



**MEETING MINUTES  
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE  
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD  
CITY HALL – CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2019 – 6:00 P.M.**

**Cumulative**

<b>Board Members</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>June 2019-May 2020</b>	
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Catherine Maus, Chair	A	5	1
Mary Fertig, Vice Chair	P	5	1
John Barranco	P	5	1
Brad Cohen (dep. 8:55)	P	5	1
Coleman Prewitt	P	6	0
Jacquelyn Scott	P	6	0
Jay Shechtman	P	6	0
Alan Tinter	P	6	0
Michael Weymouth	A	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  
Anthony Fajardo, Director, Department of Sustainable Development  
Linda Mia Franco, Urban Design and Planning  
Yvonne Redding, Urban Design and Planning  
Lorraine Tappen, Principal Urban Planner  
Benjamin Restrepo, Department of Transportation and Mobility  
Enrique Sanchez, Deputy Director, Parks and Recreation Department  
Zoie Saunders, Chief Education Officer  
Ben Sorensen, Fort Lauderdale City Commission  
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communications to City Commission**

None.

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

Vice Chair Fertig called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The Board members introduced themselves.

## II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

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

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

Members of the public wishing to speak on any Item on tonight's Agenda were sworn in at this time.

## IV. AGENDA ITEMS

### Index

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1. R19065**	City of Fort Lauderdale
2. R19031**	BSREP III Fort Lauderdale, LLC
3. L19001*	City of Fort Lauderdale
4. L19002*	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.

<del>1. CASE:</del>	<del>R19065</del>
<del>REQUEST: **</del>	<del>Site Plan Level III Review: Approval of Height and Setbacks for Lighting Structures</del>
<del>APPLICANT:</del>	<del>City of Fort Lauderdale</del>
<del>PROJECT NAME:</del>	<del>Riverland Park Field Lighting</del>
<del>GENERAL LOCATION:</del>	<del>950 SW 27th Avenue</del>
<del>ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:</del>	<del>Last Chance Village 27-13-B</del>
<del>ZONING DISTRICT:</del>	<del>Parks, Recreation and Open Space (P)</del>
<del>LAND USE:</del>	<del>Community Facilities</del>

~~A Resolution of the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, approving a Site Plan Level III development permit for the development of the Hilton Marina Hotel, located at 1881 SE 17 Street, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in the B-1 and RMH-60 zoning districts, for the addition of a hotel meeting and ballroom space, a restaurant, kitchen space, and east/west corridor, and for a modification of the east side yard setback and a parking reduction.~~

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

**3. CASE:**

**L19001**

**REQUEST: \***

Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan Elements: Administration and Implementation, Future Land Use, Housing, Infrastructure, Coastal Management, Conservation, Intergovernmental Coordination, Capital Improvements, Transportation, Parks and Recreation, Historic Preservation, and Public School Facilities; and add New Elements: Urban Design, Climate Change and Economic Development

**APPLICANT:**

City of Fort Lauderdale

**PROJECT NAME:**

Advance Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan Update

**GENERAL**

City-wide

**LOCATION:**

**CASE PLANNER:**

Lorraine Tappen

Principal Urban Planner Lorraine Tappen showed a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. She advised that changes will be entered into the record at the time the Board makes its decision on recommendation.

Ms. Tappen explained that one goal of the Comprehensive Plan update was to create a more user-friendly format. The update began in 2015 with evaluation of the existing Comprehensive Plan. Since 2017, public open houses and meetings with advisory bodies have discussed the update, including three special meetings of the Planning and Zoning Board in 2019, a public open house, and tonight's public hearing.

At the September 2019 special meeting, the Board made two motions related to revisions of the Comprehensive Plan's language. One would adopt different language related to the Education element, which would clarify terms that may become obsolete over time. This language has been incorporated into the document. The Board also voted to add policy related to an alternate water supply. Appropriate language, and a new policy, were added under the Infrastructure element.

