors of nearby buildings as well as the Central Beach Alliance (CBA). The CBA voted in favor of the project as well as in favor of a declaration of restrictive covenant. A letter from the CBA president in support of the project is included in the Applicant's backup materials, and the CBA's board voted unanimously in favor of it and worked with the Applicant to improve the plans. Additional letters of support from nearby residents are also included for the record. The Applicant accepts all conditions of approval listed in the Staff Report.

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

Motion made by Mr. Ganon, seconded by Mr. Shechtman, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP-S23035 based on the following findings of fact, the facts of the City Staff Report, based on the testimony heard by the Applicant, and the Board hereby finds that the Application meets the applicable criteria of the ULDR cited in the Staff Report, and the Board recommends approval of the Application subject to all of the conditions included in the Staff Report. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

It was determined that Items 9, 10, and 11 would be presented together and voted upon separately.

9. CASE: UDP-L24005

REQUEST: * Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map from Community Facilities to South Regional Activity Center

APPLICANT: North Broward Hospital District

AGENT: Stephanie J. Toothaker, Esq.

PROJECT NAME: Broward Health Medical Center Land Use Map Amendment

ADDRESS: 1413 SE 1st Avenue, 1409 SE 1st Avenue, 1417 SE 1st Avenue, 20 SE 14th Street, 210 SE 14th Street, 15 SE 15th Street, 150 SE 17th Street, 1512 South Andrews Avenue, and 1600 South Andrews Avenue

GENERAL LOCATION: South of SE 14th Street, West of SE 3rd Avenue, North of SE 18th Street, and East of South Andrews Avenue

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Portion of Tract A, Broward General Hospital, Lots 13 Through 19, Block 26, A Portion of Block 27, Lots 13 Through 24, Block 34, Lots 10 Through 18, Block 44, and Portions of SE 18th Street, SE 17th Street, SE 15th Street, SE 14th Street, SE 3rd Avenue, and SE 1st Avenue, Croissant Park

ZONING DISTRICT: Community Facility (CF), Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density District (RMM-25), Planned Residential Office District (ROC), and Boulevard Business (B-1) Districts

LAND USE: Community Facilities

PROPOSED LAND USE: South Regional Activity Center

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 4 – Ben Sorensen

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: Poinciana Park Civic Association

CASE PLANNER: Lorraine Tappen, AICP

10. CASE: UDP-L25001

REQUEST: * Amend Policy FLU 1.1.12 of the City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan Future Land Element, South Regional Activity Land Use Designation, to Increase Community Facility Permitted Uses from 1,000,000 Square Feet to 3,221,560 Square Feet

APPLICANT: North Broward Hospital District

AGENT: Stephanie J. Toothaker, Esq.

PROJECT NAME: Broward Health Medical Center Land Use Text Amendment

GENERAL LOCATION: South of the Tarpon River, West of S. Federal Highway, North of State Road 84, East and Adjacent to the Florida East Coast Right-of-Way

CASE PLANNER: Lorraine Tappen, AICP

11. CASE: UDP-S24072

REQUEST: ** Site Plan Level IV Review: Medical Office Building with Requests for a Design Deviation and Application of Prior Zoning Regulations

APPLICANT: North Broward Hospital District

AGENT: Stephanie J. Toothaker, Esq.

PROJECT NAME: Broward Health Medical Center Medical Office Building and Parking Garage

ADDRESS: 1601 South Andrews Avenue

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Croissant Park Resub Blk 38 52-8 B Lots 1 To 8,25 To 30 Tog With Croissant Park 4-28 B Lots 11 Thru 18 Blk 35 Tog With Por Vac R/W Desc'd In Or 34245/470, Less E 3' Thereof For Rd R/W

ZONING DISTRICT: South Regional Activity Center – South Andrews East (SRAC-SAe) District

LAND USE: South Regional Activity Center

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 4 – Ben Sorensen

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: Poinciana Park Civic Association

CASE PLANNER: Adam Schnell

Disclosures were made at this time. Mr. Shechtman recused himself from hearing or voting upon Items 9, 10, and 11.

Stephanie Toothaker, representing the Applicant, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the Applications, advising that Broward Health has a long-term vision for its properties which includes considering them in a more holistic fashion than in the past. The intent is to create a cohesive health district out of these properties.

The Applications propose a Land Use Plan Amendment, a text amendment to the City's Comprehensive Plan, and Site Plan Level IV review for a medical office building and garage. The land for the medical office is located on Andrews Avenue and 17th Street and currently exists as a surface parking lot serving

another building. Ms. Toothaker noted that the area currently has a zoning designation of Community Facility (CF). The Applicant proposes to move the subject property into the South RAC land use designation, with a zoning of South RAC.

The property is intended to serve as an extension of the hospital itself, with 129 large rooms, 237 smaller rooms, and eight floors. No surgeries would take place at the facility. The parking garage will be seven floors with 473 parking spaces. As this exceeds parking requirements, the additional parking will serve other Broward Health uses. There will be an east/west crosswalk connecting the building to the hospital.

Ms. Toothaker explained that in most RAC districts, waivers must be requested if the project exceeds the dimensional requirements of Code. In this case, South RAC zoning includes 10 floors and is written as if the project is a residential use, with 10 ft. floor-to-floor. The proposed eight-story building exceeds the height limitation by 10 ft., as medical office buildings require higher ceilings. This means while the number of floors meets Code for both the medical office building and the garage, the actual height of those two buildings exceeds Code limits.

