

**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD  
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE  
CITY HALL – CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA  
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 21, 2016 – 6:30 P.M.**

**Cumulative**

<b>Board Members</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>June 2016-May 2017</b>	
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Leo Hansen, Chair	P	6	0
Catherine Maus, Vice Chair	P	5	1
Theron Clark	P	4	2
Stephanie Desir-Jean (6:36-8:15)	P	5	1
Howard Elfman	P	6	0
Steven Glassman	P	6	0
Rochelle Golub	P	5	1
Richard Heidelberger	A	4	1
James McCulla	A	4	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  
Gus Ceballos, Assistant City Attorney  
Eric Engmann, Urban Design and Planning  
Mohammed Malik, Chief Zoning Plans Examiner  
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communications to City Commission**

None.

**I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Hansen called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and all recited the Pledge of Allegiance. The Board members were introduced, and Urban Design and Planning Manager Ella Parker introduced the Staff members present.

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

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

Chair Hansen requested that any members of the public wishing to speak on any Items before the Board be sworn in at this time. He advised that individuals wishing to speak on Items before the Board are allowed three minutes, and representatives of groups or associations are allowed five minutes.

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

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

## **IV. AGENDA ITEMS**

### **Index**

<b><u>Case Number</u></b>	<b><u>Applicant</u></b>
1. PL16009**	E & M Warehouse, LLC
2. R15036** *	5512 NW 10 Terrace, LLC and 5551 NW 9 Avenue 1-5, LLC
3. T16005*	City of Fort Lauderdale
4. T17001*	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.

**3. CASE: T16005**

**REQUEST:\* City of Fort Lauderdale /Amend Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR)**

**Amending Section 47-18.9, Cluster Development, Section 47-18.33, Townhouse, Section 47-19.2, Accessory Buildings, Structures and Equipment, General, Section 47-20.2, Parking and Landing Zoning Requirements, Parking Spaces for Duplex and Townhouse Cluster, Coach Homes, Section 47-20.13, Paving and Drainage, Section 47-21.14, Additional landscape requirements for special uses and districts and adding Section 47-18.45, Duplex/Two Family Dwelling.**

This amendment revises standards in the ULDR in order to implement the recommendations of the Neighborhood Development Criteria Revisions (NDCR) which amend the current requirements for cluster developments, townhouse developments, duplexes/ two family dwellings and amends certain provisions related to landscaping for these types of projects and addresses the requirements for the ability to park in the right-of-way swale for all development.

**APPLICANT:** City of Fort Lauderdale

**PROJECT NAME:** Neighborhood Development Code Revisions (NDCR)

**GENERAL LOCATION:** City-Wide

**CASE PLANNER:** Eric Engmann

Mr. Engmann of Urban Design and Planning stated that this item addresses Neighborhood Development Criteria Revisions (NDCR), which address several different topics. The NDCR process began in 2007, when the Council of Fort Lauderdale Civic Associations requested that the City look at its design guidelines for development, particularly in neighborhoods that were once single-family residential but were transitioning into multi-family or attached single-family areas. The City retained a consultant for this purpose, and several public workshops were held, finally resulting in the presentation of recommendations to the Planning and Zoning Board and the City Commission.

Mr. Engmann explained that an impasse was reached in approximately 2011 between some of the requirements addressing massing and scale, as there was not a strong consensus between neighbors and developers on these issues. City Staff was asked to revisit these concerns in 2016 on a fast-tracked basis, which would address some of the issues on which they felt consensus could be found without a lengthy process.

The fast-tracked issues included:

- Views from the street
- Preserving residential character
- Excessive driveways and the loss of green space
- Enhancing the pedestrian experience
- Reviewing the scale of buildings

Mr. Engmann advised that the proposed changes are primarily aimed at traditional residential neighborhoods, although they may not be single-family neighborhoods but can represent transition between types of residential developments. The changes address town and cluster home developments, as well as duplexes and two-family developments, which have never before been addressed separately by Code. The revisions will not address the design of standard single-family homes, nor will they change the approval process.

In order to promote traditional residential character, the revisions address the following issues:

- Façade articulation on the front face of the building
- Less of a garage presence
- Room for trees, swales, and drainage
- Safety principles such as visibility from the street to the buildings

- Green space and attractive front yards

Cluster projects may not have garages that face the street, although driveways can enter the property from the side or the rear. This provides additional space for windows and front entrances. For town homes, garages may still face the street, but no more than 50% of the width of each unit may be taken up by garage space. Corner lots may have one garage facing the street.

Mr. Engmann moved on to driveways, stating that the revisions propose an 8 ft. landscaped separation between driveways; however, if structural soil is added to allow tree roots to grow within less green space, the separation may be reduced to 4 ft. where appropriate.

Regarding architectural elements, the revisions propose that a minimum 25% of the façade facing the roadway must be glass. This may include design features on waterways. Mr. Engmann showed photographs of various projects to illustrate what 25% and other proportions might look like. Front entrances would be required in all districts, with a roof landing and architectural features integrated into the principal structure. A minimum of 4 ft. must be within the entrances themselves if there are two separate entrances, and they may extend an additional 3 ft. into the front yard.

Fencing and wall requirements in the RC-15 district currently state that walls may not be solid fences. To address this, the revisions propose requiring 75% of fencing in front yards to consist of non-opaque material. The revisions also specifically address garbage requirements as part of Code.

Sidewalk connections to front entrances are required so a driveway does not constitute the only entrance to a property. Mr. Engmann added that if an alternative path partially connects to a driveway, this is also acceptable. The proposed revisions also create a new section of Code to address duplexes. If parking occurs in the rear of a building, the area may be reduced from 18 ft. to 15 ft. Other duplex features, including entryways, fencing, garage width, driveways, and street trees, will be treated in a similar manner to a town home.

