



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**DRAFT
MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MARINE ADVISORY BOARD
VIRTUAL MEETING
THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 2021- 6:00 P.M.**

Cumulative Attendance May 2021 – April 2022			
Grant Henderson, Chair	P	2	0
Ed Strobel, Vice Chair	P	2	0
Cliff Berry II	P	2	0
Deirdre Boling-Lewis	A	1	1
Robyn Chiarelli	A	1	1
Barry Flanigan	P	1	1
Richard Graves	P	1	1
James Harrison	P	2	0
Rose Ann Lovell	P	2	0
Kitty McGowan	P	2	0
Norbert McLaughlin	P	2	0
Ted Morley	P	2	0
Christopher Rotella	P	2	0
Bill Walker	P	2	0
Steve Witten	P	2	0

As of this date, there are 15 appointed members to the Board, which means 8 would constitute a quorum.

Staff

Andrew Cuba, Marine Facilities Manager
Jonathan Luscomb, Marine Facilities Supervisor
Sergeant Todd Mills, Fort Lauderdale Police Department
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

No

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Henderson called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and roll was called.

II. Approval of Minutes – May 6, 2021

Motion made by Mr. Morley, seconded by Mr. Walker, to approve the minutes from the May 6 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Morley, seconded by Ms. Lovell, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 13-0.

VIII. Dock Waiver – 1801 SE 21st Avenue / Craig Michael & Debra Heslin

Mr. Chappell, representing the Applicant, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the Application, explaining that the subject property is located on the Intracoastal Waterway. It currently has an existing wooden finger pier, an L dock, and mooring piles. The Applicants' property line extends 70 ft. into the waterway.

Mr. Chappell advised that the City Attorney asked that this Application be brought back before the Board, although they received a previous Resolution of support in 2011. The Applicants do not plan to increase the length of the dock, but hope to add a section to create a larger finger pier. The navigable channel is 54.9 ft. from the property line. The waiver request is for 40 ft. Letters of support have been provided for the Applicant.

Chair Henderson asked if the Applicants had added more pilings to the existing structures. Mr. Chappell replied that the number of pilings did not change: the only change is "filling in the L" of the dock. The waterway is 100 ft. across at the subject property. The structures are outside the channel's right-of-way and turning area for cruise ships. The boat needs to be moored perpendicularly in order to avoid high waves caused by boat traffic, particularly on weekends.

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

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

IX. Dock Waiver – 9 Hendricks Isle / Allan and Michelle Sincich

Ms. Robbins, representing the Applicant, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the Application, which requests installation of a four-post boat lift that would extend 43.4 ft. from the property line. An existing marginal dock on the property is 27 ft. wide with a finger pier. The lift would require a waiver of 18.4 ft. to lift a 32 ft. boat. She reviewed the locations of other waivers and boat lifts in the area, noting that the Applicant has obtained all necessary state and County environmental permits. Neighbors of the property have provided letters of support.

Extraordinary circumstances include:

- Extension will not exceed 30% of the width of the waterway
- Extension will not impede navigation, as there are mooring piles approximately 80 ft. from the property line
- The lift is necessary to safely moor the Applicants' vessels

- The boat lift will allow for light penetration to and protection of natural resources
- Perpendicular mooring is the only option on the marginal dock

Mr. Morley asked if the finger pier and moorings were installed after receiving a waiver. Ms. Robbins replied that she could find no record of waivers for the finger pier, moorings, or structures at other homes; however, if these were approved more than 20 years ago, they may not be on file. The boat would be moored bow-in. Another 8 ft. would be required if the boat were to be moored bow-out.

Vice Chair Strobel advised that the Board's purview in this case is only the boat lift, and not the vessel itself.

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

Motion made by Ms. Lovell, seconded by Mr. Witten, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Flanigan suggested that consideration of the purchase of a larger boat did not constitute an extraordinary circumstance. Mr. Chappell replied that there is no clear definition of what constitutes extraordinary circumstances.

X. Old / New Business

Mr. Cuba recalled that the Board's communication to the City Commission from the May 6, 2021 meeting came before the City Commission at their June 1 meeting. The communication had addressed the Riverwalk extension and the possibility of dockage at the Ikon site. He and Mr. Flanigan had been in attendance at the meeting, where the Commission and the head of the City's Department of Sustainable Development responded that they were unaware of any dockage at the subject location.

Mr. Cuba continued that it was also expressed to the Commission that in addition to concerns regarding dockage, the Board had recommended the addition of fencing and signage along the edge of the dock, as specified in the permit. There was little discussion of this issue by the Commission, although he had emphasized the Board's concerns.

Mr. Harrison stated that he was also disappointed in the lack of Commission discussion on this issue. He noted that the Board's communication may have buried the request to erect fencing and signage to discourage people from climbing onto the dock. He suggested that a second communication may be necessary to reinforce this concern, as he did not feel the Board should let the issue go.