



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

DRAFT

**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS**

**100 N. ANDREWS AVE., FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA 33301
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2021 – 6:00 P.M.**

Board Members	June 2021-May 2022		
	Attendance	Present	Absent
Jacquelyn Scott, Chair	P	6	0
Brad Cohen, Vice Chair (d. 6:38)	P	4	2
John Barranco (arr. 6:03)	P	5	1
Mary Fertig	P	6	0
Steve Ganon	P	6	0
Shari McCartney	P	6	0
William Rotella	P	5	1
Jay Shechtman	P	5	1
Michael Weymouth	P	5	1

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

Staff

Ella Parker, Urban Design and Planning Manager
D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
Shari Wallen, Assistant City Attorney
Trisha Logan, Historic Preservation Planner
Jim Hetzel, Principal Planner
Christian Cervantes, Urban Design and Planning
Karlanne Grant, Urban Design and Planning
Glen Hadwen, Sustainability Manager
Mark Williams, Urban Forester
Adam Schnell, Urban Design and Planning
Istvan Virag, Transportation and Mobility
Tedra Allen, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Scott called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Roll was called and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited. The Chair introduced the Board members present, and Urban Design and Planning Manager Ella Parker introduced the Staff members present.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

~~APPLICANT: City of Fort Lauderdale~~

~~GENERAL LOCATION: Citywide~~

~~CASE PLANNER: Jim Hetzel~~

~~Mr. Hetzel advised that this Item would correct two sections of Code: Section 47-13.20, which addresses the Downtown Regional Activity Center (RAC) review process, and Section 47-24, which involves development permits and procedures. Both items would correct scribes' errors and other minor mistakes.~~

~~Ms. Fertig recalled that on September 16, 2020, the Board proposed a number of amendments to the Downtown Master Plan, which were sent to the City Commission. The minutes of the November 4, 2020 City Commission meeting indicate that Staff informed the Commission they had not had sufficient time to research these proposed amendments. She asked if this research has been completed.~~

~~Ms. Fertig further clarified that the proposed amendments addressed the following:~~

- ~~• Tower separation~~
- ~~• Minimum unit size~~
- ~~• Parking~~

~~Ms. Parker replied that Staff adopted a parking standard which has come before the Planning and Zoning Board some months ago. Staff also addressed the remaining items and sent a communication to the City Commission identifying a number of issues on which they were not moving forward, based on analysis. This included tower separation, which was adopted with a proposed separation distance of 60 ft.~~

~~There being no other questions from the Board at this time, Chair Scott 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. McCartney, seconded by Mr. Ganon, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.~~

5. CASE: UDP-T21002

REQUEST: * Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) Section 47-21, Landscape and Tree Preservation Requirements

APPLICANT: City of Fort Lauderdale

GENERAL LOCATION: Citywide

CASE PLANNER: Glen Hadwen and Mark Williams | Public Works Sustainability Division

Glen Hadwen, Sustainability Manager, showed a presentation on proposed amendments to Section 47-21 of the ULDR, which address landscape and tree

preservation. These revisions were initiated in response to City Commission concerns with the preservation of specimen growth trees and the application of existing tree preservation Code to tree removal during development.

A previous draft of this Ordinance was presented to the Planning and Zoning Board on March 30, 2021. In response to the direction provided at the March 2021 meeting, the City has retained consultant Calvin, Giordano and Associates to provide additional expertise in the area of landscape architecture. They have led the revision process and facilitated stakeholder meetings.

This effort is aligned with the City's Strategic Plans and is intended to address urban forestry concerns in a comprehensive manner, with the goal of having a more streamlined and consistent application of regulations and strengthening tree preservation as a whole. The 2020 Strategic Plan, Press Play, emphasizes cross-departmental collaboration. The updates also align with the Advance Fort Lauderdale 2040 Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use, Conservation, and Urban Design elements.

Mr. Hadwen recalled that Staff presented an introduction to the concepts under consideration for amendment at a November 2019 City Commission Conference Agenda meeting. The Commission then directed Staff to proceed with the revisions. The first draft was shared for public review in June 2020. Since that time, proposed changes have been presented to various stakeholders, including many industry professionals, developers, internal Staff, and the general public.

