



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
700 NW 19 AVENUE, FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33311
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2024 – 6:00 P.M.

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Michael Weymouth, Chair	P	7	0
Brad Cohen, Vice Chair (arr. 6:23)	P	5	2
John Barranco	P	5	2
Mary Fertig	P	6	1
Steve Ganon (arr. 6:01)	P	6	1
Marilyn Mammano	P	6	1
Shari McCartney	P	7	0
Patrick McTigue	P	7	0
Jay Shechtman	P	6	1

Staff

Ella Parker, Urban Design and Planning Manager
D'Wayne Spence, Deputy City Attorney
Shari Wallen, Assistant City Attorney
Karlanne Devonish, Urban Design and Planning
Michael Ferrera, Urban Design and Planning
Nancy Garcia, Urban Design and Planning
Yvonne Redding, Urban Design and Planning
Adam Schnell, Urban Design and Planning
Leslie Harmon, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to City Commission

None.

I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

~~Chair Weymouth called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited and the Chair introduced the Board and Staff members present.~~

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

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

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

~~Mr. Ganon arrived at 6:01 p.m.~~

III. PUBLIC SIGN-IN / SWEARING-IN

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

IV. AGENDA ITEMS

Index

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1. UDP-P21007**	1800 State Road, LLC
2. UDP-S22004**	Melrose View, LLC
3. UDP-Z24001* **	City of Fort Lauderdale
4. UDP-Z24002* **	City of Fort Lauderdale
5. UDP-S23040**	6001 Powerline, LLC
6. UDP-S23064**	Holiday Park Plaza, LTD
7. UDP-T24002*	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.

1. CASE: UDP-P21007

REQUEST: ** Plat Review

APPLICANT: 1800 State Road, LLC

AGENT: Davina Bean

PROJECT NAME: 1800 State Road 84

ADDRESS: 1800 State Road 84

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A Replat of a Portion of Tract 23, F.A. Barrett's Subdivision of W1/2 of 21-50-42-1-46 D Lot 23 E 193.21 of W 363.21 Lying S of St Rd 84 Less S 17 Thereof

ZONING DISTRICT: General Business (B-2) Zoning District and Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High (RMM-25) Density Zoning District

LAND USE: Commercial and Medium High Residential

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 4 – Warren Sturman

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: Edgewood Civic Association

CASE PLANNER: Adam Schnell

Disclosures were made at this time.

~~Davina Bean, representing the Applicant, stated that the Application is for plat approval.~~

~~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.~~

~~The Board agreed by consensus to make all Staff Reports for all Items part of the findings.~~

~~**Motion** made by Ms. Fertig, seconded by Mr. McTigue, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP-P21007 based on the following findings of fact from the Staff Report, and the Board finds that the Application meets the applicable criteria of the ULDR cited in the Staff Report.~~

~~Mr. Barranco requested clarification of the reason for the Application. Deputy City Attorney D'Wayne Spence characterized the Application as a "cleanup" item, as plat approval before the issuance of building permits was a condition of Site Plan approval.~~

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

~~**2. CASE:** UDP-S22004~~

~~**REQUEST:** ** Site Plan Level III Review: Conditional Use for Mixed Use Project with 6,741 Square Feet of Office Use and 85 Multifamily Residential Units~~

~~**APPLICANT:** Melrose View, LLC.~~

~~**AGENT:** Courtney Crush, Crush Law, P.A.~~

~~**PROJECT NAME:** 2900 W. Broward~~

~~**ADDRESS:** 2900 W. Broward Boulevard~~

~~**ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** Westwood Heights 6-34 B Por Of Lots 1-5, Por Of Lot 16 & All Of Lots 17-20, Block 5~~

~~**ZONING DISTRICT:** Boulevard Business District (B-1)~~

~~**LAND USE:** Commercial~~

~~**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** 3 — Pamela Beasley-Pittman~~

~~**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:** Melrose Manors Homeowners Association~~

~~**CASE PLANNER:** Yvonne Redding~~

~~Disclosures were made at this time.~~

~~Courtney Crush, representing the Applicant, stated that the subject property is zoned B-1, which permits commercial uses, has standardized setbacks, and allows a maximum height of 150 ft. The Applicant proposes a mixed-use project including 85 residences with 6700 sq. ft. of ground-level office use.~~

