



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CITY HALL – CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 17, 2018 – 6:30 P.M.**

Cumulative

Board Members	Attendance	June 2017-May 2018	
		Present	Absent
Leo Hansen, Chair	P	8	0
Catherine Maus, Vice Chair	P	7	1
John Barranco	P	8	0
Howard Elfman	P	7	1
Rochelle Golub (arr. 6:43)	A	7	1
Richard Heidelberger	P	5	3
Alan Tinter	P	8	0

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

Staff

Ella Parker, Urban Design and Planning Manager
Gustavo Ceballos, Assistant City Attorney
Mohamed Malik, Zoning Administrator
Linda Mia Franco, Urban Design and Planning
Karlanne Grant, Urban Design and Planning
Jim Hetzel, Urban Design and Planning
Florentina Hutt, Urban Design and Planning
Nicholas Kalargyros, Urban Design and Planning
Randall Robinson, Urban Design and Planning
Lorraine Tappen, Urban Design and Planning
Benjamin Restrepo, Department of Transportation and Mobility
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 6:30 p.m. and all recited the Pledge of Allegiance. The Chair introduced the Board members present, and Urban Design and Planning Manager Ella Parker introduced the Staff members present.

Chair Hansen noted that Vice Chair Maus has left the dais until the conclusion of the first Item, as she has abstained from hearing or voting upon that Item.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Motion made by Mr. Heidelberger, seconded by Mr. Tinter, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

III. PUBLIC SIGN-IN / SWEARING-IN

Any individuals wishing to speak on any Items on tonight's Agenda were sworn in at this time. Chair Hansen advised that individuals representing boards or associations have five minutes to speak, while individuals representing themselves are allotted three minutes.

IV. AGENDA ITEMS

Index

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1. V17012**	Charles Humphries, Related Development LLC
2. R16045**	15 Isle of Venice, LLC
3. R17013**	Gummakonda Properties, Inc.
4. PL16008**	Gummakonda Properties, Inc.
5. R17052**	Archdiocese of Miami
6. Z18001* **	Bridge Development Partners, LLC
7. L17003* **	City of Fort Lauderdale and Envision Uptown, Inc.
8. T18001*	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.

Chair Hansen advised that the City has requested Item 7 be deferred until the next meeting.

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

1. CASE: V17012

REQUEST:**	Right-of-Way Vacation
APPLICANT:	Charles Humphries, Related Development LLC
PROJECT NAME:	RD Las Olas
GENERAL LOCATION:	201 South Federal Highway – North-South Alley between S. Federal Highway and SE 5 th Ave, and between Las Olas Boulevard and SE 2 nd Street
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	A portion of the 14-ft. alley adjacent to Lots 5,6,7,8 & 9, Subdivision of Block "H" of Stranahan's Revised and Additional Subdivision in the Town of Fort Lauderdale, FL
ZONING DISTRICT:	Regional Activity Center-City Center (RAC-CC)
CURRENT LAND USE:	Downtown Regional Activity Center (DRAC)
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	4 – Romney Rogers
CASE PLANNER:	Randall Robinson

Disclosures were made at this time.

Robert Lochrie, representing the Applicant, stated that the request is for vacation of a portion of an alley that runs between an existing parking garage and a bank drive-through. The portion to be vacated is located to the north and adjacent to the garage. Because it serves the garage and two additional businesses, the remainder of the alley must continue to function after the property is developed. The developer plans to build an amenity deck over the alley.

Mr. Lochrie explained that the developer plans to dedicate a three-dimensional easement with a height of approximately 15 ft. 8 in. through the building. The Application has been reviewed by the City's Engineering Department and meets all necessary regulations. The Applicant has received letters from franchise utilities stating they do not object to the requested vacation.

Mr. Lochrie noted that one condition of approval states that all utilities found within the alley must be relocated. The Applicant suggests an alternative condition, left to the discretion of City Engineers, that a utility easement be granted to any utilities remaining in the subject area. This is because a sewer line remains within the easement and a portion of it may extend into the vacated area.

Mr. Tinter observed that if the alley is vacated, it will be divided evenly between the two property owners on either side. He asked how the Applicant would be able to grant an easement for the other property owner's half of the vacated area. Mr. Lochrie replied that the Applicant will purchase both the east and west halves of the alley so they own the entire parcel.