Based on stakeholder feedback, Staff revised the text incorporated in these changes prior to the March 2021 Planning and Zoning Board meeting. There were 30 meetings with both internal and external stakeholders, including a number of stakeholder groups listed in the Staff Report. Three additional such meetings have been held since the March 2021 Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

Mike Conner, representing consultant Calvin, Giordano and Associates, explained that the firm was engaged by the City of Fort Lauderdale in April 2021. After an extensive review of documentation, they developed a list of 30 major issues based on the input of the stakeholder advisory group. Three additional meetings were held in May and June 2021 for further discussion, and documentation was further reviewed with City Staff.

At the end of this process, a first draft of proposed changes to the Ordinance was distributed to stakeholder groups, Broward County, and the City Attorney's Office in late June 2021. The City Attorney's Office included a number of additional comments that necessitated further meetings between consultants and Staff. Another draft was prepared in October 2021, and distributed to the stakeholder group on October 15. Subsequently, final revisions were made in response to comments from the City Attorney's Office and the Department of Sustainable Development (DSD). The final

Ordinance included in the Board members' backup materials was distributed on November 5, 2021.

Some of the significant changes to the draft Ordinance address the following:

- Revision of definitions to address concerns with caliper versus diameter
- Definition of "specimen trees" and the criteria required for this term
- Updated tree classification list to reflect amended definitions and criteria
- Percentage of allowed lawn, turf, or sod areas with respect to water conservation
- Use of modular/extended pavement systems and structural soils
- Shade tree usage and required percentage
- Equivalent replacement and value calculations for removed trees
- Criteria for the spacing of shade trees from buildings, streets, and each other
- Requirement of more information in the landscape/tree document packet required at the time of permitting, including irrigation and lighting/electrical plans
- Use and installation of synthetic turf
- Stronger tree protection barricade and signage requirements

Motion made by Mr. Weymouth, seconded by Mr. Ganon, to make the Staff Report part of the record. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Ms. Fertig requested clarification of when the most recent public meeting with the advisory group was held. It was confirmed that this was in June 2021. Any further communications were sent via emails to the group and the City Attorney's Office. The final report was provided to the community in November 2021, although Mr. O'Connor noted that there were no significant changes to the proposed Ordinance since it was first sent to the City Attorney.

Ms. Fertig also requested clarification of the changes recommended by the City Attorney's Office. Mr. Conner replied that one of the focus items addressed the phrase "to be determined by Department Staff." The City Attorney recommended that the team be more specific in determining criteria rather than leaving them to the discretion of Staff.

Mr. Barranco commented that the revised Ordinance is very lengthy, and he was not comfortable voting upon it at this time, as he has not yet been able to review the entire document in detail. He expressed concern that the stakeholders may also have lacked sufficient time to adequately review the document. Ms. Fertig also noted the importance of allowing the City's neighborhoods to review the proposed Ordinance and become comfortable with its specifications.

Ms. Fertig continued that she also felt it was extremely important to move the Ordinance forward. She pointed out that as the issue continues to be discussed, the City is losing more and more of its tree canopy. She emphasized that there may be no concerns sufficiently critical to continue to delay passage of the revised Ordinance.

Mr. Shechtman commented that this Ordinance is very important to a broad and diverse range of people and neighborhoods, and it is not possible to craft a version that will win everyone's approval. He felt it is the Board's role to listen to proposals on all sides of the issue and arrive at a compromise.

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

Nancy Long, president of the River Oaks Civic Association, advised that the Ordinance has been discussed at length by this group. She expressed concern with the proliferation of development in her neighborhood and its effect on the shade canopy, and urged the Board to approve the proposed Ordinance, with amendments to be made at a later time if necessary.

Ms. Fertig asked if Ms. Long felt the Ordinance would address some of the issues her neighborhood has experienced in recent years. Ms. Long replied that while the Association feels some of the aspects of the Ordinance could be stronger, they believe it can be helpful. She specifically recommended stronger penalties for the illegal removal of specimen trees.

Mr. Conner advised that he understood all trees are treated equally under the current Code, regardless of whether or not they are classified as specimen trees. The proposed language will require that specimen trees of a certain size and condition require evaluation and appraisal by a certified arborist to determine their value prior to any removal.

Assistant City Attorney D'Wayne Spence stated that he has been involved in the crafting of this Ordinance since 2019. He addressed the penalty and/or fee as well, as this was an issue that was discussed at length by Staff early in the process. The state of Florida considers any fee that is not a regulatory or user fee to be a tax or penalty, which means the City may not impose what the state views as "illegal taxes" unless authorized to do so by the state.

