



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

Board Members	Attendance	June 2017-May 2018	
		Present	Absent
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.

2.	CASE:	R17028
	REQUEST: **	Site Plan Level III Review: Conditional Use for Convenience Store within Shopping Center in Northwest Regional Activity Center (NW-RAC)
	APPLICANT:	Andrews Project Development, LLC.
	PROJECT NAME:	Progresso Commons
	GENERAL LOCATION:	947 N Andrews Avenue
	ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	Lots 1 and 48, less the north 15 feet of said lots; and lots 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, in Block 209, of Progresso, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 2, Page 18, of the public records of Miami-Dade County, Florida; said lands situate, lying and being in Broward County, Florida.
	ZONING DISTRICT:	Northwest Regional Activity Center – Mixed Use Northeast (NWRAC-MUne)
	LAND USE:	Northwest Regional Activity Center (NW-RAC)
	COMMISSION DISTRICT:	2 – Steve Glassman
	CASE PLANNER:	Nicholas Kalargyros

Continued from the March 21, 2018 Agenda

3.	CASE:	V18004
	REQUEST: **	Vacation of Right-of-Way: 15-Foot Alley Reservation
	APPLICANT:	Andrews Project Development, LLC.
	PROJECT NAME:	Progresso Commons Alley West
	GENERAL LOCATION:	East of NW 2nd Avenue, south of W Sunrise Boulevard, west of NW 1st Avenue and north of NW 9th Street
	ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	A Portion Of The 15 Foot Wide Alley Dedication Lying Within The Following Described Lots In Block 209, "Progresso", According To The Plat Thereof, As Recorded In Plat Book 2, Page 18, Of The Public Records Of Dade County, Florida
	ZONING DISTRICT:	Northwest Regional Activity Center – Mixed Use northeast (NWRAC-MUne)
	LAND USE:	Northwest Regional Activity Center (NW-RAC)
	COMMISSION DISTRICT:	2 – Steven Glassman
	CASE PLANNER:	Nicholas Kalargyros

4. CASE:	V18005
REQUEST: **	Vacation of Right-of-Way: 15-Foot Alley Reservation
APPLICANT:	Andrews Project Development, LLC.
PROJECT NAME:	Progresso Alley East
GENERAL LOCATION:	East of NW 1st Avenue, south of W Sunrise Boulevard, west of N Andrews Avenue and north of NW 9th Street
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	A Portion Of The 15 Foot Wide Alley Dedication Lying Within The Following Described Lots In Block 210, "Progresso", According To The Plat Thereof, As Recorded In Plat Book 2, Page 18, Of The Public Records Of Dade County, Florida
ZONING DISTRICT:	Northwest Regional Activity Center – Mixed Use northeast (NWRAC-MUne)
LAND USE:	Northwest Regional Activity Center (NW-RAC)
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	2 – Steven Glassman
CASE PLANNER:	Nicholas Kalargyros

Disclosures were made at this time.

Debbie Orshefsky, representing the Applicant, recalled that the project has previously come before the Planning and Zoning Board. The subject parcel has been vacant for some time and was recently cleared by the owner/developer. A small adjacent parcel with two buildings includes existing uses and is considered a transitional area.

The Site Plan is for a unified shopping center anchored by an Aldi supermarket and including a Wawa restaurant. At an early community meeting, representatives of the Progresso Village Civic Association requested that a sit-down restaurant be included on the site. One freestanding building will be able to accommodate both a restaurant and some retail uses. The resulting corner property development is intended to create a more pedestrian-friendly neighborhood.

The Aldi and Wawa will have two entrances from roadways, which allows for circulation throughout the site. There are also plans for internal pedestrian circulation areas with landscaping and pavers. The site will include connectivity to sidewalks, which will be enlarged to 10 ft. in width. The Applicant also plans to provide additional sidewalks.

Mr. Tinter observed that the Site Plan seems to respond to comments made when the Applicant came before the Board some time ago to seek vacation. He asked if the plat has already been approved by the County. Ms. Orshefsky advised it is currently in process, as the City Commission has not given approval until all vacations were complete.

Mr. Tinter expressed concern with plans for a 31 ft. throw from the right-of-way line to the first aisle of the parking lot, noting that the typical requirement is for 50 ft. He added

that there are also concerns regarding a driveway entrance from Andrews Avenue, which he felt may be redundant due to the other entrances. He concluded that he was also concerned with the channelization of some of the property's entrances and exits onto the roadways.

Ms. Orshefsky advised that the Applicant's team worked closely with the Department of Transportation and Mobility regarding the entrance from Andrews Avenue. A traffic study was conducted to review this issue, and the Department was comfortable maintaining the extra driveway due to site circulation. Mr. Tinter commented that the Board members were not provided with a copy of this study.

Ms. Orshefsky continued that while the Applicant sought to eliminate a turn lane on Sunrise Boulevard, it was eventually allowed to remain. Mike Troxell, also representing the Applicant, submitted a letter of no objection from Broward County regarding plat review. Where the letter requires 25 ft. of distance on Sunrise Boulevard between the non-vehicular access line and the first parking space or interior drive aisle, the Applicant has provided 31 ft.

Mr. Troxell also addressed concerns regarding channelization, stating that neither Broward County nor the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) requires the Applicant to include channelization for any of its driveways. Mr. Tinter pointed out that the County's plat restricted the property to a right turn in/right turn out only. Ms. Orshefsky replied that the Applicant will review channelization as part of the final Development Review Committee (DRC) process to determine whether or not it interferes with truck access to the site. If the County approves, the Applicant will further discuss the possibility of channelization.