~~The Site Plan includes a 1700 sq. ft. public plaza, a gym for residents, and three levels of parking for 67% of lot coverage. This leaves a significant amount of open space. Ms.~~

~~Crush showed images of the residences, describing the structure as a 360-degree building which incorporates vertical elements.~~

~~The Applicant seeks a parking reduction of one space. The 85 residences will be fully parked and 27 commercial spaces will be provided for the office use. Staff has reviewed and agrees with the proposed reduction, which takes the building's peak hours into account.~~

~~Ms. Crush reviewed the site, including the Broward Boulevard plaza and pedestrian streetscape, amenities for residents, and inset cutout on the south side. The City typically allocates flexibility ("flex") units in its commercial corridors; however, in this case the Applicant may use Geller units and pay the \$10,000 payment in lieu per unit. A payment will be made into the County's and City's Affordable Housing Trust Fund.~~

~~Ms. Crush continued that public participation meetings were held with the Melrose Manors and Boulevard Gardens communities in spring 2022. Letters of support are included in the Board members' backup materials. There were 15 residents at the Melrose Manors public meeting and 8 at the Boulevard Gardens meeting.~~

~~Mr. Ganon asked if there will be parking for retail on the project's first floor, or if this space will be reserved residents. Seth Yeslow, architect for the Applicant, clarified that there will be dedicated ground floor parking spaces for retail. The project includes three levels of parking. The building is "wrapped" on its north, east, and south sides to screen parking with a number of architectural treatments, massing, and modulation of the building's façade. There will be some residential parking on the ground floor, with the second and third floors consisting of residential parking.~~

~~Mr. Yeslow advised that the project will also include office space on the ground and second floors. The second floor will include some parking for the office component.~~

~~At this time Chair Weymouth opened the public hearing.~~

~~Jerry Covington, president of the Melrose Manors Homeowners' Association, advised that the Applicant has held numerous meetings with this organization. Residents expressed concerns with the location and height of the proposed building, and particularly with ingress and egress on the site. He noted that residents have not heard whether or not a traffic study has been conducted on eastbound Broward Boulevard, and pointed out that gridlock occurs at 29 Avenue and 28 Terrace.~~

~~Mr. Covington referred to additional gridlocked areas, and asked if anything has been done to alleviate this problem for drivers leaving the Melrose Manors neighborhood.~~

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

~~Ms. Crush addressed the concerns raised during the public hearing, stating that access to and from the building is on the northeast corner of the block, with an internalized drop-off location and two-way drive aisles. No ingress/egress cut is proposed for Broward Boulevard. The site's operation and access will remain internalized.~~

~~Vice Chair Cohen arrived at 6:23 p.m.~~

~~Ms. Crush pointed out that the site's uses are considered low traffic generators. The project generates 42 a.m. peak hour trips and 51 p.m. peak hour trips for a total of 470 daily trips. A traffic statement was reviewed by City Staff. If a project approaches a threshold of 1000 trips, the City would require further analysis of the area.~~

~~Mr. Barranco asked if a member of the Applicant's team has met with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to discuss the project. Carl Peterson, also representing the Applicant, reiterated that the proposed Site Plan includes access from 29 Avenue and has no driveway on Broward Boulevard. The team has coordinated with FDOT regarding landscaping and hardscaping, but there was no need for a permit or pre-application letter from that entity.~~

~~Mr. Ganon asked if the project's gym is indoor or outdoor. Ms. Crush clarified that the gym is inside with an outdoor area.~~

~~**Motion** made by Ms. Fertig for UDP-22004, to adopt the Resolution approving a Site Plan Level III based on the following findings of fact, and the Board finds that the Application meets the standards and requirements of the ULDR and criteria for the proposed use as cited in the Resolution; also, there are three conditions to this and we're recommending all three conditions.~~

~~Assistant City Attorney Shari Wallen advised that the request is for conditional use, which means the Board would approve the Application rather than recommend it for approval.~~

~~Ms. Fertig **restated** her **motion** as follows: to approve that same Resolution, based on the following findings of fact and approval of the conditions.~~

~~Mr. McTigue **seconded** the **motion**. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (9-0).~~

~~It was determined that Items 3 and 4 would be presented together and voted upon separately.~~

3. CASE: UDP-Z24001

REQUEST: * ** Rezoning from Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density (RMM-25) District to Uptown Urban Village Northeast (UUV-NE) District

APPLICANT: Stephanie J. Toothaker, Esq.