Attorney Spence continued that the fee structure proposed in the Ordinance is established as regulatory fees, which are paid into a trust fund. The formula developed by the consultant is based on the value of the tree that is being removed. The actual fee is capped at this value.

Bianca Bryant, private citizen, provided a photograph for the record, stating that developers and builders in the River Oaks neighborhood often remove oak trees that have been alive for many years. She pointed out that fully mature oaks cannot be adequately replaced, and emphasized the importance of passing the proposed Ordinance. She also stated that developers sometimes proceeded with attempted removal of existing trees without permission.

Ms. Fertig asked if the proposed Ordinance would help prevent the issues described by Ms. Bryant. Mr. Conner confirmed this, stating that the additional enhancements required at the time a landscape or tree permit is issued would help DSD Staff better evaluate the condition of existing trees. If the developer cannot work around the existing trees, they might be asked to relocate them if possible. If not, they would have to seek a tree removal permit and/or provide replacement trees or the placement of the equivalent value of the tree into a trust fund, which would permit the City to plant new trees elsewhere in the City to offset the loss of canopy. Mr. Conner concluded that the value of a specimen oak tree would be significantly increased by the proposed Ordinance.

Ms. Fertig also asked Attorney Spence if he felt the proposed Ordinance would address the concerns raised thus far during public comment. Attorney Spence replied that Mr. O'Connor's explanation of how the Ordinance addresses removal and replacement of trees was accurate. Mr. Shechtman noted, however, that while the Ordinance would increase the burden placed on developers who removed trees, it may not actually prevent that removal.

Mark Williams, Urban Forester, advised that the City has proposed a set criteria package that must be followed when reviewing plans for tree removal. The proposed Ordinance would require that the owner or developer of a property seeking to remove a tree must provide a valid reason to do so, such as poor condition of the tree, damage to existing property or foundations, or other considerations.

Mark Cantor, private citizen, stated that while the proposed Ordinance would be an improvement over the existing one, it could also be better. He hoped to stop the removal of specimen oak trees without permitting, pointing out that this has been done in the past on Riverland Road. He did not feel the proposed fines for this type of activity would be a meaningful deterrent to builders.

Chair Scott asked Mr. Conner to describe how fines are addressed within the proposed Ordinance. Mr. Conner replied that he could not speak to fines, but reiterated what is required for tree removal permits and the replacement or equivalent value payment of trees.

Attorney Spence addressed fines, again pointing out the limitations that are placed by the state of Florida on the City's ability to increase them. Fines are established by State Statute Chapter 162, which places an upper limit on fines for specific violations.

Ms. Fertig asked what the penalty would be if an individual developer removes trees without a permit. Mr. Hadwen explained that this is addressed within the Ordinance: there is a \$1000 for the first offense, and the responsible party must pay the equivalent value of the tree. The fine increases to \$2000 plus twice the equivalent value for a repeat offense.

Chair Scott asked what a citizen could do to stop this activity if it is witnessed. Mr. Hadwen replied that they should call Code Enforcement. It was further clarified that Code Enforcement has a 24-hour hotline that can be contacted in this case. Action would depend on what is being done with regard to trees, such as complete removal, pruning, or other activity.

Ms. Fertig noted that every public speaker thus far has been able to provide examples of this type of activity occurring in their neighborhoods. She asserted that the Ordinance should put a process in place to prevent the removal of trees by developers.

It was further clarified that while a fine for tree removal is set by State Statute, the equivalent value of a tree is not. This value can now be up to \$100,000 per tree, and is multiplied for repeat offenses.

Chair Scott asked if the Ordinance addresses improper pruning or trimming. It was noted that this ties into a County Ordinance regulating tree trimming. All tree trimmers must be licensed and insured to work within Fort Lauderdale and must follow appropriate procedures for structural pruning. If responsible parties do not follow the correct procedures, they will be subject to citations and/or fines. This was not previously included in any Ordinance.

Karlanne Grant, representing Urban Design and Planning, clarified that the property owner would be the party to receive a citation of this type. Broward County pursues the issue with the tree trimmer or other party.

Ms. Fertig asked which parts of the Ordinance the public would like to see strengthened further. It was pointed out that while Code Enforcement is asked to enforce the Ordinance, they are not on duty 24 hours per day. While the Ordinance is an improvement, an unscrupulous developer may still find ways around it.

