



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**DRAFT**

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

<b>Board Members</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Michael Weymouth, Chair	P	8	1
Brad Cohen, Vice Chair (arr. 6:04)	P	6	3
John Barranco (arr. 6:12)	P	7	2
Brian Donaldson	A	8	1
Steve Ganon	P	9	0
Shari McCartney	P	8	1
Patrick McTigue	P	8	1
Jacquelyn Scott	A	2	1
Jay Shechtman	P	7	2

**Staff**

Ella Parker, Urban Design and Planning Manager  
 D'Wayne Spence, Interim City Attorney  
 Jim Hetzel, Principal Urban Planner  
 Karlanne Devonish, Urban Design and Planning  
 Tyler Laforme, Urban Design and Planning  
 Yvonne Redding, Urban Design and Planning  
 Lorraine Tappen, Urban Design and Planning  
 Burt Ford, Chief Zoning Examiner  
 L. Harmon, Recording Clerk, 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. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited. The Chair introduced the Board members present.

The following Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

**III. PUBLIC SIGN-IN / SWEARING-IN**

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

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

~~**REQUEST:** \*\* Vacation of Right-of-Way: 40-Foot-Wide by 525-Foot-Long Portion of NE 6<sup>th</sup> Terrace, Between NE 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and NE 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, East of Federal Highway~~  
~~**APPLICANT:** City of Fort Lauderdale~~  
~~**AGENT:** Andrew Schein, Lochrie and Chakas, P.A.~~  
~~**PROPERTY ADDRESS:** 840 N. Federal Highway~~  
~~**ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** Progresso, Blk 251 and 252~~  
~~**ZONING DISTRICT:** Boulevard Business (B-1) and Parks and Open Space (P)~~  
~~**LAND USE:** Commercial and Park and Open Space~~  
~~**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** 2 Steven Glassman~~  
~~**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:** Victoria Park Civic Association~~  
~~**CASE PLANNER:** Lorraine Tappen, AICP~~

~~Disclosures were made at this time.~~

~~Robert Lochrie, representing the Applicant, stated that the City of Fort Lauderdale requests vacation of a portion of NE 6<sup>th</sup> Terrace between NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street and NE 9<sup>th</sup> Street. The right-of-way was originally dedicated by the Progresso plat in 1911 and runs east of Federal Highway.~~

~~Most of the properties which previously used the right-of-way were purchased by the City in the 1990s and demolished. The subject site will be the future home of the YMCA and Broward Health. The Applicant agrees with all conditions 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 Vice Chair Cohen, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP-V24001 based on the following facts of finding, the facts of the City Staff Report, and/or 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. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (7-0).~~

**4. CASE: UDP-S24030**

**REQUEST:** \*\* Site Plan Level III Review: Waterway Use, Conditional Use for a Mixed-Use Development with 129 Multifamily Units Including the Allocation of 108 Flex Units and 4,935 Square-Foot of Commercial Use and Conditional Use for Use Greater than 10,000 Square-Foot in Community Business District  
**APPLICANT:** Claridge Homes 3000 Waterside, LP  
**AGENT:** Andrew Schein, Lochrie and Chakas, P.A.  
**PROJECT NAME:** Flowing Waters  
**GENERAL LOCATION:** 3000 E. Oakland Park Blvd  
**ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** OAKLAND OCEAN MILE 28-45 B LOT 11 & LOT 25 LESS W 100 & LESS N 50 FOR ST RD

**ZONING DISTRICT:** Community Business (CB)  
**LAND USE:** Commercial  
**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** 1 – John Herbst  
**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:** Coral Ridge Association, Inc.  
**CASE PLANNER:** Tyler Laforme, AICP

Chair Weymouth advised that speakers representing homeowners' or civic organizations are allotted five minutes' speaking time, while individuals speaking on their own behalf are allotted three minutes.

Disclosures were made at this time.

Andrew Schein, representing the Applicant, stated that the subject property is next to the Intracoastal Waterway and south of Oakland Park. He showed aerial views of the property, noting that an office building previously located there has been demolished.

Mr. Schein explained that this project takes advantage of the City's Transfer of Development Rights program, which was approved by the Planning and Zoning Board in December 2020 and the City Commission in March 2021. This program allows owners of properties which have been designated as historic by the City to create development rights, which they may then transfer to other properties throughout the City. The other properties do not have to be owned by the same individual who will transfer the development rights.

The rights for the Application are for 10 extra units of density per acre as well as 12 ft. in height. They came from a property located at 901 Progresso in the Flagler Village area. The Applicant had a massing study prepared to show what could be built on the site within the parameters of existing Code and density. The study showed that 56 units could be built on the site, as well as roughly 93,000 sq. ft. of other developable space.

