



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, MARCH 21, 2018 – 6:30 P.M.**

Cumulative

| Board Members | Attendance | June 2017-May 2018 | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| | | Present | Absent |
| Leo Hansen, Chair (dep. 7:30) | P | 10 | 0 |
| Catherine Maus, Vice Chair | P | 9 | 1 |
| John Barranco | P | 10 | 0 |
| Brad Cohen | P | 1 | 0 |
| Howard Elfman | P | 9 | 1 |
| Mary Fertig (arr. 6:37) | P | 1 | 0 |
| Rochelle Golub | P | 9 | 1 |
| Richard Heidelberg | P | 7 | 3 |
| Alan Tinter | P | 9 | 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
- Lynn Solomon, Assistant City Attorney
- Chris Cooper, Deputy Director, Department of Sustainable Development
- Karlanne Grant, Urban Design and Planning
- Jim Hetzel, Urban Design and Planning
- Randall Robinson, Urban Design and Planning
- Mohammed Malik, Zoning Administrator
- Tricia Logan, Historic Preservation Planner
- 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.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Ms. Golub, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Ms. Golub, to defer Item #2. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Ms. Golub, to defer Item 3. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

It was clarified that Items 2 and 3 would be deferred until the next Agenda.

III. PUBLIC SIGN-IN / SWEARING-IN

Chair Hansen advised that the City Commission has clarified voting on Items before the Board in the following way: if a motion to approve an Item does not pass, this constitutes a “no” vote and the Item fails. Five members of the Board constitute a quorum. A tie vote also means the Item fails.

Chair Hansen stated that individuals representing boards or associations have five minutes to speak, while individuals representing themselves are allotted three minutes. 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. R17009** | Paul Vigil |
| 2. R17037** | Florida Power & Light |
| 3. R17028** | Andrews Project Development LLC |
| 4. 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.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| REQUEST: ** | Site Plan Level III Review: Conditional Use for 6-Unit Residential Cluster Development |
| APPLICANT: | Paul Vigil |
| PROJECT NAME: | Sailboat Bend Residential Development |
| GENERAL LOCATION: | 1017 SW 4th Street |
| ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: | Waverly Place 2-19 D Lot 7,9 Block 107 |
| ZONING DISTRICT: | Residential Multifamily Low Rise/Medium High Density (RML-25) |
| CURRENT LAND USE: | Medium-High Density |
| COMMISSION DISTRICT: | 2 |
| CASE PLANNER: | Randall Robinson |

Disclosures were made at this time.

Seth Yeslow, representing the Applicant, recalled that this Item was first brought before the Board in June 2017. It has been deferred twice since then. The Applicant has worked closely with City Staff to develop a plan based on the feedback received from the Board at that time.

Mr. Yeslow advised that the Applicant has met with the project's neighbors, including the Sailboat Bend Civic Association. The project was previously approved by the City's Historic Preservation Board and has been supported by Staff in both its current and former versions.

Ms. Fertig arrived at 6:37 p.m.

Mr. Yeslow showed a PowerPoint presentation to the Board, explaining that the Applicant chose to pursue a cluster development due to the existence of two buildings on the site. The development is intended to preserve and enhance the historic character of the area. The Applicant plans to make improvements to existing residences and develop the project in scale with current structures.

Most of the project's Site Plan, including interior and rear portions of the site, remains consistent with the previous plan. The primary change is in Building B, which has been adjusted approximately 2 ft. to the north to compensate for changes made to Building A. Where the previous Site Plan showed two side-by-side units, the footprint of Building A has been changed from 35 ft. by 45 ft. The front of the building is now a single contiguous unit. The building remains in excess of minimum required setbacks. The second unit of this building is located in the back and is now oriented east/west rather than north/south.

The main change to Building A is that it is now a two-story structure. The first floor includes a 5 ft. recessed entry feature, while the second floor now has a 5 ft. recess outside the framed elements. This provides a contiguous terrace across the front façade. The three-story element of this building now starts an additional 25 ft. back, which acts as another full front setback for a total of 50 ft. This improves the overall scale and massing of the project.

The building's architectural style has also been modified, having eliminated some of the awnings and louvers and changed the window patterns. The result is a simplified design that shows roof and eave lines lower than those on the existing historic structure. Balcony railing designs have been changed to a more historically compatible feature. Wood siding on the building's first two levels are also more compatible with the historic structures, and the third level will have a stucco finish.

Mr. Yeslow showed side elevations of the proposed buildings, as well as some of the decorative elements of the project. The rear of the building has larger window profiles to maximize natural lighting. The revised Site Plan includes a central axial walkway that meanders in and out of the buildings, with planned decorative landscaping elements. Building B's entrance has been relocated from the east side to the west so it is directly accessible from the walkway.