With regard to penalties and the value of the trees, Mr. Williams further clarified that fines for the illegal removal of a tree would be levied in addition to requiring the responsible party to pay the value of the tree or trees they removed. Attorney Spence referred the Board members to the tree mitigation calculation requirements on p.82 of the Ordinance.

Charlie Lachoff, private citizen, felt Staff and the consultants have done a good job developing the proposed Ordinance, and emphasized the need to take stronger action against developers who remove trees illegally.

Mr. Barranco addressed the section of the Ordinance reflected on p.82, pointing out that the monetary value of an illegally removed tree is multiplied by a delta factor. Mr. Williams explained that this multiplier is clarified under Section J.1.A.2.

It was also noted that a percentage of the Tree Canopy Trust Fund into which these payments are made can be used toward auxiliary needs as well as tree planting. One suggestion is that these monies go toward the creation of an Urban Forestry Master Plan for the City. This would allow all City Staff to determine their specific roles regarding trees, including Code Enforcement. The first goal would be for developers to find ways to work around trees on a site; if this is not possible, they would then be permitted to relocate, replace, or reimburse the value of the tree.

It was further clarified that an Urban Forestry Master Plan would provide for improved communication among various City Departments that are involved with trees, including DSD, Engineering and Public Works, Code Enforcement, the Police Department, and others.

Doug Coolman, private citizen, stated that one reason for a recent increase in lost trees is a change in Florida law which allows homeowners to remove trees without permits if the removal is accompanied by a report. There is no action the City can take to dissuade this.

Mr. Coolman continued that the proposed Ordinance that came before the Board in March 2021 was incomplete and required modification. He felt the current proposed Ordinance is a significant improvement; however, he felt this updated document is also incomplete and must be reviewed further, particularly by stakeholders and Staff. He asserted that at least two more weeks would be necessary to complete this review and reach consensus.

Fred Stresau, private citizen, recalled that a question was asked regarding which portions of the proposed Ordinance stakeholders felt should be strengthened. He cited a section of the Ordinance that now permits landscape designers to participate in the preparation of plans as well, which he felt was a problem, as landscape designers may not be permitted to sign these plans.

Mr. Stresau continued that another issue is the requirement of 50% native plants, shrubs, trees, or other ground cover. He felt this limitation would hamper professionals' ability to create appropriate design. He also addressed spacing between trees of similar sizes, pointing out that there are no guidelines for the spacing between trees of different sizes.

Mr. Stresau also referred to soil requirements for individual trees. He provided the Board with a document prepared by a soil consultant, which states that some material may inhibit the growth of plants. He concluded that there are additional portions of the Ordinance that require further review.

Mr. Conner pointed out that the majority of the changes made in consultation with the advisory group occurred during their three meetings. Staff then revised the Ordinance based on comments provided from Broward County and by the City Attorney's Office.

He felt the group has had sufficient time to review the significant changes to the Ordinance. He also cautioned that sending the proposed Ordinance back to the advisory group could result in “start[ing] the process all over again” and postponing its adoption for months.

Ms. Fertig asked when the Ordinance would go before the City Commission if it is approved at tonight’s meeting. Attorney Spence replied that this would be approximately six to eight weeks. He added that the communication between Staff and the advisory entity has also involved the City Commission and City Manager’s Office, and these parties are familiar with the discrepancies between what is proposed by Staff and what was suggested by the working group.

Chair Scott advised that her greatest fear is for the continued delay of the proposed Ordinance, and noted that it is unlikely for all parties to reach full consensus on the finished product.

Mr. Shechtman pointed out that some of the issues raised by members of the advisory group, including spacing between different-sized trees and structural soils, were of interest to the Board. He requested additional information on these. It was clarified that the section referring to tree spacing is new language, and what is currently in the Ordinance was agreed upon by the advisory group as a whole.

With respect to structural soils vs. suspended pavement systems, Staff and the advisory group discussed this at length without reaching unanimous agreement and determined that developers should be required to provide sufficient space for trees to grow naturally. If this is not possible, they must then look at the suspended pavement system, and finally, under limited circumstances, structural soils would be a last resort.

Ms. McCartney commented that the section of the Ordinance addressing synthetic turf could be perceived as micromanaging the issue. It was clarified that this turf could be used in certain areas to help conserve water. It was also noted that the reference to 50% native plants has been in the existing Ordinance for some time, and that licensing law permits landscape designers to prepare plans in some cases.

The following individuals provided public comment via Zoom.

