



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, MAY 16, 2018 – 6:30 P.M.**

**Cumulative**

<b>Board Members</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>June 2017-May 2018</b>	
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Catherine Maus, Chair	P	11	1
Howard Elfman, Vice Chair	A	10	2
John Barranco	A	11	1
Brad Cohen	P	2	1
Mary Fertig	P	3	0
Rochelle Golub	P	11	1
Richard Heidelberg	P	9	3
Jacquelyn Scott	P	2	0
Alan Tinter	P	11	1

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

**Staff**

Ella Parker, Urban Design and Planning Manager  
Shari Wallen, Assistant City Attorney  
Karlanne Grant, Urban Design and Planning  
Jim Hetzel, Urban Design and Planning  
Nicholas Kalargyros, Urban Design and Planning  
Randall Robinson, Urban Design and Planning  
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communications to City Commission**

None.

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

Chair Maus called the meeting to order at 6:32 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.

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

**Motion** made by Mr. Tinter, seconded by Ms. Golub, 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.

### IV. AGENDA ITEMS

#### Index

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1. R17037**	Florida Power & Light
2. R17028**	Andrews Project Development, LLC
3. V18004**	Andrews Project Development, LLC
4. V18005**	Andrews Project Development, LLC
5. V18001**	195 Federal, LLC
6. R17042**	ALTA Flagler Village II, LLC
7. T18002*	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.

**Motion** made by Ms. Golub, seconded by Mr. Heidelberger, to defer [Item 1] until the June meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

It was determined by consensus that the Board would hear Items 2, 3, and 4 presented together and would vote upon each item separately.

sq. ft. of open space planned, concentrated at the two street corners, to serve as semi-public seating areas with shade trees and both fixed and movable seating.

Ms. Golub asked Mr. Robinson to address the addition of 1700 new trips a day, including trucks, to an area with a narrow internal roadway. Mr. Robinson replied that Staff is comfortable that the site can manage traffic flow in the area, pointing out that the private street is subject to the same requirements as a private parking lot regarding access and circulation.

Ms. Fertig expressed concern with the form letter regarding water and wastewater capacity, noting that it also reflects the incorrect information she had referred to during the discussion of Items 2, 3, and 4. This information is not consistent with the City's recently adopted Engineering Master Plan. She added that because the City addresses this concern on a project-by-project basis, there is no cumulative total generated for capacity. She reiterated that Staff should provide a correct letter before the Application is sent on to the City Commission.

Ms. Scott asked if there is City consideration of unacceptable levels of service at intersections. Joaquin Vargas, traffic consultant, stated that the acceptable levels of service in Fort Lauderdale are A, B, C, and D, while levels E and F are not acceptable. All the intersections evaluated for the subject project are within the A to D range. He added that while projects may also affect major thoroughfares such as US-1 or Broward Boulevard, these are County and state facilities, which are assessed according to those entities' standards.

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

**Motion** made by Mr. Tinter, seconded by Ms. Scott, to approve, subject to Staff conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

---

7.	<b>CASE:</b>	<b>T18002</b>
	<b>REQUEST: *</b>	Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) Amending Section 47-20, Parking and Loading Requirements to Implement Off-Street Compact Parking and Off-Street and On-Street Motorcycle/Scooter Parking
	<b>APPLICANT:</b>	City of Fort Lauderdale
	<b>PROJECT NAME:</b>	Compact and Motorcycle/ Scooter Parking Standards
	<b>GENERAL LOCATION:</b>	City-Wide
	<b>CASE PLANNER:</b>	Karlanne Grant

---

Karlanne Grant, representing Urban Design and Planning, stated that T18002 proposes a Text Amendment for compact vehicles and motorcycle/scooter parking standards. The Item was first presented in March 2018, at which time the Board requested that the Item be deferred so additional data could be obtained to support the proposed depth of these spaces, as well as the percentage of required parking for both compact vehicles and motorcycles/scooters.

Ms. Grant continued that the original proposal would have allowed 35% of the total number of required parking to be made up of off-street compact spaces, with a parking space size of 8 ft. 8 in. wide by 15 ft. long. After further discussion and research, it was determined that the majority of other local municipalities' parking spaces have less than 30% of required parking and a length of roughly 16 ft. for compact parking spaces. As a result of this research, Staff now proposes to allow up to 20% of the total number of required parking spaces to include off-street compact spaces, with a parking space size of 8 ft. 8 in. by 16 ft.