Ms. Toothaker advised that the Applicant and Staff determined that the best way to proceed with the Applications was to apply a provision of Code called Application of Prior Zoning District. This allows consideration of the prior zoning for the area, which was formerly CB zoning. The Application meets all technical requirements under the CB zoning district. If the Board approves the request under this Code provision, the project will ultimately go before the City Commission for approval.

The building will be adjacent to an existing sports medicine building. The right-of-way between these two buildings has been vacated in order to serve as a private drop-off area and will serve both buildings.

Ms. Toothaker noted a change to one condition of approval included in the Staff Report: the Applicant requests that a letter of approval by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) be provided before the issuance, rather than the submittal, of a building permit. She confirmed that the Assistant City Manager has approved this change although it was not captured in the Staff Report.

Ms. Toothaker reviewed a map of the property, including current and proposed zoning. Because the property currently zoned CF will be brought into the South RAC, a text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is required for consistency, although no actual changes will be made to the site.

Public participation meetings were held for the Applications, and all three Applications must go before the City Commission for approval. The Land Use Plan Amendment and text amendment will also go before the Broward County Planning Council.

At this time Chair Weymouth opened the public hearing.

Ted Inserra, president of the River Oaks Civic Association, advised that while a health district is needed, the area surrounding the proposed changes is mostly residential. He also noted that future plans for the area may include a commuter rail station as well as tall residential buildings. He concluded that the proposed building is too large for the residential area in which it would be located, and expressed concern with the crosswalk as well.

Ms. Scott asked if Mr. Inserra's comments were made on an individual basis or represented the River Oaks Civic Association. Mr. Inserra clarified that he spoke for the Civic Association, whose board voted against the proposed project.

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

Mr. Donaldson asked if the crosswalk would be signalized. Ms. Toothaker replied that the Applicant is required to ask for the crosswalk, and plans to work with the County to implement it at the subject location.

Ms. Toothaker also noted that the Applicant did not make a presentation to the River Oaks Civic Association, as that Association is outside the notification area.

Attorney Spence advised that the Board will act in its capacity as Local Planning Agency (LPA) with regard to the Future Land Use Plan map.

Motion made by Mr. Ganon, seconded by Ms. McCartney, to recommend approval of the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, Case Number UDP-L24005. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0. (Mr. Shechtman abstained. A memorandum of voting conflict is attached to these minutes.)

Attorney Spence clarified that the next Item presents a text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan allowing the increase in square footage.

Motion made by Mr. Ganon, seconded by Mr. McTigue, to recommend approval of the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, Case Number UDP-L25001. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0. (Mr. Shechtman abstained. A memorandum of voting conflict is attached to these minutes.)

Chair Weymouth noted that a motion on Item 11 will need to include the modification to the condition in the Staff Report mentioned by Ms. Toothaker during her presentation.

Motion made by Mr. Donaldson, seconded by Ms. McCartney, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP-S24072, based on the following findings of fact, the facts of the City Staff Report, and based on the testimony heard by the Applicant, the Board hereby finds that the Application meets the applicable criteria of the ULDR cited in the Staff Report, and the condition that was added during the presentation by Applicant's attorney in the timing of the approval by the FAA, subject to all the conditions as amended at tonight's meeting. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0. (Mr. Shechtman abstained. A memorandum of voting conflict is attached to these minutes.)

V. COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION

Chair Weymouth recalled an earlier suggestion that the Board send a communication to the City Commission regarding the NWRAC. Attorney Spence clarified that the proposal had been for a comprehensive rezoning effort in that district.

Ms. Devonish advised that the NWRAC land use extends as far south as Broward Boulevard and as far north as Sunrise Boulevard, including the Broward Boulevard corridor. Its eastern boundary is the FEC tracks.

Mr. Shechtman commented that Fort Lauderdale's residential neighborhoods surrounding Downtown are what make the City special. He stated that he would support rezoning west of 4th Avenue and east of 9th Avenue.

Attorney Spence explained that as a result of planning efforts years ago, it was decided that the area in question would be the NWRAC. The boundary of that area also includes a number of historic residential single-family areas. He recommended that any suggestion made by the Board include taking a comprehensive look at that area, including either an approach to redevelopment throughout the NWRAC or looking only at certain areas within the NWRAC.

Ms. Scott stated that approval of Item 1 changes the area, as there were unlikely to be more plans in that location for single-family buildings. Mr. Donaldson pointed out that this was the intent of the City's extension of the life of the CRA, as it would encourage more affordable housing.

The Board members discussed the boundaries of the proposal for the NWRAC. Mr. Donaldson advised that he felt they would need to review a more complete map in order to propose more comprehensive rezoning. No action was taken on this issue.

Chair Weymouth recommended that the City identify a more dignified location in which to hold PZB meetings, as he found the current location unacceptable over the long term. There was discussion of moving the location of future meetings to Holiday Park.

Motion made by Mr. Barranco, seconded by Ms. Scott, that we make a communication regarding proper facilities for City of Fort Lauderdale boards in general. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Shechtman thanked his fellow Board members for the opportunity to serve the City with them. Ms. Devonish and Attorney Spence also recognized the Board members whose terms were ending and thanked them for their service as well.

VI. FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 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

Planning and Zoning Board

May 21, 2025

Page 18

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