AGENT: City of Fort Lauderdale

ADDRESS: 150 NW 68th Street
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 3-49-42 THAT PT OF SE1/4 OF SE1/4 OF SW1/4 LYING E OF SAL R/W LESS PT IN ORS 3589/575 & 5598/720 FOR RD TOGET WITH 3-49-42 S1/2 OF S1/2 OF SW1/4 OF SE1/4 LYING S OF C & S SFFCD R/W & LESS EASEMENT & LESS OR 3589/575 AND 10-49-42 NE1/4 OF NW1/4 OF NE1/4 LESS THE FOLLOWING: C & SFFCD, MCNAB RD, LESS ANDREWS AVE EXT & N1/2 OF NW 1/4 OF NW1/4 OF NE1/4 LESS N 53.3 FOR MCNAB RD & S1/2 OF NW1/4 OF NE1/4 OF NE1/4 LYING S R/W/L CYPRESS CREEK CANAL & NWLY OF REVISED N ANDREWS EXT R/W; & THAT PT OF N1/2 OF NW 1/4 OF NE 1/4 OF NE1/4 LYING S OF CANAL & BLKS 1-3 OF N COLLIER ESTATES 53-33 INC VAC RD LYING BETWEEN LOTS 1,2,3 & POR OF NE 1 WAY
ZONING DISTRICT: Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density (RMM-25) District
PROPOSED ZONING: Uptown Urban Village Northeast (UUV-NE) District
LAND USE: Employment Center
COMMISSION DISTRICT: 1 – John Herbst
NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: N/A
CASE PLANNER: Michael Ferrera

4. **CASE:** UDP-Z24002
REQUEST: * ** Rezoning from Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density (RMM-25) District to Uptown Urban Village Northeast (UUV-NE) District
APPLICANT: Stephanie J. Toothaker, Esq.
AGENT: City of Fort Lauderdale
ADDRESS: 150 NW 68th Street
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: 3-49-42 THAT PT OF SE1/4 OF SE1/4 OF SW1/4 LYING E OF SAL R/W LESS PT IN ORS 3589/575 & 5598/720 FOR RD TOGET WITH 3-49-42 S1/2 OF S1/2 OF SW1/4 OF SE1/4 LYING S OF C & S SFFCD R/W & LESS EASEMENT & LESS OR 3589/575
ZONING DISTRICT: Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density (RMM-25) District
PROPOSED ZONING: Uptown Urban Village Northeast (UUV-NE) District
LAND USE: Employment Center
COMMISSION DISTRICT: 1 – John Herbst
NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: N/A
CASE PLANNER: Michael Ferrera

Disclosures for Items 3 and 4 were made at this time.

Michael Ferrera, representing Urban Design and Planning, stated that Application Z24001 requests the rezoning of 991,359 sq. ft. of land from Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density (RMM-25) to Uptown Urban Village Northeast (UUV-NE). The subject property is within the City's Uptown project area, which is an incentive program in which the City processes rezoning applications on behalf of owners.

~~The subject property is a mobile home park, which has certain requirements under Florida Statute 723.083 regarding the removal of mobile home owners without first determining whether or not adequate mobile home parks and facilities exist for relocation. The Applicant provided a housing study which established that there are adequate existing resources for the mobile home owners at the Pan-American Estates mobile home park.~~

~~Ms. Mammano commented that as part of the study to determine adequate relocation, the City considered units in the price range of \$1000 to \$2000 per month across all of Broward County. She expressed concern that there may not be locally available housing. Stephanie Toothaker, representing the Applicant, clarified that all residents have moved from the subject site.~~

~~Mr. Barranco pointed out that although the study shows available affordable housing, there continue to be reports of a lack of affordable housing. He also asked how many units existed on the property prior to the fire. Ms. Toothaker replied that she did not have this information on hand.~~

~~Mr. Barranco emphasized that Fort Lauderdale still has a deficit of affordable housing, even though the mobile home owners have relocated elsewhere in Broward County. Ms. Toothaker stated that pursuant to the Florida Statute, incentives were offered to the residents, who took advantage of those incentives. She added that the mobile homes on the site were in extremely poor condition and were unsafe. The City assisted the Applicant with the processing of demolition permits, which allowed the Applicant to implement a construction fence on the property.~~