Mr. Tinter requested clarification of some of the amenities reflected in the Site Plan. Mr. Yeslow replied that where there were previously two grill areas, there is now an expanded amenity area within the setback. This increases the landscaped area.

Mr. Tinter also asked if the secondary entrances into some units lead into the units' bedrooms. Mr. Yeslow characterized these as flex rooms, which can serve as bedrooms if the owners wish. He added that private entrances into these rooms were part of the plan. It was also noted that there is no direct access from garages into units.

Mr. Heidelberger asked if the units will be sold or rented. Mr. Yeslow replied that the units are intended to be sold. He added that the project will have a homeowners' association that includes a maintenance agreement.

Ms. Golub asked how the project's pool areas will be protected. Mr. Yeslow advised that each of the pool deck areas have fenced enclosures and are roughly 12 to 18 in. above the ground. The fences will be 4 ft. in height and will encompass the entire area, not just the pools. Mechanical elements, including an external compressor, will be accessible via panels on the decks.

Ms. Golub also noted that no sidewalks are provided on the site. Mr. Yeslow stated that the Applicant consulted with Staff and the City's Transportation Master Plan for the area. Due to the historic character of the neighborhood, there are no plans for any public sidewalks to be constructed. An open sidewalk connects to the project's parking spaces. Ms. Golub observed that sidewalks are typically required on the perimeters of cluster

developments. Randall Robinson, representing Urban Design and Planning, explained that a 5 ft. access easement is required so properties may be maintained.

Ms. Golub also addressed parking, noting that the Site Plan states three spaces are available to the historic structures. Mr. Yeslow responded that two spots are available to historic residents, while the existing one-story cottage in the northeast corner of the site has one required space. Code requires two spaces per unit in the garage.

Mr. Robinson stated that the request is for Site Plan Level III approval for a six-unit cluster development in the Sailboat Bend neighborhood. It will consist of three three-story residential buildings with two units each. The site currently includes an existing two-story single-family residential structure and a one-story accessory cottage. Both are designated historic structures. A free-standing one-story garage on the site will be demolished as part of the project. The Applicant proposes to construct units between the single-family residential building and the accessory cottage.

The project was reviewed by the Development Review Committee (DRC) in February 2017 and all comments have been addressed. It was also reviewed by the Historic Preservation Board in June 2017. On June 21, 2017, the Planning and Zoning Board reviewed the Application and voted unanimously to defer the Item. Their concerns at the time were as follows:

- The existing two-story structure seemed to be overcrowded by the proposed infill
- The proposed structure heights of three stories did not appear to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood or the existing two-story structure on the site
- There appeared to be insufficient space for circulation around the historic two-story residence, and circulation throughout the site appeared “confusing”
- The existing structures on-site were more indicative of a “cracker” style rather than the previously proposed West Indies style and did not seem to be compatible with surrounding structures in the historic district

Changes were subsequently made to the Site Plan to address the Board’s concerns.

Review criteria for cluster developments are as follows:

- A cluster development is defined as one or more clustered buildings and associated amenities located on the same development site
- Lot requirements, density, access and entrance, and yard and setback requirements meet or exceed the requirements of the RML-25 zoning district

The proposed concept incorporates a typical single-family residence while creating a pedestrian-friendly environment. Its architectural features match those of existing structures. The Applicant proposes to build the units between the single-family structure and the accessory cottage while retaining these historic buildings. Staff feels the proposal is generally consistent with the height and scale of the building types in the vicinity of the project.

Mr. Tinter commented that the total site is 17,500 sq. ft., and each unit of a cluster development is supposed to have 2500 sq. ft. of land; however, a portion of the 17,500 sq. ft. is dedicated to the existing historic structures. If this area were eliminated, the six units would not fit onto the subject parcel. Mr. Robinson replied that the proposal was deemed acceptable because the Applicant is retaining and rehabilitating the two on-site historic structures. Staff viewed the site as having six units, although there are actually seven units on the property.

Mr. Tinter continued that there are only 10 ft. between Units 4 and 6, with the front door of the smaller unit facing the three-story larger unit. He felt the buildings would have required a more significant setback if a property line divided them. Mr. Robinson stated that the Applicant feels this will be acceptable to residents of the development. Ms. Parker added that while density would allow up to 10 units on the lot, only 6 units are proposed in addition to the preservation of historic buildings.