Staff also heard additional comments and concerns from the public including:

- A strong statement directing development away from the barrier island; this was clarified in the Future Land Use element, along with unified flex strategy



- Walkability on the beach: supported by Parks and Recreation policies 1 through 3 as well as policy in the Transportation element regarding pedestrian improvements throughout the City
- Retaining walls around Port fuel tanks: addressed under the Intergovernmental Coordination element as part of local hazard mitigation strategy
- Accessory dwelling units: policy was added under the Housing element for the evaluation of these units as a tool for affordable housing
- Water catchment and treatment requirements: language added in the Infrastructure element
- Recycling and incentivization for businesses to recycle more

The Comprehensive Plan includes three new elements: Climate Change, Economic Development, and Urban Design. Ms. Tappen thanked all the individuals and advisory bodies that contributed to the update.

The Future Land Use element is intended to guide orderly, sustainable development as well as provide a vision for the City's built environment. A list of permitted uses was moved from the end of this element to the beginning. The list includes policies that guide aspects of development, such as appropriate mass and scale, preserving the character of lower-density neighborhoods, supporting multimodal transportation, climate resiliency, affordable housing, and fulfilling statutory requirements for projected populations.

The Future Land Use element was last updated in 2008, when it did not anticipate the Uptown and Central City districts. New language was added for these areas. The land use designation of Employment Center was updated to reflect the zoning designation of the same name. The Broward County Planning Council recommended that this element incorporate language to support their flex policies, as well as trafficways and platting under the Broward County Land Use Plan, known as Broward Next.

The Urban Design element is intended to address strategies for improving the quality of life for the urban environment and the public realm experience. This includes policies relating to building and site design, quality materials, sufficient transparency in window coverage, consideration of balance between higher- and lower-scale neighborhoods, resiliency, continuous network of public and private spaces, enhancement of the waterfront areas, and policy language regarding gateway design.

The Economic Development is intended to create an economic environment that is business-friendly, with new policy language regarding the creation of an Economic Development Strategic Plan, supporting the efforts of Community Redevelopment Agencies (CRAs), encouraging high-tech development, support for the aviation and marine industries, and ensuring planning for a resilient economy.

The Climate Change element addresses climate change in a comprehensive and holistic manner to contribute to the future reduction of greenhouse gases to the best of the City's ability. One goal is to reduce City operation-produced greenhouse gases by 2050 by 80%.

use blue/green infrastructure to increase stormwater collection, and reduce overall vehicle miles traveled by supporting a transit-friendly built environment.

The Conservation element would protect and monitor water and air resources in addition to protecting the City's natural resources. Public input provided guidance on how to make this language more robust. Language was added stating that the City would conduct a natural communities assessment using the Florida Natural Areas Inventory, and would consider identifying private land for possible purchase or land conservation agreements.

The Board and the public provided comments that resulted in revised language regarding tree preservation, which was added to encourage funding opportunities for an urban forest management plan, a City-wide Geographic Information System (GIS) inventory, and guidance for forestry operations. The latter effort would include significant public participation. Language to update and implement the ULDR would be added with clear, strong standards for tree protection. Development and redevelopment of City parks and projects should include the needs of wildlife and rare native plants.

The Education element, called the Public School Facilities element in the current Comprehensive Plan, will now address more than school capacity and facilities, including how education can meet the needs of the community. The updated Education element will include language measuring student success, supporting early learning and after-school programs, supporting career and technical education, boosting social mobility in economically distressed communities, and encouraging lifelong learning opportunities. Social and environmental justice are recurring themes throughout the updated Comprehensive Plan, and are addressed in policies found under the Future Land Use, Education, Capital Improvement, and Infrastructure elements.

The Housing element was updated in response to the City's Housing and Community Development Division's main goals of creating and preserving affordable housing. One new policy proposes creation of an affordable housing tracking system. This element will include information on all affordable housing resources. The City will continue to set strategic policies throughout the Housing and Community Development Consolidated Plan and set annual goals for housing rehabilitation, home purchase assistance, rental assistance, public services, and new construction of affordable housing through the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).