Trudy Jermanovich, private citizen, observed that it may be significantly more expensive to plant new trees than to leave existing old growth trees in place. She felt climate change should be a consideration of the Ordinance.

Jane Kish, private citizen, expressed concern that it may be some time before action is taken on the Ordinance, and recommended that it be moved forward in some way. She did not object to the two-week time frame previously suggested during public comment.

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. Fertig asked if there are incentives for the protection of specimen trees. It was clarified that these include replacement of the tree, payment of equivalent value, and creation of an Urban Forestry Master Plan to improve coordination between Departments.

Chair Scott asked if it would be possible to provide incentives to developers who maintain existing trees, such as amending setback requirements. Ms. Fertig commented that she would like to see a system of incentives for preservation of specimen trees.

Ms. Fertig also addressed the Urban Forestry Master Plan, stating that she would like to see language in the Ordinance requiring the creation of this document using money from the Tree Canopy Trust Fund. She continued that tree spacing should be taken into consideration in order to enhance the City's tree canopy, and that the City should explore grants to help preserve old growth trees. She concluded that she would like to see the Ordinance advanced with specific recommendations from the Planning and Zoning Board.

Attorney Spence advised that the Board's recommendations and directives should be sufficient, with the possible exception of the spacing issue. He stated that Staff can attempt to address this issue further before the Ordinance goes to the City Commission.

Ms. Fertig concluded that while she felt the Ordinance could be deferred for one month to make improvements, she would not be in favor of a longer deferment.

Mr. Shechtman observed that he was more confident in the proposed Ordinance than he had been in March 2021 when it first came before the Board.

Mr. Weymouth commented that one month's deferment of the issue could provide the needed time for the advisory group to review issues of concern in the proposed Ordinance. Mr. Rotella agreed that the two weeks requested by the advisory group did not seem unreasonable, as its members seemed close to arriving at an agreement.

Mr. Barranco offered a number of suggestions relating to the proposed Ordinance:

- Use the phrase "per the adopted Code" throughout the Ordinance
- Clarify definitions of "grass" and "grasses"
- Remove references to arbors and pergolas from the section on hardscapes, as these are overhead structures rather than part of a hardscape
- Clarify the perimeter referred to in the definition of interior parking
- Definitively determine whether or not a landscape and tree packet will be required at the time of permitting, as referred to on p.11; also further clarify what may be included in this packet
- Clarify the term "soft engineering"

- Clarify language referring to “nuisance trees”
- Clarify definition of “ornamental plant”
- Clarify what is meant by “structures” in the phrase “distance from structures,” and make “tree distance from structures” more specific
- Address how the rights of a property owner may be affected by the rights of an adjacent property owner, as with a tree whose branches or roots may cross property lines
- Clarify references to utility infrastructure in relation to distance from trees

Mr. Barranco added that he understood structural soil to refer to a patented material including clay and other natural materials. Because it is proprietary, Code cannot describe its composition. He recommended that the City Attorney’s Office provide more information to the Board or address the definition of this material in Code.

Ms. Fertig observed that many of the Board members may have items they would like to see addressed or included within the proposed Ordinance, and asked if it would be possible for the members to provide Staff with a list of their comments and/or concerns, which Staff could bring back to the December 2021 meeting for additional discussion. Mr. Conner replied that it was not feasible to complete this for the December meeting, as Staff would need to meet and discuss all the submitted comments, include any agreed-upon changes into the document, send it to the City Attorney’s Office, Broward County, and other Department heads, and then submit it to the Board.

Ms. Fertig asked if the proposed Ordinance could be moved forward with the list of comments, so Staff and the consultant may review them before the Ordinance goes before the Commission. She pointed out that most of the suggested changes seem to be clarifications rather than substantive amendments. She also expressed concern that the Board may eventually hear an item that involves one of the elements they felt should have been addressed within the Ordinance.

Mr. Conner further clarified that Staff and the consultants would not be able to act on the Board members’ comments due to procedural time limits. Work on the Ordinance has already been underway for roughly eight months, while nine months is the time frame in which Ordinances are typically prepared and passed. Another issue is the consultant’s contract, which would need to be extended to include this additional time.

Chair Scott requested clarification of the time frame of the City Commission approval process, asking if there may be time for amendments or corrections to be made within that time frame. Attorney Spence advised that the Board is functioning as a local planning agency (LPA) in this case, with their recommendations forwarded to the City Commission for consideration.