~~Chair Weymouth confirmed that there are community concerns regarding affordable and/or workforce housing, and requested additional information on the site. Mr. Ferrera stated that an incentive applies to properties within the Uptown area who wish to rezone to one of the Uptown zoning districts. The City will bring forward these rezoning applications on behalf of the property owner in order to speed up the process.~~

~~Attorney Spence added that the Uptown zoning districts are intended to lead to a comprehensive rezoning of the subject area; however, there were not sufficient resources or funds to undertake comprehensive rezoning. As an alternative, the City offered property owners within the area to bring forward rezoning applications and have them processed by the City.~~

~~Chair Weymouth noted that the RMM-25 zoning district allowed 25 units per acre and a maximum height of 35 ft., while the UUV-NE zoning district allows 50 units per acre and a maximum height of 75 ft. He observed that this may provide an opportunity for the development of more affordable housing if that is the Applicant's desire.~~

~~Ms. Toothaker stated that there were 204 mobile homes on the site, and confirmed that greater density can be developed on the site in the future.~~

~~Chair Weymouth asked if there are any impacts from surrounding or nearby properties under Florida's Live Local Act which would change the intensity of the site. Ms. Toothaker pointed out that the Board has approved similar rezoning requests in the past, and that the site's use is intended to be residential. She added that the project is not being developed under the Live Local Act.~~

~~Ms. Mammano observed that the proposal is consistent with the City's vision for the Uptown area as well as with the City Commission's goals. She suggested that the City may wish to include a workforce or moderate income component in its incentives related to the Uptown.~~

~~Ms. Fertig advised that when the Uptown zoning districts were developed, they included an affordable housing component. It was clarified that this component would apply later in the process.~~

~~Mr. Ganon agreed that the City has approved projects which encourage residents to live in the Downtown area even if those projects are not considered affordable housing. He felt the more housing provided, the more affordable it will become. He added that the \$10,000 payment in lieu for developers who do not include an affordable housing component should be higher in order to incentivize developers to provide affordable housing.~~

~~Mr. Shechtman asked if the developer will be required to include some affordable/workforce housing or submit the payment in lieu fee. Ms. Toothaker replied that the City's pool of flex units is depleted, and any construction using flex units requires the payment in lieu, which has recently increased to \$10,300. The flex units could only have been used in the City's flex receiving zone. The City has processed a transit-oriented development (TOD) Land Use Plan Amendment which permitted the addition of non-Geller units.~~

~~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. Fertig, seconded by Mr. McTigue, to recommend approval of the rezoning for Case Number UDP-Z24001 based on the findings of fact in the City Staff Report, and the Board hereby finds that the Application meets the criteria of the ULDR cited in the City Staff Report; additionally, in accordance with Section 723.083 Florida Statutes, the Board finds that adequate mobile home parks or other suitable facilities exist for the relocation of the mobile home owners.~~

~~Ms. Mammano requested clarification that the **motion** means the Board affirms approval of the housing study which determined there are suitable relocation opportunities in Broward County to replace the units that were removed. Attorney Wallen explained that~~

~~Florida Statute 723.083 states no municipal, local, county, or state government shall approve any application for rezoning or take any other action which shall result in the removal or relocation of mobile home owners residing in a mobile home park without first determining that adequate mobile home parks or other suitable facilities exist for their relocation. The Statute does not require the owners to be relocated within Broward County; they may relocate anywhere.~~

~~Attorney Spence further clarified that the **motion**, as stated, confirms that the Board has determined adequate mobile home parks or other suitable facilities exist for the relocation of owners. He noted that the Board heard testimony from Ms. Toothaker that the owners have received payment and found alternative housing. The **motion** does not require the Board to adopt the study's findings.~~

~~Attorney Wallen added that p.2 of the Staff Report includes the findings related to the study, including the fact that the study establishes the existence of adequate housing. The **motion** indicates that the Board agrees with these statements made in the Staff Report.~~

~~Ms. Fertig stated that the current condition of the site shows no one is living at that location. Ms. Mammano explained that she was still concerned, as the former residents of the site were incentivized to move, which does not mean they found other adequate housing resources.~~