The Historic Preservation element is intended to enhance the sense of place and quality of life by identifying, promoting, and preserving the City's historic, archaeological, and cultural resources. It includes policies for the evaluation of these resources using both national and state guidelines, as well as new language that will allow the Historic Preservation Board to use federal guidelines to evaluate impacts to historic resources. New language will be added in support of a transfer of development rights program.

Edward Ng of the Corradino Group, consultant, addressed the Sanitary Sewer, Water and Stormwater element, which is intended to ensure the City delivers these services in



efficient, resilient, and sustainable methods. This includes ensuring adequate wastewater services with an updated level of service (LOS) standard that is updated to reflect current practices. In addition, the Development Review process will request sewer demand letters demonstrating calculations for sanitary sewer connections and fees, and must ensure that the City commits to reviewing flows for previously approved projects as well.

The LOS required for the Water Services Division has changed, based upon the recommendations of a plan that provides 170 gallons per capita per day. This is consistent with the limits of the City's water withdrawal permit. The wastewater provision must be reviewed for development and redevelopment applications. This element includes policies that promote alternative water supplies and efforts for water conservation. Policies to ensure future system upgrades in a cost feasible manner are also included under this element.

A statutory mandate requires the City to update its Ten-Year Water Supply Plan, which is tied to the South Florida Water Management District. Policies within this element are designed to ensure that the City continues to meet its obligations.

The Stormwater service provision element establishes the lowest finished floor elevation, based on the most stringent of the following criteria:

- 100-year storm design
- Florida Building Code elevation
- Flood plain management section of the Code of Ordinances

During the review process, the City must ensure that new development, redevelopment, and roadways meet Florida water management district quality and quantity criteria. Policies must ensure that single-family homes must retain the first inch of runoff or the first 2.5 inches multiplied by the percentage of perviousness. These standards and practices already exist and are in effect prior to codification in the Comprehensive Plan.

The Coastal Management element seeks to protect coastal resources and economically based economic drivers, maintain environmental balance, and prepare for hazards and emergency events. The updated Comprehensive Plan will include policies to ensure priority is given to water-related uses along the waterfront and limit the impact of development and redevelopment on wetlands, marine resources, and wildlife habitat. New policies must meet the requirements of Broward Next, including sewage pumping facilities for live-aboard boats and coordination and cooperation on a comprehensive Beach Management and Maintenance Plan for the County. Mr. Ng emphasized that these are requirements under Broward Next for the City's recertification process.

The Solid Waste element is intended to develop and implement best practices for collection, processing, and disposal of solid waste. The City will continue to provide for the collection and management of residential, multi-family, and commercial solid waste while incorporating sustainable technological practices. Policies include ensuring that the

City incorporates sustainable practices into its existing contracts with vendors. Additional policies will promote education on recycling, reuse, and diversion of waste.

The Capital Improvement element includes standards to improve existing facilities. This is a statutory requirement for at least a five-year period and includes a detailed schedule for the funding, prioritization, and timing of improvements. It is automatically updated each year upon the adoption of the City's Capital Improvement Plan. Policies include criteria for ranking projects, such as cost benefits, safety, risk analysis, and other factors.

The Intergovernmental Coordination element is intended to support cooperative efforts with regional agencies and other municipalities with regard to quality of life issues. These include coordination of plan elements with Broward County and state agencies, Broward County Transit (BCT), and the Airport and Seaport. A key component of the Climate Change element involves coordination with neighboring municipalities, including the East Florida Climate Change Compact, of which the City is a signee.

The Parks, Recreation, and Open Space element is intended to ensure equity and accessibility to parks and community programming to enhance the quality of life for residents and visitors of all ages and abilities. The concept of "all ages and abilities" reflects a major change in language from the existing Comprehensive Plan, which previously referred to environmental and social justice.

Policies are meant to encourage publicly accessible open space requirements for new residential development projects, consideration of options that create open space and other uses and amenities, and regular assessment of the Parks Master Plan with updates as needed, particularly in relation to population projections resulting from updated census figures. They are also intended to leverage parks and recreation programming and promote community unity and health.