The Applicant received approval for 56 units and 93,000 sq. ft. of development space under the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program. These units and space may be given to other properties that would not be eligible for them under current zoning Code. The Applicant was issued two Certificates of Eligibility for the project's units and square footage.

The TDR program allows for the transfer of up to 10 units per acre to a different project. The current density cap for the subject site would be 50 units per acre under existing flexibility provisions. For the project before the Board tonight, this would allow up to 60 units per acre once development rights are transferred from the other property owner. The transfer also allows for an additional 12 ft. in height based on square footage.

Mr. Schein noted that not all properties are eligible to receive transferred development rights. Only properties within the City's unified flexibility zone may receive additional density. Most of these properties are located on commercial corridors, such as Oakland

Park Boulevard. In order to receive additional square footage through TDR, a project must be located in certain zoning districts which are mostly commercial. The project before the Board tonight is one such project.

Public outreach was held in April 2024. Notice of the City's Development Review Committee (DRC) meeting at which the project would be presented was sent to the Coral Ridge Homeowners Association and Coral Ridge Country Club Estates Homeowners Association. The Applicant met with the Coral Ridge Civic Association's board in May 2024. Mr. Schein advised that during the public outreach phase, the Applicant did not receive any negative feedback about the project.

The Coral Ridge Civic Association indicated that they would like the Applicant to meet with residents of Lauderdale Towers, which would be the project's neighbor to the south. The Applicant met with that board in June 2024 for the first time and has maintained regular contact with their attorney.

The official public participation meeting, for which all property owners within 300 ft. were notified, was held in October 2024. Mr. Schein estimated that 20 people attended that meeting and provided positive feedback related to the proposed development. In November 2024, the Applicant met with Lauderdale Towers' general membership and began work on a construction agreement, which will be finalized before construction begins on the project.

Mr. Schein advised that the subject property came before the Board in April 2021 when a different project by the same owner and developer was approved. While that Site Plan remains active, the current Site Plan will replace it if approved. The previous Site Plan proposed 103 units and 4000 sq. ft. of restaurant space in three 15-story towers. Since that project was approved, however, the rental market has become more difficult in terms of financing, and the developer chose to bring forward a condominium concept instead of rental units. The submission of the Application before the Board today coincided with the first certificate of eligibility for the TDR program.

The previously approved project consisted of three towers at 150 ft. in height and including 103 units. The current Application proposes 129 units in one tower, as well as restaurant and retail space, at a height of 162 ft. The massing of the current project is significantly lower than the previous project.

The project is located along an access road for Oakland Park Boulevard. Mr. Schein showed views from that road, including the main entrance to the project. A secondary exit and entrance are located on NE 30<sup>th</sup> Place. The project will include 13 boat slips, at least two of which will be available for public use by the restaurant on the north side of the property. The remaining slips will be private.

The project includes an at-grade pool deck. Neighborhood compatibility provisions in Code require a property above 40 ft. in height to step back 1 ft. for every foot over that

height; in lieu of proceeding with that “wedding cake” style, the Applicant elected to push the entire building to the north with one large ground floor setback.

Mr. Schein showed a number of views from the property, including the secondary entrance and exit. The Applicant is working with its neighbors to address drainage issues on that roadway, including an additional catch basin as well as curbs and gutters. All stormwater for the project will be retained on-site using roof drains that feed into exfiltration trenches and underground drainage wells.

Mr. Schein compared the Application to the previously approved project, noting that current massing is 21% lower than the previous project. The number of parking spaces has been increased in proportion with the increase in residential units for a total of 310 parking spaces.

The previous tower floor plate consisted of roughly 20,000 sq. ft. of massing. This has been reduced to between 14,000 and 15,500 sq. ft. There is also significantly more landscaping proposed for the site.

The overall Site Plan for the project shows entrances and exits on NE 30<sup>th</sup> Place as well as onto the Oakland Park Boulevard service road. The project meets all waterway use requirements, including the 20 ft. landscape yard adjacent to the bulkhead on the waterway. There will be a 1400 sq. ft. pedestrian plaza next to the Oakland Park Bridge, including a restaurant. Elevations from the waterway show a large setback from the neighboring development on one side as well as an alley farther south of the site. The landscape plan includes street trees, many of which are shade trees.

At this time Chair Weymouth opened the public hearing.

Karen Polivka, vice president of the Coral Ridge Country Club Estates Homeowners Association, opposed the additional units proposed for the project, citing existing traffic issues in the area when the bridge is up. There are multiple projects underway in that area as well. She emphasized the need for smart growth and consideration of traffic.

Tim Hernandez, president of the Coral Ridge Country Club Estates Homeowners Association, advised that he also spoke on behalf of the president of the Coral Ridge Homeowners Association, who had provided him with an email. Attorney Spence clarified that Mr. Hernandez may submit the email for inclusion in the record of tonight’s meeting.