Mr. Tinter also asked if the Applicant has considered reversing the direction of the alley so delivery vehicles do not have to back blindly into loading zones. Mr. Lochrie advised that other businesses served by the alley have angled parking that requires a

south/north orientation. He agreed, however, that during the Site Plan process the Applicant can ensure that their plans will continue to work within this configuration. He could not speak on behalf of the other businesses.

Mr. Heidelberger characterized the plan as creating a tunnel the width of the alley through the parking garage building, and asked if the top of the tunnel will also be part of the garage. Mr. Lochrie confirmed this. The parking deck extends further to the west and the amenity deck is located atop it. The proposed building will be residential, with commercial use on its ground floor.

Randall Robinson, representing Urban Design and Planning, stated that the request is for right-of-way vacation. The Board's decision will go before the City Commission when the Application is reviewed. The vacation is proposed for a 14 ft. wide 240 ft. long portion of the alley associated with the RD Las Olas mixed-use project, which is currently under review.

Mr. Robinson reviewed the following criteria for vacation of rights-of-way:

- The right-of-way or other public space is no longer needed for public purposes
- Alternate uses are available and do not cause adverse effects to surrounding areas
- Closure of the right-of-way provides safe areas for vehicles to turn and/or exit the area
- Closure of the right-of-way shall not adversely affect pedestrian traffic
- All utilities located within the right-of-way have been or will be relocated, pursuant to a relocation plan

Mr. Robinson confirmed that the proposal meets all criteria for vacation. The Applicant will coordinate with franchise utilities to address any facilities within the subject portion of the alley, including any that may require relocation.

Ms. Golub arrived at 6:43 p.m.

Mr. Tinter asked if City Staff had any objection to the alternative condition proposed by the Applicant regarding utility relocation. Mr. Robinson confirmed that the City is amenable to this alternative.

Ms. Golub asked why the alley is being vacated if plans for the property include sidewalks and a road. Mr. Robinson replied that the additional space over the alley is necessary in order to have a sufficiently large floor plate for a parking level. The parking levels bridge the alley, and the easement will be the same width as the alleyway. There are no plans for sidewalks at this time.

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair Hansen opened the public hearing. As there were no individuals wishing to speak on this Item, Chair Hansen closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Tinter, seconded by Mr. Heidelberger, to approve the vacation, with the conditions that Staff has recommended; however, modifying conditions 1 and 2 to permit the utilities to be in [the] easement if that is acceptable to the City Engineer. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-0. (Vice Chair Maus abstained. A memorandum of voting conflict is attached to these minutes.)

Vice Chair Maus rejoined the Board at this time.

2. CASE:	R17013
REQUEST: **	Site Plan Level III Review: Conditional Use for a Mixed Use Development; 16 Residential Units and 2,215 Square Feet of Retail Use with Residential Flex Allocation
APPLICANT:	Gummakonda Properties, Inc.
PROJECT NAME:	Ocean 3001
GENERAL LOCATION:	3001 N Ocean Boulevard
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	Lauderdale Beach 4-2 B Por Of Lots 94 & 95 Desc As: Beg Int N/L Lot 95 & W/R/W/L A-1-A, SW 85.60 Alg W/R/W/L To P/C, Swly Arc Dist 22.95, Wly 165.25 Alg S/L Lot 94, N 99.92, Ely 183.72 Alg N/L Lot 95 To Pob Aka: 3001 N Ocean Blvd
ZONING DISTRICT:	Community Business (CB)
LAND USE:	Commercial
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	2 – Dean Trantalis
CASE PLANNER:	Florentina Hutt

Disclosures were made at this time.

Nectaria Chakas, representing the Applicant, stated that the request is for Site Plan Level III review. The Applicant has met with surrounding residential neighbors for their input into the process, resulting in changes to plans for the property. She showed a PowerPoint presentation on the proposal, noting that the site is zoned RMM-25 on Isle of Venice, where the height limit is 55 ft. and 25 units per acre. The width of the lot is 120 ft. The lot is surrounded by larger properties.

At present, a two-story 13-unit apartment building with backout parking is located on the property. There is also tandem parking, which partially blocks a portion of the right-of-way. The proposed site plan eliminates backout parking and includes a new sidewalk, which continues work begun by the Aqua Mar property located to the north. The Applicant also plans street trees between travel lanes and sidewalks. All access to and from the site has been consolidated into a single access point at the south end. All ground floor uses facing the street are lobby and amenity areas.

The Applicant requests side yard modifications to allow setbacks of 17 ft. to the closest point of the building. Ms. Chakas pointed out that the building includes significant terracing and variations within the roof line. They also request a rear yard modification,