In response to feedback from the Planning and Zoning Board, Staff revisited the definitions of parks, which are included as Policy PR 1.1.1 within the element. These include community parks, conservation areas, greenways, open spaces, waterways, and more. The updated document includes a chart that provides for 10% of waterway acreage to fall within the definition of parks. This comes to slightly below 18 acres.

Based on analysis, Staff recommends that the park LOS be increased from three acres per 1000 residents to 4.5 or 5 acres per 1000 residents. They request that the Board provide direction on whether to move forward with 4.5 acres per 1000 or 5 acres per 1000. The 4.5 acre calculation would not require any additional park acreage through 2045, while the 5 acre calculation would require the acquisition of just over 78 additional acres in order to meet LOS standards.

The Transportation and Mobility element is intended to promote a continuous connected system that enables multiple modes of transportation by providing increased choices for residents, businesses, and visitors, enhancing local safety, and achieving the goals of the



Vision Zero program. Policies and objectives that require the City to develop a long-range comprehensive Transportation Master Plan are necessary to the achievement of these goals, and certain elements must be enhanced, such as creation of a complete mobility network and contemplation of future emerging technologies. Other policies would evaluate the potential multimodal LOS for roadway standards to replace the current auto-oriented standards.

Policies also call for the incorporation of Vision Zero strategies to achieve the goal of zero traffic fatalities, ensure a complete network for bicyclists, and provide for dockless mobility options, which must be treated equally to bicycles according to statutory requirements. There are also updated policies supporting a reduction in the number of missing links in bicycle trails. Based on comments received from the Board and the public, Staff has included Old Dillard Trail in these recommendations.

The Transportation and Mobility element also calls for the development of a Transit Master Plan, evaluation of improvements on waterways, and development of a blueways system.

At present, the updated Comprehensive Plan is in its public hearing phase. The Board's recommendation will be transmitted to the City Commission for first reading in January 2020. Once approved, the Plan will be submitted to the Broward County Planning Council and then to the Broward County Board of County Commissioners. After these public hearings have been conducted, the state and other reviewing agencies will receive the document and provide a receipt of notice to the City. These agencies have an additional 30 days in which to provide the City with their comments. Once they are received, the Plan goes back to the County for second hearing and ultimately back to the City for final adoption upon second hearing. This is expected in approximately mid-2020.

The Comprehensive Plan has gone through a thorough public involvement process, with stakeholder meetings and public workshops. Comments may still be submitted on the City's website. Further questions or comments may be directed to Ms. Tappen at the Department of Sustainable Development.

Ms. Scott asked which sections of the Comprehensive Plan address the health, safety, and welfare of the public in relation to emergency services. Ms. Tappen replied that the Coastal Management element directly addresses evacuation in emergencies. While some Comprehensive Plans discuss emergency services such as fire, rescue, Police, and emergency medical services, this can often make the plan unwieldy, as these service providers prefer to have their own plans and specific standards for implementation of emergency services.

Ms. Scott stated that because the Comprehensive Plan is intended to be a road map for the future of the City, she felt it should include these elements or some language addressing emergency needs, particularly in light of the density of development in many areas.



Vice Chair Fertig suggested that language dealing with emergency services could be incorporated into more than one section of the Comprehensive Plan in order to establish health, safety, and welfare as priorities.

Ms. Parker pointed out that many of these elements have already been incorporated into City Code and Florida Building Code. As Site Plans are reviewed for development, safety aspects are considered as part of the process. She agreed that some general language referring to emergency plans could be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Tinter asked what would happen if the other agencies scheduled to review the Plan make significant changes. Ms. Tappen replied that after tonight's hearing, the changes would typically be decided upon by the City Commission. They may then be shared with the Board; however, if changes are made at the state or County level, the Board would not review the document again before it goes before the City Commission for second reading.

Assistant City Attorney D'Wayne Spence reiterated that once the Comprehensive Plan leaves the Board, which will act in its capacity as Local Planning Agency (LPA), it would go to the City Commission, then to other County and state agencies before returning to the City Commission for final adoption. This process, which can be lengthy, is outlined by State Statute and does not provide for the Plan to come back before the LPA. Staff may be able to provide the Board with the comments made by other agencies prior to the Plan's second reading before the City Commission, although the Plan would not be presented for action.