~~Attorney Spence advised that the **motion** includes a statement from the Staff Report relying upon the study. If the Board wishes to make a distinction between that study and the testimony heard at today's meeting, they may do so.~~

~~Ms. Mammano asserted that she would be more comfortable approving the Item based on the testimony that the mobile home residents left the site voluntarily. Ms. Fertig indicated that she would accept this **amendment** to her **motion**.~~

~~Ms. McCartney commented that providing the residents with an incentive to relocate met the Florida Statute's criteria, and she did not feel it was necessary to make any other finding. Attorney Wallen explained that the **amendment** would state on the record that the Statute's requirements were met, based on the incentive program.~~

~~In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (9-0).~~

~~Chair Weymouth requested a motion on UDP-Z24002.~~

~~**Motion** made by Ms. Fertig, seconded by Mr. McTigue, to recommend approval of the rezoning for Case Number UDP-Z24002: in accordance with Section 723.083, Florida Statute, the Board finds that adequate mobile home parks or other suitable facilities exist for the relocation of mobile home owners, based on the testimony heard today, and the~~

~~rezoning meets the criteria in the ULDR. In a roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously (9-0).~~

5. CASE: UDP-S23040

~~**REQUEST:** ** Site Plan Level III: Parking Reduction Request for Outdoor Storage~~

~~**APPLICANT:** 6001 Powerline, LLC~~

~~**AGENT:** Damon Ricks~~

~~**PROJECT NAME:** 6001 Powerline~~

~~**ADDRESS:** 6001 North Powerline Road~~

~~**ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** 9-49-42 E1/2 OF NE1/4 OF SE1/4 LESS E 67 FOR RD R/W & LESS RR R/W & LESS N 350 & LESS BEG AT SW COR OF E1/2 OF NE1/4 OF SE1/4 SEC 9, N 393.39 TO S/L RR SPUR, E 586.82 TO W R/W POWERLINE RD~~

~~**ZONING DISTRICT:** General Industrial (I)~~

~~**LAND USE:** Industrial~~

~~**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** 1— John Herbst~~

~~**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:** N/A~~

~~**CASE PLANNER:** Adam Schnell~~

~~Disclosures were made at this time.~~

~~Andrew Schein, representing the Applicant, stated that the subject property is next to the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport (FXE) and is currently an industrial warehouse. The request is for a parking reduction. One of the businesses on the site uses an area for storage of vehicles to be shipped out, and the parking spaces cannot be “double-counted” toward required parking. The business received a Code violation due to this counting error.~~

~~The area used to store vehicles will be removed from the site’s parking requirement. There will also be an 8 ft. wall on the site to screen the stored vehicles from abutting rights-of-way. Landscaping will be beautified on the east and west sides of the property. Three black olive trees will be replaced with silver buttonwoods and other trees. The Applicant also plans to add 63 shrubs to the landscaping in order to line the wall.~~

~~The Applicant has submitted a parking study with the Application. They plan to provide 198 spaces on the site, which represents an 18-space parking reduction. Mr. Schein advised that the parking lot is rarely used.~~

~~The Applicant sent out information for a public participation meeting, but there were no attendees. They also reached out to FXE to determine if there were concerns, but did not receive a response.~~

~~Ms. McCartney requested clarification of the length of the tenant’s lease. Mr. Schein replied that the business is an owner/occupant of the building. Ms. McCartney explained~~

~~that her concern was with the possibility that the business might move from the site and the parking reduction could be problematic for the next use. Mr. Schein stated that there will be a recorded parking reduction order which is specific to the use. Any amendment of that order would require the Applicant to come back to the Planning and Zoning Board.~~

~~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. Ganon requested additional information about trees on the site. Mr. Schein replied that most trees are located on the perimeter of the property, lining the walls to the west and east.~~

~~**Motion** made by Ms. Fertig approving a Resolution of the Planning and Zoning Board, approving a Site Plan Level III development permit for parking reduction to reduce the required parking spaces from 216 to 198 for the property located at 6001 North Powerline Road, based on the testimony of Staff and that we find the Application meets the standards and requirements of the ULDR and criteria for the proposed use as cited in the Resolution.~~