Mr. Tinter reiterated that the requirement for 2500 sq. ft. per building in a cluster development cannot be met while preserving the land for the historic buildings. He also addressed the entrance requirements as described in the Applicant's narrative, which state that any building façade facing a public right-of-way shall be considered the front façade for those units and must include those units' principal entrances, and pointed out that this does not apply to Unit 5, which faces a 10 ft. alley. Mr. Robinson advised that this was also an adjustment that would allow development to occur on the site with two existing historic buildings.

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

Michael Rizzo, private citizen, stated that he was in favor of the project, which he felt would benefit the Sailboat Bend neighborhood.

Ely Benuim, private citizen, advised that he is a realtor who appreciates the Sailboat Bend area and felt new development would help the neighborhood and maintain its charm.

It was noted that neither Mr. Rizzo nor Mr. Benuim were residents of Sailboat Bend.

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

Ms. Parker clarified that the project must go before the Historic Preservation Board once more so that Board may review its revisions.

Mr. Tinter observed that if five units were constructed on the site rather than six, many of the concerns he had raised could be addressed, including the 2500 sq. ft. per unit

requirement, greater separation between units, grouping of amenities, and frontage of Unit 5.

Ms. Golub also expressed concern that there are too many units on the property, pointing out that the backout parking on the site contributes to a lack of sidewalks in the area.

Mr. Barranco noted that the Applicant has addressed most of the Board's concerns from the June 2017 meeting while preserving historic buildings and ensuring circulation. He felt smaller details could be easily resolved through the City's Building Department.

Ms. Fertig commented that she would have expected the project to go before the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) once again before coming to the Planning and Zoning Board. Chair Hansen agreed that he would have liked to hear the HPB's comments prior to tonight's meeting. Ms. Parker recalled that the Item was brought before Planning and Zoning first because this Board had raised specific concerns with the project, but could be brought back to Planning and Zoning following a hearing by the HPB if that is the Board's desire.

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Mr. Tinter, to defer to a time after the HPB has had an opportunity to review the project. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 5-4 (Mr. Barranco, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Elfman, and Mr. Heidelbergger dissenting).

Zoning Administrator Mohammed Malik addressed the square footage requirements cited by Mr. Tinter during discussion of Item 1, explaining that Staff determined the two historic units were not considered as part of the site's overall size because they are existing nonconforming units. He confirmed that the requirement for 2500 sq. ft. per unit does exist for cluster developments if the nonconforming nature is not taken into consideration.

Mr. Tinter asserted that if the two historic structures were not considered, the fenced area around these buildings would still be less than 2500 sq. ft. Ms. Parker replied that Staff would clarify this aspect further when the Item is presented to the Board again in the future. In the absence of the two historic structures, the lot size would allow for the construction of 10 units.

Chair Hansen left the meeting at 7:30 p.m. Vice Chair Maus assumed the position of Chair at this time.

4. CASE:

T18002

REQUEST: *

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

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| APPLICANT: | City of Fort Lauderdale |
| PROJECT NAME: | Compact and Motorcycle/ Scooter Parking Standards |
| GENERAL LOCATION: | City-Wide |
| CASE PLANNER: | Karlanne Grant |

Karlanne Grant, representing Urban Design and Planning, showed a PowerPoint presentation to the Board, explaining that the proposed Text Amendment addresses compact and motorcycle/scooter parking while ensuring safety, efficiency, and convenience for vehicles and pedestrians.

Past policies regarding compact parking allowed up to 35% of required parking to be compact parking, with dimensions of 7 ft. 6 in. x 15 ft. The provision currently in Code, however, only allows for compact vehicles within Regional Activity Centers (RACs), the City Center, and the Arts/Science Center. Staff has conducted research to determine the average compact parking requirements across the nation, which show that only a few cities of similar scale to Fort Lauderdale prohibit compact parking. In some Downtown areas, up to 100% of parking may be compact parking.

In a dense urban core area, where parking garages are a primary means to accommodate parking, Staff hopes to offer the flexibility of compact parking spaces to help resolve difficult design standards, such as the positioning of columns within parking facilities. Ms. Grant reviewed statistics from 2008-2018, noting that cars have remained nearly the same size during this time frame. Within a less dense area, the implementation of compact parking would allow for more landscaping and possible assistance with pervious areas. Staff research also determined that some cities would allow for motorcycle/scooter parking to be part of the parking requirements.

Staff proposes that compact parking spaces retain the same width as standard parking, which is 8 ft. 8 in.; however, the depth of these spaces would be reduced from 18 ft. to 15 ft. For motorcycle parking, off-street spaces would split the size of a standard parking space in half, allowing for two motorcycle spaces. For on-street spaces, motorcycle/scooter parking would be perpendicular to the curb, which could provide five to six spaces.

If approved by the Board, the proposed Amendment would go before the City Commission for first reading in May or June 2018.