The Board addressed the Comprehensive Plan on an element-by-element basis, with no comments regarding the Future Land Use element. Vice Chair Fertig advised that the Urban Design element should include a definition of the term "exceptional" as used in the phrase "exceptional sense of place."

Attorney Wallen recommended that the Board take all comments from the public at one time rather than addressing them by each element; however, she noted that this would ultimately be left to the Chair's discretion. It was determined that one speaker would be allowed on the current element and all other comments would be held until the Board had completed its discussion of the elements.

Marilyn Mammano, representing the Council of Fort Lauderdale Civic Associations, addressed the Affordable Housing element, stating that this group was disappointed by the aspirational nature and conservative milestones proposed for the Affordable Housing element. While there have been changes and additions to that element since the Council's first review, the Council urges the Board to look at this element and consider whether or not the City is being as aggressive as possible in its promotion of affordable housing. She provided documentation of the Council's recommendations.

Ms. Mammano also addressed the Affordable Housing element as a private citizen, suggesting that the City adopt a new policy that would only allocate flex units to developments in which roughly 50% of the units provided will be affordable. Another suggestion would commit the City to prohibit the sale or lease of City-owned land unless an affordable housing component is included.

The Board also addressed the Affordable Housing element, with Mr. Shechtman noting that Broward Next includes incentives for affordable housing, such as density bonuses for a percentage of affordable units. Ms. Tappen noted that the Broward County Planning Council is currently discussing an amendment to their plan with respect to affordable housing on properties designated for commercial land use. Staff has attended the meetings at which this proposal has been discussed and will bring back more information to determine if this would be suitable for the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Shechtman pointed out that there have already been elements of this proposal adopted at the County level, such as density bonuses for inclusion of affordable housing. Ms. Tappen confirmed that the existing Broward County Land Use Plan and Broward County Comprehensive Plan have each included a section on affordable units for some time; however, the development community does not advantage of these incentives, as there are no clear guidelines for how the units may be used. Staff hopes that in the future, when an inclusionary zoning Ordinance is presented to the Board and the City Commission, this may provide sufficient guidance for the future development of affordable housing.

Mr. Shechtman reiterated that he believed there are already adopted elements of the County plan that include density bonuses for the inclusion of affordable housing in development, with established guidelines. He also recommended that the City Commission include a density bonus for affordable housing in order to encourage its development in Fort Lauderdale, and to establish guidelines for this incentive if none have been set thus far.

Attorney Spence advised that the Florida Legislature recently adopted House Bill (HB) 7103, which contains provisions related to inclusionary zoning and affordable housing. These provisions would require any municipality to provide full compensation or to fully offset the cost of requiring the inclusion of affordable housing. He recommended that the Board keep this in mind when adopting any policy related to an affordable housing requirement, as it has not yet been determined whether or not density bonuses would fully offset these costs.

Mr. Shechtman clarified that his recommendation would specifically include a density bonus.

Vice Chair Fertig noted that Staff would vet any recommendation for legal sufficiency before it is presented to the City Commission. Attorney Wallen confirmed this.



The Board discussed the issue of density bonuses further, with Mr. Tinter pointing out that density bonuses for affordable units were also addressed when the Uptown Master Plan came before them. He recommended that the Board be more specific if they wished to provide guidance to the City Commission. Mr. Shechtman felt the Board should make a general recommendation to the Commission and allow them to make the final decision.

Mr. Barranco advised that the updated Comprehensive Plan includes general incentives for the development of affordable housing, with more specific policies to be determined in conjunction with Zoning Code. Mr. Shechtman stated that because the Plan is very general throughout, the omission of specific recommendations could contribute to lack of progress. He did not feel there was any prospective harm in specifying direction for the City.

Ms. Parker reiterated that bonus density is only one tool by which the overall goal of creating affordable housing can be met. The City is currently working on policy, based upon County requirements and the passage of HB 7103, to address this need. There are additional concerns with bonus density, such as neighborhood compatibility, that would go into the creation of City policy at the direction of the Commission.