Mr. Hernandez stated that the Association he represents opposes the proposed development, as does the Coral Ridge Homeowners Association. While he felt the Application is preferable to the previous Site Plan, he characterized the Applicant’s description of the public outreach process as being misrepresented, as there was no response to questions provided to the Applicant’s team from the president of the Coral Ridge Homeowners’ Association. His own Association had also requested a traffic study in 2024, which was never provided.

Mr. Hernandez continued that under current Code, a change of fewer than 1000 trips for a developer's individual project, regardless of its size, does not require a full traffic study. He noted that Code Section 47-22, which addresses adequacy requirements and neighborhood compatibility, encourages a developer to prepare a traffic study if they are asked to do so. He cited experience with traffic congestion in the subject area, which would only be exacerbated by the project. There is also very little public transportation in the area.

Mr. Hernandez asserted that his Association was not anti-development, but wished to work with a developer that is willing to partner with the roughly 10,000 residents in the surrounding two neighborhoods. He concluded that his Association only recently learned of the proposed project and was not in favor of it without significantly more work to address impacts on the two neighborhoods.

Bruce Qualey, board member of the Coral Ridge Country Club Estates Homeowners Association, recommended that the Board consider the fact that more than one project is underway in the subject area, including both residential and commercial development and redevelopment. He cited concerns with traffic congestion, and requested clarification of the planned restaurant's size. It was noted that the proposed restaurant will be 4000 sq. ft. He concluded that he was not in favor of allowing the proposed project to add more units than previously approved.

Mr. Hernandez addressed the Board once more, requesting that two aerial photos from p.42 of the Staff Report be shown. He pointed out that these photos were provided by the Applicant and show views from the east. He asked if the Board felt these views were compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Shechtman asked if Mr. Hernandez and other members of his Association had discussed the neighborhood compatibility of stucco rentals in the area and throughout the City and, by comparison, the proposed Application, which includes luxury units with glass. Mr. Hernandez replied that while there are several existing stucco developments in his neighborhood, he felt the developer should meet with the two neighborhood associations and try to work toward a solution that would not add more traffic on Oakland Park Boulevard. He emphasized the impact of traffic over aesthetics, pointing out that residents express concerns with traffic on a daily basis.

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.

Vice Chair Cohen asked how many units are added in the current Application over the previous Site Plan. Mr. Schein replied that there would be 26 additional units, and noted that the Applicant's traffic statement considers the project to be multi-family high rise residential. It does not, however, take into account the differences between unit ownership and rental. He emphasized that the proposal is for luxury condominiums, and

it is unlikely that most owners would be in residence for more than half of the year. He added that this would also have an impact on “the quality of the neighborhood,” and there would be fewer moving trucks visiting the property.

Vice Chair Cohen also requested clarification of the size of the additional units. Mr. Schein replied that these would include a mixture of two- and three-bedroom units, although he did not have a number of additional bedrooms that would be provided using the 26 additional units.

Mr. McTigue asked for clarification of the driving force behind the additional units and additional height requested, other than profit. Mr. Schein replied that the TDR program was available and the site was eligible to participate in that program. He noted that the property from which the 26 units were transferred had 56 available units. The design of the building drove the additional units. The project proposes between seven and 10 units per floor.

Mr. Ganon asked if the reduction in massing meant the square footage of the units was slightly reduced. Mr. Schein noted that the unit sizes are “about the same” as in the previous proposal, and described the newer design as more efficient.

Ms. McCartney asked why the Applicant had not considered maintaining the original height and number of units in the redesigned project. Mr. Schein replied that the redesigned project is very expensive; retaining the original height and units would mean lowering ceiling heights and removing two floors from the plans.

Ms. McCartney also noted that the impact of traffic on the subject neighborhood was troubling and raised issues of compatibility. Mr. Schein stated that the project did not reach the required threshold to trigger a traffic study, again emphasizing that the building would consist of condominiums rather than rental units.

Ms. McCartney noted that the design of the original project was also preferable, which would help the Applicant in terms of neighborhood compatibility. Mr. Schein stated that the Applicant cannot financially maintain the original number of units under the new design.

Mr. Schein added that the Applicant would be willing to defer approval of the Application to a later date in order to meet with the appropriate neighborhood(s).

Chair Weymouth asked how many trips would be associated with the addition of 26 units. Mr. Schein estimated that there would be roughly 118 extra daily trips, or 4.5 trips per unit. Chair Weymouth also asked if the office building previously located on the site would have generated more traffic than the proposed residential building, pointing out that he did not recall traffic in the area improving once the office building was demolished. Mr. Schein advised that the proposed project would have approximately 33 fewer trips during

peak hours by comparison to the office building, although the overall number of trips would increase to 471 daily trips at different times of day.