Mr. Barranco stated that his intent was to ensure the items within the Ordinance that concerned him are part of the record. He added that there should be a way to pass these, and the other members’ concerns, along to the consultants without making it part

of the public process. He suggested that the consultants be allowed to reach out to the Board members for their feedback in advance of a public hearing, as this could make the process less time-consuming.

Attorney Wallen stated that Staff has been informed that it is preferable for the Board to pass the proposed Ordinance on to the City Commission with a recommendation for either approval or denial, along with their comments. Ms. Fertig requested the source of this directive, expressing concern that the Board would not be fulfilling its charge as LPA if they pass items on to the City Commission without addressing comments and concerns raised during discussion of the items.

Attorney Wallen reminded the Board that a document including their individual recommendations may be passed on to the City Commission as an exhibit, along with their recommendation regarding the Ordinance. She also noted that City Commissioners may or may not be in attendance at Planning and Zoning Board meetings, where all comments are made in a public format. She reiterated that it is requested that the Item be sent to the City Commission with a recommendation of either approval or denial.

Mr. Barranco asked if Planning and Zoning Board members have personal liability: for instance, whether or not they can be held liable for decisions they make as a function of their Board membership. Attorney Spence replied that they have no such liability. Mr. Barranco explained that he was concerned with whether or not the Board should “push things along.” He added that he would like to attach his concerns in written form so they can be seen by the Commission and are part of the public record.

Mr. Barranco continued that while the intent of the Ordinance is good, he felt there are sections that could be made clearer and/or more definitive. He also expressed concern that some portions of the Ordinance are too specific. He cautioned against tying the hands of landscape designers through over-regulation.

Mr. Weymouth commented that the Board should determine a time by which their written comments on the Ordinance must be submitted. These would be included in the members’ backup materials prior to the December 15, 2021 meeting, at which time they would have reviewed the materials and would be prepared to vote on it.

Motion made by Mr. Shechtman that we move this forward for approval, along with our original comments that we would like to add to that. The **motion** died for lack of second.

Motion made by Mr. Weymouth, seconded by Mr. Rotella, to defer this to a time certain of the December Planning and Zoning Board meeting, at which time all submitted requests of modifications or considerations to the Ordinance be attached to the Ordinance for the City Commission to consider.

Mr. Weymouth further clarified that this meant the Board members' comments would be attached to the Ordinance. Ms. Fertig noted that this would provide the Board members with an opportunity to see their fellow members' comments in an organized way. Chair Scott stated that she was concerned with any further delay of the Ordinance.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-2 (Chair Scott and Ms. McCartney dissenting).

It was clarified that the Board members would submit their written comments to Ms. Parker's Office no later than 5 p.m. on December 3 for inclusion in the information packet and consideration at the December 16, 2021 meeting.

7. CASE: UDP-T21010

REQUEST: * Amend the City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) Establishing Section 47-23.16, Affordable Housing Regulations; Amend Section 47-13.30 SRAC, Table of Dimensional Requirements; Amend Section 47-13.31 NWRAC MU Table of Dimensional Requirements; Amend Section 47-13.51, SRAC-Sa Special Regulations; Amend Section 47-13.52, NWRAC MU Special Regulations; Amend Section 47-20.3, Reductions and Exceptions; Amend Section 47-24.1, General Table 1. Development Permits and Procedures; and Section 47-37b.3, Applicability and General Regulations.

APPLICANT: City of Fort Lauderdale

COMMISSION DISTRICT: Citywide

CASE PLANNER: Adam Schnell

Adam Schnell, representing Urban Design and Planning, showed a presentation on proposed affordable housing text amendments. The intent of these regulations is to provide incentives to developers for the construction of affordable housing. He noted that this is also known as "workforce housing," as it targets individuals and families earning incomes of between 60% and 100% of area median income (AMI).

The target areas for this housing are primary corridors of the City's the Regional Activity Centers (RACs), including the Uptown Urban Village area. These areas permit development with higher density, walkability, and access to multimodal transportation options.

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) already focuses on providing housing to families who earn between 30% and 60% of median family income (MFI); however, the state traditionally cuts off funding for housing for families earning 60% or greater of MFI. In addition, housing costs have increased significantly over the last 10 years while wages have remained stagnant. This leaves many households without access to affordable housing. The intent of the City's regulations is to focus on

Motion made by Ms. Fertig, seconded by Mr. Weymouth, to approve it. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 10:18 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.]