Attorney Spence advised that the City's Comprehensive Plan is required to be consistent with the County's Land Use Plan, which establishes density for Broward County. The City's Plan may not exceed this density. The structure of any bonus density offered by the City may not exceed the density cap established by the County Plan. He suggested that Mr. Shechtman's recommendation of bonus density be added as an example of an incentive the City may be able to pursue in the future.

Mr. Prewitt observed that due to the gravity of the City's affordable housing need, he would recommend encouraging the City Commission to pass an affordable housing Ordinance to address this issue. He felt the Board should express its concern with the critical nature of affordable housing.

It was determined that the Board would make a decision on any recommended amendments at the end of the discussion of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Board did not provide any comments regarding the Historic Preservation, Conservation, and Climate Change elements.

Mr. Shechtman addressed the Transportation and Mobility element, stating that one result of development is the adverse effects on residents who live in neighborhoods abutting the Downtown area. Issues include "cut-through" streets, which can be hazardous to pedestrians, particularly if they do not have sidewalks. He recommended that the proposed Transportation Master Plan identify these streets on which traffic is increasing and sidewalk links are missing, and prioritize these at once.

Ms. Scott asked if the LOS of City streets is changing. Mr. Ng replied that no changes to LOS standards are planned. Ms. Scott also noted that the Comprehensive Plan does not discuss the removal of street closures related to traffic modification in neighborhoods. Mr. Ng confirmed that the Plan does not propose to remove policies related to road closures.

Vice Chair Fertig noted that p.10 of the Comprehensive Plan shows the LOS for the eastern core remaining at level E, while other City roadways remain at level D. She asked why a lower LOS was acceptable in one portion of the City. Mr. Ng responded that some roadway segments are part of the Strategic Intermodal Systems (SIS) network. These are regional rather than local roadways and receive transportation funds from the federal government. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has specific guidelines for these roadways so they may continue to receive SIS dollars. Raising the LOS for these roadways would come at a prohibitive cost, and could require changes such as the addition of two to four lanes from surrounding properties.

Mr. Tinter explained that only a limited number of roadway segments are SIS facilities, such as I-95 and connectors of transit hubs to interstates. These areas are identified in the Transit element of Broward County's Comprehensive Plan. Local roadways would remain at LOS D, which is the current standard.

Vice Chair Fertig stated that this would mean the updated Comprehensive Plan does not meaningfully address the issue of roadways, which is typically the issue of greatest concern in responses to neighborhood surveys. She did not believe an LOS of E was an acceptable goal in the City's eastern core district. She concluded that she would like to include language suggesting that the City strives for an LOS of D throughout the City in order to show that this concern is being addressed.

Vice Chair Fertig continued that the Transportation and Mobility element also includes Policy TM1.1.1b, which has a series of bullet points to be incorporated as base elements of the overall plan, including transit, sidewalk/bicycle lighting, signalization, and others. She asked if it would be appropriate to include vehicular traffic in this list. Mr. Ng replied that this could be added, although vehicular traffic does not include a separate sub-element plan.

Mr. Shechtman requested that Policy 1.5.3, which refers to consideration of multiple forms of mobility when reconstructing streets, include a reference to the reconstruction of bridges as well as streets. He added that with regard to the cut-through streets, the City should identify and construct sidewalks on these roadways in neighborhoods surrounding regional activity centers. He also recommended that the City prioritize and construct protected bicycle lanes on major thoroughfares in the City.

The Board had no comments regarding the Sanitary Sewer, Water, and Stormwater, Solid Waste Management, or Economic Development elements.



Regarding the Education element, Vice Chair Fertig noted that there is a section that refers to what the City is entitled to through capital dollars. She felt the Comprehensive Plan should not include any language suggesting that the City would not disagree with the School Board if the City were denied an entitlement. She requested that language to this effect be removed from the document.