Regarding motorcycle/scooter parking, the original proposal would have allowed one space for every 10 standard spaces in non-residential off-street parking to be converted to motorcycle/scooter spaces, with a maximum of six standard off-street parking spaces to be converted. Upon further review, it was determined that roughly 7% of registered motorcycles were registered in 2016. There was discussion of providing percentages for this parking rather than allowing the conversion of 1 out of 10 standard spaces with a maximum of six; however, Staff preferred to establish a maximum number of these spaces to be converted. Therefore the original proposal stands of converting one of every 10 standard off-street parking spaces with a maximum of six.

Mr. Tinter asked why the proposal for converting off-street motorcycle/scooter parking would not also be applied to residential uses over a certain size. Ms. Grant replied that this could be proposed to Staff for further consideration before the Text Amendment is presented to the City Commission.

Ms. Fertig suggested that the maximum number of off-street motorcycle/scooter spaces be decreased from six to a more realistic number. Mr. Tinter proposed converting one off-street motorcycle/scooter space for every 15 vehicle spaces rather than every 10.

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

Jeff Lis, representing the Stiles Corporation, commented that he was in favor of the proposed Amendment, which he characterized as a green initiative. He pointed out that the proposal would be consistent with a building currently under construction by his corporation, which provides for smaller low-emission vehicles. He noted that the average length of a car in the United States is 15 ft., and that vehicles under 16 ft. in length would also fit into compact spaces. Mr. Lis added that the building under construction also plans to provide at least 20 charging stations for electric vehicles in its



garage, which will allow for a configuration that will accommodate smaller vehicles on the inside of the facility.

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

**Motion** made by Ms. Golub, seconded by Mr. Tinter, to approve.

Mr. Tinter offered the following **amendment**: that Staff further investigate the number of off-street motorcycle/scooter spaces needed, and provide these spaces in multi-family residential areas. Ms. Golub accepted the **amendment**.

Ms. Parker clarified that Staff would bring this information to the City Commission rather than bringing it back before the Board.

Ms. Fertig asked if Staff's research would also consider a lesser maximum number of spaces. Ms. Grant confirmed this.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

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

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

Ms. Fertig again emphasized her concern with water/wastewater capacity letters, which she did not feel took the City's infrastructure concerns into full consideration. She reiterated that the totals cited in these letters are not cumulative, and requested that the letters be made more compliant with the City's Master Plan.

Chair Maus recalled that at one time, the Board was provided with a map showing all parking reductions enacted within a specific area where further reductions were requested. She suggested that a similar concept be adapted for water/wastewater capacity. Ms. Fertig pointed out, however, that this is a City-wide issue, and a cumulative total would be necessary at least within given areas.

Ms. Parker stated that she would communicate this concern to the Public Works Department and ask that the nature and format of capacity letters be addressed in order to better present the necessary information.

Ms. Fertig referred to a recent report regarding water and wastewater capacity, which cites the reduced effectiveness of some water treatment plants. Ms. Parker added that she would ask a representative of Public Works to address the Board at a future meeting regarding planned improvements.

Ms. Scott pointed out that when items presented are found to be incompatible with one of the City's Master Plans, it is typically noted that the particular Master Plan was not codified, which negates the incompatibility. She did not feel this had the effect that designers of Master Plans hoped they would have, and asked the Board to recommend that the City Commission codify and/or update these Master Plans so they may be applied properly.

Ms. Parker observed that there was recent discussion at the City Commission level regarding the applicability of aspects of the Downtown Master Plan. While Master Plans for areas such as Downtown or the Northwest or South RACs are codified, others, such as the Central Beach Master Plan, require additional work before they can be finalized. There is specific Code language that states in the event of discrepancies between existing language and the Downtown Master Plan, the Master Plan is given precedence. The City is working to make changes to Code to include more prescriptive criteria, such as streetscape designs and dimensional requirements. She concluded, however, that all potential contexts and solutions cannot be anticipated for all sites.

Ms. Fertig recalled that within the last five years, several projects have been brought forward that complied with certain neighborhood Master Plans; however, the neighborhoods were informed that their Master Plans have not been codified. She recommended that the list of Master Plans on the City's website include these neighborhood Master Plans, and suggested that a list of which plans were or were not codified could be presented to the Board at a subsequent meeting.

Ms. Parker recognized Ms. Golub and Mr. Heidelberger for their service on the Board.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:32 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.]