Mr. Engmann continued that Code currently limits front balconies to 20% of the front façade. Staff proposes to keep balcony requirements the same on the sides and rear of a building, but would allow front balconies to extend the full length of a building's front façade. Carports would be allowed up to 10 ft. in height and within 200 sq. ft., which is approximately the size of one car. These must be open on all sides except where attached to a building.

Code distinguishes between standard and attached single-family dwellings as follows: standard single-family homes are typical one-unit structures, while attached single-family units are duplexes, town homes, or cluster developments. Setbacks of 17 ft. are

allowed within standard single-family homes, with a 3 ft. extension off the front for other units. Porches must be open on two sides with no screen enclosures.

Guest parking requirements will remain the same for duplexes: duplex, town, and cluster homes with their own parking may have two spaces per unit. If these units do not have garages, they must provide 0.2 additional spaces per unit. The proposed revisions would allow only two spaces per unit for town and cluster homes of four units or fewer. Larger developments that must undergo the Site Plan Review process will have guest parking requirements, and Staff will work with these developments to determine what is appropriate for these properties.

Stronger language was desired with respect to preserving swales for drainage. If a new development has lots with a width of less than 75 ft., they may have two 12 ft. wide driveway segments or one 24 ft. wide driveway segment. Up to 50% of these lots can consist of driveway space. Use of gravel is limited and terms for its removal are established. A permitting process for paving in swales is also set forth.

At present, Code includes a caveat to the reduction of landscaping requirements for cluster and town home developments: they may meet the requirements of the RS-4.4 zoning district for common areas. The proposed revisions would remove this exemption, also removing the portion of the rear yard not under common ownership, while retaining specific landscaping requirements for the remainder of the development.

Mr. Engmann concluded that Staff held 10 outreach meetings, including two meetings with the Council of Fort Lauderdale Civic Associations (CFLCA), as well as meetings with developers, builders, and attorneys. Letters of support have been provided by the CFLCA as well as from a developer. Staff hopes to take this Application before the City Commission in February 2017.

Mr. Elfman commended Staff on their work toward the proposed revisions, and asked if they had encountered significant resistance from developers regarding certain issues, such as two-car garages in smaller developments. Mr. Engmann characterized this process as a give-and-take, pointing out that the results have satisfied most individuals.

Vice Chair Maus asked why the amenity requirement for cluster dwellings was removed from Code. Mr. Engmann replied that in Staff's experience, this has not been a successful feature requirement, as it typically does not add to the development. Staff feels that green space could be as beneficial as an amenity. This change was discussed with multiple civic associations, none of which perceived it to be an issue.

Vice Chair Maus continued that landscaping requirements currently prohibit shade trees from within 15 ft. of a building. Mr. Engmann observed that this may be dependent upon the types of shade trees proposed, and noted that some swales may house larger trees as well.

Vice Chair Maus addressed the limitation of a garage door to 50% of a structure's front façade, and asked if driveways will be similarly limited. Mr. Engmann stated that a 50 ft. wide lot, for example, could accommodate two 12 ft. driveways, separated by a landscaped strip. If structural soil is used, the landscaped strip could be 4 ft. wide. The proposed landscaping requirement is 35% of the entire area, which will be located primarily in the front of a building.

Chair Hansen commented that the revised front façade glazing requirements could be perceived as taking decisions out of the hands of architects. Mr. Engmann explained that this requirement was addressed in order to establish minimum standards. Ms. Parker added that the intent was not to curtail architectural freedom, but to focus on the principles of connectivity in traditional neighborhoods. She pointed out that 25% is not a large amount of glass coverage, and that most plans reviewed by Staff exceeded this percentage.

Chair Hansen observed that in some traditional neighborhoods using the Mediterranean style, windows are typically smaller, as large windows conflict with that style. He advised that this is a very subjective proposed change which may not allow for individual circumstances and styles. Mr. Engmann explained that this was reduced to 25% coverage based upon feedback from developers.

Chair Hansen suggested including an "out" clause for projects of special design, or a trade-off for the inclusion of specific features. Ms. Parker noted that the requirement only applies to the front façade of a development, where it is intended to create active frontage on the street. She explained that this is a recognized principle to reflect a human presence behind the doors and windows facing the street.

Mr. Engmann suggested that for cluster developments, language could be added to allow exceptions by request of the Planning and Zoning Board; however, this would not address the requirement for town homes or duplexes.

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

Gus Carbonell, private citizen, stated that the proposed revisions arose from communication between small groups of neighbors who approached the CFLCA. He felt Staff has done a good job conducting outreach to all interested parties.

Mr. Carbonell continued that the amenity requirement for cluster developments was not popular, as it affected residents' privacy and encroached upon their space. He felt this requirement should be removed from Code. He also agreed with Chair Hansen's comments regarding the 25% glass façade requirement, pointing out that modern architecture regularly uses glass features. He felt the requirement addressing private patios inside town or cluster homes should be amended to encourage rather than require paving with pervious material.

Michael Madfis, private citizen, commented that he was also involved with the process resulting in these revisions, which he felt would be significantly beneficial to the City. He noted that because there are relatively few units available for high-density development in the Downtown area, many developers looked to residential neighborhoods for this opportunity.

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

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Ms. Golub, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Ms. Desir-Jean left the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

The Board took a brief recess from 8:15 p.m. to 8:25 p.m.

#### **V. COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION**

None.

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

Mr. Glassman requested that the Board reconsider its 2017 meeting calendar, pointing out that the meeting scheduled for Wednesday, September 20, 2017 would fall on the first night of Rosh Hashanah. Ms. Parker suggested that the Board meet instead on Monday, September 18, 2017. The Board members agreed with this change by consensus.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:36 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.]