Mr. Shechtman addressed the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space element, noting that Staff requested guidance from the Board regarding whether 4.5 or 5 acres per 1000 residents should be the LOS. Mr. Barranco observed that the 4.5 acre LOS would represent a 50% increase in green space from the current standard of 3 acres, which he characterized as a lofty goal. He was not certain, however, that it was realistic. He also noted that only 10% of the City's waterways were counted toward open space, and requested additional information on how this was determined.

Ms. Tappen recalled that during one of the Board's special meetings to discuss the Comprehensive Plan, there was discussion of various methods for counting park and open space. When it was suggested that waterways be included, there was additional discussion of counting waterways that are directly accessible from public spaces and counting 10% of this area toward the City's open space inventory. Waterways located within parks were already included in the inventory. The City's GIS Department considered other spaces, such as the Riverwalk, and found 170 acres of water adjacent to these publicly accessible areas. Based upon the suggested definition of 10%, this resulted in the addition of 17 acres.

Ms. Tappen further clarified that the water areas includes the area adjacent to a publicly accessible area to the opposite side of the waterway. Mr. Tinter asserted that a much larger waterway area than this would be open to recreational use. Ms. Parker advised that not all waterways were included, but only those with publicly accessible space. The figure was based on how many people could use these spaces. Mr. Tinter felt this was not a representative sample of the recreational area available in waterways.

Mr. Tinter recommended that if waterway open space would be limited to the space on the boundaries of parks and other public areas, the City should increase the percentage used to calculate this space. He proposed using 25% instead of 10%.

Mr. Barranco stated that raising the LOS by 50% or more could tie the City's hands in the long run, as there may not be sufficient property available. Mr. Tinter observed that at 4.5 acres/1000, including 10% of waterway space, the City has sufficient park and open space through 2040. If the waterway space is increased to a higher percentage than 10%, this might provide sufficient space through 2050.

Mr. Barranco also suggested that one way to raise the percentage of waterway use might be to make waterways more accessible to the public. He concluded that while the City needs more parks and open space, he was not certain that an increase of 50% or more was realistic.

The Board discussed the proposed changes in park and open space LOS further, with Mr. Prewitt commenting that the LOS and definition of open space should not be considered in isolation from one another. He felt the more accurate question would be the LOS at which development must stop until more park space is added. Mr. Shechtman recalled that when the Board first discussed parks and open space in the context of the Comprehensive Plan, one of the City's greatest obstacles to increasing this space was the amount of money available for the purchase of this space. The question would become moot if the City does not have sufficient funds to buy land.

Vice Chair Fertig noted that the Parks Bond makes it possible to purchase additional land for parks and open space. It also establishes a commitment to improving natural habitats for wildlife and plant life. Mr. Sanchez of the Parks and Recreation Department confirmed that funds are set aside as part of the Parks Bond; in addition, there is another mechanism, park impact fees, which would set aside money to expand park use. This is expected to be sufficient for approximately the next 20 years.

Mr. Sanchez felt it was preferable to be conservative in the Comprehensive Plan and revisit the addition of park space in the next Parks Master Plan. Mr. Shechtman requested that the Board's final recommendation also address a mechanism for raising additional park dollars.

The Board had no comments regarding the Coastal Management, Implementation, Capital Improvement, or Intergovernmental Coordination elements.

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

Marilyn Mammano, representing the Council of Fort Lauderdale Civic Associations, again referred the Board to a document including the Council's written recommendations. After Affordable Housing, which was noted earlier, she advised that the Council has additional concerns:

- The Council shared Mr. Shechtman's concern with "cut-through" traffic on neighborhood roadways and felt this trend should be reduced
- The intent to maintain the existing LOS for park space rather than purchasing more land, which Ms. Mammano characterized as allowing the LOS to deteriorate over time
- The lack of a firm commitment to adopting green building requirements in zoning Code, with no attendant time frame
- Lack of action regarding the transfer of development rights and inclusionary zoning, which have been named in the Comprehensive Plan since 2008 but have not yet occurred
- Lack of acknowledgement that the Future Land Use Plan, as currently implemented, would result in a requirement infrastructure service improvements, such as emergency medical services



- Acknowledge the City's fiduciary duty to protect the health, welfare, and safety of the community as its main priority

Ms. Mammano advised that the City's fiduciary responsibility to the well-being of the community could be reflected in the amendment of Objective CI 1.1 and Policy CI 1.1.1, which would fund capital improvements and reduce the time frame for Capital Improvement Program amendment to address shortfalls from five years to two years. She recommended making the prioritization of capital improvements that would reduce risk and promote the public welfare the highest priority on the list of these improvements.