Chair Weymouth asked if the Applicant's traffic statement determined how many cars were turning toward the bridge and how many were leaving the neighborhood from nearby roadways. Mr. Schein replied that the Applicant's team had not studied the intersection in this way, but expected most of the traffic to use the Oakland Park Boulevard access road rather than 30<sup>th</sup> Place.

Mr. Barranco commented that the City is facing a challenge, as there are several properties with the potential to offer a building that meets all requirements but which may not be compatible with their surrounding neighborhoods. He noted that the addition of other developments along the same corridor would have a significant impact on traffic, and felt this is a more global problem than a single project.

Mr. Barranco continued that he felt the Applicant should also speak to residents of the Dolphin Isles, Bermuda Riviera, and Galt Ocean Mile communities as well as the two surrounding neighborhood associations. He recommended that the Applicant reach out to those communities as well if the Application is deferred.

Chair Weymouth asked if the Applicant would prefer to defer the Item or move forward with a vote. Mr. Schein replied that he would leave this to the Board's discretion, but stated that he felt all the problems in the area were being attributed to the project, which made him unsure of what deferral might accomplish. He added that the Applicant would be willing to accept a deferral if that is the Board's recommendation.

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Cohen, seconded by Mr. Barranco, to defer.

Ms. McCartney asked what would be accomplished by deferral. Mr. Barranco replied that the Applicant could have more interaction with the neighborhood associations, particularly those that were not originally contacted with regard to the Application.

Attorney Spence advised that the project is under its second extension, which lasts until April 13, 2025. The City must make a final determination on the project by that date. Mr. Schein noted that this date could be extended into May 2025. The Application is subject to a 30-day City Commission request for review.

Attorney Spence requested that the **motion** to defer also include a reference to the City Commission's call-up period, as the City Commission has had concerns regarding use of that Statute to subvert their ability to call up items. Mr. Schein replied that the Applicant would like to be able to come back in March 2025.

Urban Design and Planning Manager Ella Parker recommended that if the Applicant wishes to come back to the Board in March, the requested extension should be until June 2025. She was not certain that a return of the Application in March would provide enough

time for the Applicant to meet with neighboring residents, come back to the Planning and Zoning Board, and still offer the City Commission a 30-day call-up period.

Mr. Schein stated that the Applicant must meet a contractual deadline in May which would not allow them to defer the Item until June.

Attorney Spence again recommended that the **motion** include a date.

Vice Chair Cohen **restated** his **motion** as follows: **motion** to defer until the March meeting. Mr. Barranco **seconded** the restated **motion**.

It was determined that the date of the next Board meeting would be March 19, 2025.

Mr. Ganon commented that he also did not feel deferral would be a useful option, as he did not anticipate any changes to the proposal unless a concession is made by the Applicant. He also felt the City's traffic problem was being superimposed onto a single project rather than treated as a City-wide issue.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** failed unanimously (0-7).

Mr. McTigue asked if the Applicant might consider reducing the proposed number of floors by one. Chair Weymouth pointed out that the project's density, and not its height, was the primary concern.

Mr. Schein advised that a loss of five units in one floor might be financially feasible, but he did not believe it would make a difference with regard to traffic. He reiterated that he also did not believe 26 units would significantly affect traffic, and concluded that he may be able to explore that suggestion if it is the Board's desire.

**Motion** made by Mr. Ganon, seconded by Vice Chair Shechtman, to adopt a Resolution approving Site Plan Level III, Case Number UDP-S24030, based on the following facts of finding, the facts of the City Staff Report, and testimony heard of the Applicant, and it meets the standards and requirements of the ULDR criteria for the proposed use as cited in the Resolution. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 4-3 (Vice Chair Cohen, Mr. Barranco, and Ms. McCartney dissenting).

~~5. CASE: UDP T25001~~

~~**REQUEST:** \* Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) Section 47-24, Development Permits and Procedures Table 1, Amending the Approval Process for Development Permits in the Uptown Urban Village Zoning Districts; Amend Section 47-37B, Uptown Urban Village Zoning Districts, Applicability and General Regulations, List of Permitted and Conditional Uses, Table of Dimensional Requirements, Special Regulations; and Amend Section 47-20.3, Parking Reductions and Exemptions~~

~~**APPLICANT:** City of Fort Lauderdale~~

~~Mr. Ford advised that the proposed amendment would not prevent a homeowner from having a raised deck; it would only prevent the deck being constructed on the slab on grade. A deck could be raised to match the house's finished floor elevation. A pool could be elevated as well.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Ganon, seconded by Vice Chair Cohen, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP T25005, 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** failed 3-4 (Chair Weymouth, Vice Chair Cohen, Mr. Barranco, and Ms. McCartney dissenting).~~

## V. COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION

None.

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

None.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 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.]