Ms. Golub asked if the City plans to retain the 35% rule for compact spaces. Ms. Grant confirmed this, further explaining that motorcycle parking would be counted toward parking requirements for any use; however, the inclusion of motorcycle or scooter parking itself would not be a parking requirement. Mr. Mohammed Malik, Zoning Administrator characterized this as a voluntary requirement which would benefit

developers, as a single standard parking space could now be made into two motorcycle spaces.

Ms. Grant further clarified that a developer may not take more than a certain percentage of required parking spaces and use them for motorcycle/scooter parking. There is a maximum of 10 off-street motorcycle spaces for any non-residential use. Only up to six standard parking spaces may be converted for motorcycle parking.

Mr. Tinter commented that he was not in favor of the 15 ft. depth of the proposed spaces, as approximately 85% of cars are 17 ft. 2 in. in size. He asked if Staff has conducted research regarding how many vehicles currently on the road would fit into a 15 ft. parking space. He also pointed out that vehicles other than "smart cars" may try to fit into compact spaces, resulting in significant extension past their boundaries.

Benjamin Restrepo, representing the Department of Transportation and Mobility, advised that the compact car market constitutes 16% of North American car sales. Subcompact cars are smaller than 14 ft. in length. He estimated that the total market for both sizes may be as high as 21%. Mr. Tinter reiterated that most compact cars have lengths so close to 15 ft. that they would not fit comfortably into 15 ft. spaces.

Mr. Restrepo advised that the Board may amend the proposal to make the length of spaces 16 ft. if they wish; however, he noted that the Amendment is aimed at compact and subcompact vehicles rather than mid-sized cars. Part of its intent is to incentivize residents to purchase smaller cars in recognition of environmental needs.

Mr. Tinter recommended that the requirement for compact parking spaces be lowered from 35% to 10% in recognition of the compact market share. Mr. Restrepo replied that he would not want to decrease this percentage below 16% and would encourage the Board to round this figure to 20%, which is consistent with neighboring cities such as Pompano Beach.

Ms. Fertig also felt the current 35% rule is too high, and encouraged Staff to determine a percentage that will include motorcycle/scooter spaces as well.

Mr. Elfman did not feel provision of more compact spaces was an incentive to the public to drive smaller cars, and requested further clarification of how motorcycle spaces would count toward parking requirements. Ms. Grant explained that for a 1000 ft. retail space, the current requirement is for one parking space for every 250 sq. ft. The motorcycle spaces would count toward this requirement at the discretion of the developer. She added that this could help smaller businesses that might otherwise have to appear before the Board to request a parking reduction for a very few spaces.

Vice Chair Maus expressed concern that a developer might choose to manipulate the Amendment by dividing standard spaces into motorcycle/scooter spaces. Ms. Grant pointed out that only one compact space for every 10 standard spaces, with a cap of

six, could be converted. She also characterized the Amendment as an incentive for developers seeking a change of use.

Mr. Heidelberger asked if the Amendment would establish any type of administrative action from Code Enforcement if people with standard-sized cars park in compact spaces that do not fit them properly. Mr. Malik replied that Code Enforcements may issue tickets to cars that extend beyond compact spaces. Mr. Heidelberger noted, however, that in a private parking lot, there would be no repercussions for vehicles larger than compact spaces.

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

Courtney Crush, private citizen, stated that most commercial builders expect to be able to include a percentage of compact car parking. Residential builders, particularly those who target millennials, are also looking at this trend, which could make garages smaller and provide more space for landscaping.

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

Ms. Fertig recommended that Staff conduct further research to determine the number of compact vehicles driven, as well as demographic information about the drivers, before amending Code. She also felt the 10% allowance of motorcycle spaces was too much. She concluded that the Item should be deferred pending additional research on the appropriate number of spaces for both compact vehicles and motorcycles/scooters.

Motion made by Ms. Fertig, seconded by Mr. Elfman, to defer until the research is done.

Vice Chair Maus agreed that the Board needs more information on the Item, and suggested that Staff consider adjusting its figures; however, she felt this could be done before the Item is addressed by the City Commission. Mr. Tinter added that Staff's proposed research should include information on the dimensions required for compact parking by other cities.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-2 (Vice Chair Maus and Mr. Cohen dissenting).

Ms. Parker clarified that the Item would be deferred until the May 16, 2018 meeting.

V. COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION


None.

VI. FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

Ms. Golub requested additional clarification regarding voting procedures, asking if the Board may now frame a motion to disapprove a project rather than only to approve it. Assistant City Attorney Shari Wallen advised that the Board may vote to deny or disapprove an Item. Staff is working to prepare a Resolution that will further clarify this issue.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 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.]