Ms. Mammano also provided the Board with a copy of her personal comments as well as the Council's.

As there were no other individuals wishing to speak on these Items, Vice Chair Fertig closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

The Board reviewed their comments and recommendations on the updated Comprehensive Plan. Attorney Wallen advised that any recommendations made should be for changes to what is currently proposed by Staff in the document.

**Motion** made by Mr. Shechtman, seconded by Mr. Barranco, to recommend to the Commission that [they] explore additional bonus density, similarly to what [the Commission] recently approved in Uptown. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

The Board discussed a recommendation that would have the City strive to reach LOS D on City streets; however, Mr. Tinter noted once again that the City may not take action that would be more restrictive than the existing LOS on County and state roads. Vice Chair Fertig proposed that Staff discuss more responsive strategies for residents in the eastern core who have repeatedly expressed concerns with roadway issues.

**Motion** made by Mr. Shechtman, seconded by Mr. Barranco, that when streets and bridges are rebuilt, [the Board] would like to see them incorporate bike lanes. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

**Motion** made by Mr. Shechtman to identify, within one year, major cut-through streets in neighborhoods surrounding Regional Activity Centers and construct sidewalks within three years when acceptable by the neighborhoods. [The **motion** died for lack of second.]

**Motion** made by Mr. Shechtman, seconded by Mr. Cohen, to identify major cut-through streets in the City of Fort Lauderdale and construct sidewalks when acceptable by those neighborhoods. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 6-1 (Mr. Tinter dissenting).

**Motion** made by Mr. Tinter, seconded by Ms. Scott, to recommend that [the Commission] adopt the 4.5 acres per 1000 and leave the 10% on the waterways the way it is currently

[stated] in the Comprehensive Plan. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 6-1 (Mr. Barranco dissenting).

**Motion** made by Mr. Shechtman to recommend that the Commission consider setting aside additional dollars annually for the purchase of park space as it becomes available. [The **motion** died for lack of second.]

**Motion** made by Ms. Scott, seconded by Mr. Cohen, that the City prioritize the health, safety, and welfare of the community. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

**Motion** made by Mr. Shechtman, seconded by Mr. Tinter, to ensure that if LauderTrail merges with Mockingbird Trail, [Mockingbird Trail would] also be included as part of [Transportation element 1.5.f]. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

**Motion** made by Mr. Barranco, seconded by Mr. Prewitt, to include [Staff] modifications as part of the Comprehensive Plan. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Vice Chair Fertig revisited her concern with the potential for adoption, by reference or by restatement, that "in no event shall the City attempt to modify the adopted District Educational Facilities Plan (DEFP)." She recommended that this language be deleted from the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Tappen stated that Staff wished to clarify the interlocal agreement between the City and the School Board to ensure that the removal of this clause would not be in conflict with the agreement.

**Motion** made by Ms. Scott, seconded by Mr. Prewitt, to remove the final clause in Policy 1.2.1 unless it is in conflict with the interlocal agreement. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

**Motion** made by Mr. Shechtman, seconded by Ms. Scott, to transmit the Comprehensive Plan, with the Planning and Zoning Board's recommendations, to the Commission. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Mr. Cohen left the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

<b>4. CASE:</b>	<b>L19002</b>
<b>REQUEST: *</b>	<del>Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Comprehensive Plan to update the Ten-Year Water Supply Plan</del>
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	<del>City of Fort Lauderdale</del>
<b>PROJECT NAME:</b>	<del>10-year Water Supply Facilities Work Plan 2020 Update</del>
<b>GENERAL LOCATION:</b>	City-wide
<b>CASE PLANNER:</b>	Lorraine Tappen