~~Attorney Wallen noted that no member of Staff had testified, and recommended that the **motion** be based on the Staff Report rather than testimony. Ms. Fertig stated that she would make this **amendment** to her **motion**.~~

~~Chair Weymouth clarified that the **motion** refers to Case UDP-S23040.~~

~~Attorney Wallen requested confirmation that the **motion** was also intended to include all Staff conditions. Ms. Fertig confirmed this as well.~~

~~Ms. Mammano **seconded** the **motion**. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (9-0).~~

6. CASE: UDP-S23064

~~**REQUEST:** ** Site Plan Level III Review: Parking Reduction for Change of Use from 2,086 Square Feet of Retail Use to Restaurant Use~~

~~**APPLICANT:** Holiday Park Plaza, LTD~~

~~**AGENT:** Andrew Schein, Esq., Lochrie and Chakas, P.A.~~

~~**ADDRESS:** 1601 E Sunrise Boulevard~~

~~**ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** Livermore Estates 10-11 B Lot 6~~

~~**ZONING DISTRICT:** Boulevard Business (B-1) District and Community Business (CB) District~~

~~**LAND USE:** Commercial~~

~~**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** 2 — Steve Glassman~~

~~**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:** Lake Ridge Civic Association~~

~~**CASE PLANNER:** Nancy Garcia~~

~~Disclosures were made at this time.~~

~~Andrew Schein, representing the Applicant, stated that the subject site is a shopping center known as Holiday Park Plaza, which is located across Sunrise Boulevard from Holiday Park. The Plaza includes several different uses. One of the businesses on the site has downsized, leaving the easternmost portion of their bay vacant. A new tenant, described as a "fast casual" restaurant, has been identified for the vacant site.~~

~~Mr. Schein explained that the Application functions as a 12-space parking reduction, although it looks larger on paper. The bay is 2087 sq. ft. in size, and the former tenant required nine spaces based on the calculation of one space per 250 sq. ft. The restaurant use requires one space per 100 sq. ft., which would require 21 spaces.~~

~~If the former tenant still occupied a portion of the bay, the parking requirement would have been 104 spaces, with 76 spaces provided. The new tenant would require 116 spaces and would provide 76. Mr. Schein explained that the requested parking reduction would "clean up" the parking count for the mixture of tenants who have moved in and out of the site in the past.~~

~~The parking study for the site included parking counts to determine peak hours and spaces available. The Applicant found that the greatest demand occurs on Thursdays and Saturdays at 12:30 p.m. There were at least 43 spaces available at all times during this peak period.~~

~~Ms. McCartney requested clarification that the parking study's results are correct for the specific use of a fast casual restaurant. She expressed concern that the reduction might result in insufficient parking for the use. Mr. Schein advised that the restaurant is unlikely to result in queuing on Sunrise Boulevard, characterizing it as a nighttime 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.~~

~~Vice Chair Cohen commented that while he was normally not in favor of parking reductions, he felt there were two aspects of the proposed reduction that made it more likely to work: the use of the specific restaurant, and the traffic study's indication that there were still 40 spaces available during peak hours.~~

~~**Motion** made by Ms. Fertig, seconded by Mr. Ganon, to approve the Resolution adopting Case Number UDP-S23064 based on the findings of fact, the Staff Report, and the Board finds the Application meets the standards and requirements of the ULDR and criteria for the proposed use as cited in the Resolution, and I think there's one condition in the Staff Report which we also recommend. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (9-0).~~

7. CASE: ~~UDP-T24002~~

REQUEST: * ~~Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) Section 47-39, Development Regulations for Annexed Areas, to Update Height, Measurement and Height Requirements~~

APPLICANT: ~~City of Fort Lauderdale~~

GENERAL LOCATION: ~~RS-3.52, RS-6.70, RS-6.85A, RS-6.85B, RD-12.22, RM-12.67, RM-16, RM-33.5 Zoning Districts~~

CASE PLANNER: ~~Karlanne Devonish~~

~~Karlanne Devonish, representing Urban Design and Planning, advised that the request is for an amendment to the City's Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) Section 47-39. The amendment will update the height and measurements for residential zoning districts in the neighborhoods of Chula Vista Isles, Melrose Park, Lauderdale Isles, Riverland Manors, Riverland Village, and Riverland Woods. All of these locations are within annexed zoning districts within the ULDR.~~

