



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**DRAFT
VIRTUAL MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
MARINE ADVISORY BOARD
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 2021 – 6:00 P.M.**

		Cumulative Attendance May 2021 – April 2022	
Grant Henderson, Chair	P	4	0
Ed Strobel, Vice Chair	P	4	0
Deirdre Boling-Lewis	P	3	1
Robyn Chiarelli	P	2	2
Bob Denison	A	2	1
Barry Flanigan	P	3	1
Richard Graves	A	1	3
James Harrison	P	4	0
Rose Ann Lovell	P	3	1
Kitty McGowan (arr. 6:01)	P	3	1
Norbert McLaughlin	P	4	0
Ted Morley	P	3	1
Noelle Norvell	P	1	0
Christopher Rotella	P	4	0
Steve Witten	P	4	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 Tom Capano, Fort Lauderdale Police Department
Officer Paul Kelly, Fort Lauderdale Police Department
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

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

II. Approval of Minutes – July 1, 2021

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

middle of the pier. Further research determined that the subject slip is located on the end. The Surf Club objected to this, as the 2017 agreement was that slips #1 and #6 "would never be touched."

Steve Farrell, Applicant, stated that he was not attempting to extend the dock or the boat slip, but to place a lift within the four corners of the existing slip. He was not aware of or party to any agreement between neighboring properties and the developer. Other slips in the unit have already been sold. He emphasized that the property was not in a No Wake Zone. The boat that would be placed on the requested lift has not yet been purchased.

Mr. Amos stated that the notice he had received indicated a change in the length of the slip from 25 ft. to 40 ft. Ms. Engle clarified that the slip is 48 ft. from the seawall and 12 ft. wide. The slip's size is not changing; however, because the City has placed a limitation on how far into the waterway structures may be installed, the Application had included an illustration of where the 25 ft mark is located within the Applicant's slip.

Mr. McLaughlin asked to see the Site Plan and the location of slips 1 through 6. Ms. Engle reiterated that slip #6 is 40 ft. by 12 ft. and located on the south side, which is closest to the Surf Club. Slips 2, 3, 4, and 5 are larger slips and slip 1 is located to the north. There is no request to increase the size of slip #6, and no boat is currently docked in that slip.

Ms. Engle noted that boat slip #6 will be roughly 8 ft. landward of slip #5, which places it closer to the dock. Mr. McLaughlin concluded that slip #6 did not seem to constitute a navigational hazard, as it is closer to the upland than some other slips to which the neighboring property owners had no objection. No mooring piles are planned beyond the boat lift.

As there were no other 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. Witten, seconded by Ms. Lovell, to approve. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously. (Ms. Chiarelli was not present for the vote.)

VIII. Dock Permit – 1516 Ponce De Leon Drive / William & Ethel McIntyre

Mr. Chappell and Ms. Robbins, representing the Applicants, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the Application, which requests private use of public property. A new seawall has been constructed in the Rio Vista neighborhood, which meant residents had to remove their docks. The City is requesting that approval for the replacement of these docks come before the Board.

Ms. Robbins explained that the Applicants' property is located to the right of a public right-of-way. She showed photos of the new seawall in the subject area and aerial views

of the subject property. The Applicant previously had a marginal dock and floating dock to accommodate their 40 ft. vessel. These were removed due to the Cordova Road seawall project.

Ms. Robbins also showed the 5 ft. side yard setback of the Applicants' property, which is required for their zoning district. Their dock area is permitted to extend from one side yard setback line to the other. The new sheet pile seawall is 79.6 linear ft. in length. The Applicants request private use of public property abutting waterways for the installation of a 400 sq. ft. concrete marginal dock that is 50 ft. in length and 8 ft. wide, as well as the installation of a 20 ft. by 6 ft. floating dock with a 3 ft. by 16 ft. ramp.

Justifications of private use of public property include:

- All structures and piles will not exceed 30% of the waterway width
- Applicant previously had an existing marginal and floating dock and would like to install the new structures in the same configuration

The Applicants propose to adhere to the Cordova Road landscaping plan from the public swale area to their proposed marginal and floating docks. They have received two letters of support from adjacent property owners to the north and south. Other private uses of public property are and/or were permitted within the vicinity.

Mr. Morley asked how the new docks would be mounted, pointing out that they cannot be affixed to the new seawall. Mr. Chappell advised that there are two sets of piles which support the entire structure. The area between the seawall cap and the dock will include an expansion joint that can be removed if necessary in the future.

Mr. Morley advised that it is very important for households that make private use of public property to meet the City's requirement of landscaping between the roadway and the seawall cap.

Mr. Harrison asked if there are any concepts of stairs or a ramp for the seawall cap on the roadway side. Mr. Chappell replied that the Applicant does not yet have a design for this step, but pointed out that the distance is roughly 1.5 ft. from the ground elevation to the top of the cap. He estimated that this would be a wooden step up to the cap and over to the dock.

At Mr. Chappell's request, Mr. Cuba agreed to forward the step design proposed by another property to the Applicants, as it was both aesthetically pleasing and safe.

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 Vice Chair Strobel, seconded by Mr. Harrison, to approve as is. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously. (Ms. Chiarelli was not present for the vote.)