~~Ms. Devonish explained that an applicant submitted a permit for the addition of a second story to an existing structure, but was informed that the maximum height in this zoning district is 20 ft. or two stories. The applicant and Zoning Administrator did not agree on the interpretation of what is called a story, and the applicant submitted an application to the Board of Adjustment to challenge the Zoning Administrator's interpretation. While the Board of Adjustment upheld the Zoning Administrator's interpretation, they also understood the applicant's position, and sent a communication to the City Commission to have Staff look into possible changes to how height is measured.~~

~~Ms. Devonish noted that for the purposes of determining the height of a building, the term "story" shall be considered 10 ft. Existing Code for residential zoning districts refers to two stories at this measurement, which would result in a maximum height of 20 ft. in those zoning districts. Staff proposes to change this measurement by eliminating the term "story" from Code in order to align residential zoning districts within the City.~~

~~This elimination would change the maximum height in residential zoning districts from 20 ft. to 35 ft., which would align the subject district with the City's other residential zoning districts. The RS-3.52, RS-6.85A, RS-6.85B, and RD-12.22 districts will now have a maximum height of 35 ft. The RS-6.70, which is the zoning district for Melrose Park, has opted to remain at 20 ft. in height and will not change.~~

~~The amended height requirement will apply to duplexes and town homes, which are considered to be single family homes although they are attached.~~

~~The RM-12.67 and RM-16 zoning districts would increase from two stories, or 20 ft., to 35 ft. for single family homes. For multi-family dwellings, Staff proposes a maximum height of 40 ft. Ms. Devonish noted that this is equivalent to the height limit in an RM-15 zoning district.~~

~~For RM-33 zoning districts, which are multi-family, Staff proposes increasing the height limit for single-family dwellings to 35 ft. For multi-family dwellings, the limit would be increased to 55 ft. This would be similar to the height limit for an RM-25 zoning district.~~

~~Staff also proposes the addition of dimensional tables. This would mean all tables reflecting dimensional standards would be condensed into a single table.~~

~~Mr. Barranco commented that it has been difficult to build in the subject areas due to inconsistencies in existing Code, and was in favor of cleaning up antiquated Code.~~

~~Ms. Mammano referred to a letter from the president of the Lauderdale Isles Civic Association, which refers to a resident making a presentation. Ms. Devonish explained that the City reached out to the Civic Association, which resulted in the letter of support. Ms. Mammano pointed out that the letter refers to unanimous support for limiting building height to two stories and less than 30 ft. Ms. Devonish advised that the change will be to 35 ft., stating that the original requested height had been for two stories at a limit of 30 ft. rather than 20 ft.~~

~~Ms. Mammano requested clarification of the Applicant in this case. Ms. Devonish replied that the City is the Applicant; however, because the City has heard from several residents about this change over the years, and because the Board of Adjustment sent a communication to the City Commission, Staff initiated the effort.~~

~~Ms. Mammano asked if the general public understood that the proposal was to raise the height limit for residential single-family homes from two stories/20 ft. to 35 ft. Ms. Devonish confirmed this.~~

~~At this time Chair Weymouth opened the public hearing, and two members of the public were sworn in at this time.~~

~~Eric Silva, private citizen, stated that he is a resident of Lauderdale Isles and submitted a building permit for a two-story home in 2022. He advised that the current height limits are confusing and are more restrictive in his neighborhood than in others. The proposed amendment would clearly define height limits and provide property owners with the same rights as other neighborhoods.~~

~~Daniel Solomon, private citizen, advised that he is also a resident of Lauderdale Isles. He did not take issue with any height adjustments that may occur as a result of the proposed amendment.~~

~~As there were no other 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 Vice Chair Cohen, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP-T24002, and the Board hereby finds that the text amendments to the ULDR are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In a roll-call vote, the ~~motion~~ passed unanimously (9-0).

~~V. COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION~~


~~None.~~

~~VI. FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE~~

~~Chair Weymouth asked if future Board meetings will be moved to a more official location, noting that it can be time-consuming to reach the current location. It was explained that the current location is due in part to the resources allocated to where meetings are held, but Staff can look into other possible options.~~

~~There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 7:30 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.]