Mr. Cohen asked where trucks serving the supermarket will enter and exit the property. Ms. Orshefsky replied that they will enter from NW 2nd Avenue and back into the property. Turning movement sheets have been provided. Garbage pickup for the planned restaurant is likely to have access from Andrews Avenue.

Nicholas Kalargyros, representing Urban Design and Planning, stated that the Applicant requests conditional use approval for a multi-purpose convenience store within a shopping center in the Northwest Regional Activity Center (RAC). The project is known as Progresso Commons and will include three tenants in its buildings. The request is subject to ULDR criteria regarding liquor and convenience stores, conditional use, adequacy requirements, and design standard applicability.

Prior to tonight's presentation, the project has come before the Planning and Zoning Board multiple times for plat approval, right-of-way vacation, and rezoning. The City Commission has approved the rezoning request, although the plat and right-of-way vacation has not yet come before the Commission for approval. The Applicant has obtained a variance from the Board of Adjustment (BOA) regarding the distance requirements between automotive service stations and parks.

Convenience store multi-purpose use may be permitted within the Northwest RAC, subject to the approval of a conditional use permit. Criteria for conditional use include the following:

- Development must be located within a shopping center with a minimum of 25,000 sq. ft. gross floor area and at least three different commercial establishments
- Contains an area devoted to the preparation, service, consumption, and sale of fresh or freshly prepared food and sale of automotive fuel with fuel pumps, but does not offer automotive repair
- Impact on abutting properties is evaluated under neighborhood compatibility requirements, including consideration for access and adjacent roadway capacity, traffic generation characteristics
- Applicant must show that the location of the use or structure is not in conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan
- Off- or on-site conditions exist to reduce the impact of permitting the use or structure
- Location of the use in proximity to similar uses does not affect the character of the zoning district in which the use is located or affect the health and safety of adjacent properties

Mr. Kalargyros continued that the impact of the site's water and wastewater utilities on public facilities will be provided by the City. A capacity letter from the Public Works Department identified additional demand on these services, which is expected to increase, as the site is currently vacant.

The site contains three direct vehicular access points: one from Sunrise Boulevard and two from Andrews Avenue. Additional access from Sunrise Boulevard is provided via NW 2nd Avenue, which reaches a dead end prior to the residential neighborhood to the south.

Parking requirements in the Northwest RAC may be reduced to 60% of required parking for a project. This resulted in a required amount of 164 spaces. The Applicant proposes to include 250 spaces as well as additional bicycle parking.

The project is located within the Northwest Progresso-Flagler Heights Redevelopment Plan Area and meets this area's goal of reducing blight by using City design guidelines and development standards unique to the area. These standards affect building orientation, architectural requirements, open space, vehicular and pedestrian access, building materials, active ground floor uses, and streetscape design. The Applicant will encourage multimodal transportation methods in order to reduce the effects of traffic. These methods include installation of bus shelters, well-defined access points, and bicycle parking. Internal connectivity exists between the uses within the project.

The Applicant has provided a public participation summary reflecting meetings held in January 2018. Mr. Kalargyros noted that additional extensive public participation

meetings were held to offer the neighborhood an opportunity to learn about and make suggestions for the proposed project. The Progresso Village Civic Association provided a letter of support for the proposed development. Staff recommends approval of the request.

Mr. Tinter noted that a pedestrian signal on Sunrise Boulevard is being eliminated by FDOT, and asked if construction of the turn lanes would be coordinated with the removal of this signal. Ms. Orshefsky confirmed that coordination would occur.

Ms. Golub asked what changes were made by the Applicant to turn the project into a shopping center, pointing out that there are no plans that bring the three buildings together. Mr. Kalargyros replied that the ULDR defines a shopping center as "a group of commercial establishments, planned, developed, owned, and managed as a unit, with common off-street parking, meeting the total requirements of [ULDR] 47-20, Parking and Loading Requirements, on property related in the location, size, [and] type of shops to the trade area it serves, and using a common name." He concluded that Staff feels the proposed project fits within this definition.

Ms. Golub addressed multimodal transportation, pointing out that bicycle racks and a bus stop may not be useful amenities for a gas station and a grocery store. Mr. Kalargyros advised that the property's entrances face the primary streets, which provides easier access for pedestrians and bus riders to reach the amenities. He further clarified that the convenience store will be allowed to sell alcohol.

Ms. Golub continued that the plans for the project do not include glazing or "eyes on the street" from the parcel's structures. She was not certain that the project met the definitions for this consideration or for multimodal transportation, in addition to her concerns regarding neighborhood compatibility and the definition of a shopping center.

Ms. Parker advised that Staff worked closely with the Applicant, as they recognized that the planned uses for the site, as well as the location within an RAC, have requirements that make it difficult to implement urban design solutions. The intent was to create a corner project that accommodates the planned uses' need for storage as well as the activity within the buildings. The perimeter of the parcel follows an urban form and edge, which Staff felt meet the required criteria.

Ms. Golub requested further clarification of plans for the improved pedestrian walkway. Mr. Kalargyros stated that the site includes two bus stop locations, which are connected to the sidewalks on Andrews Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard.

Ms. Fertig addressed the letter of availability for water/wastewater utility, requesting that future letters of this nature reflect a recent study citing reduction of this capacity. She expressed concern that capacity may be overestimated for future developments if this is not corrected.

Mr. Kalargyros reported that the Applicant also requests vacations of two separate 15 ft. wide portions of public right-of-way reserved for an alley, although there are no alleys in the reserved areas. The vacations had been reserved for parcels previously secured for proposed development. Right-of-way vacations are subject to the following criteria:

- Right-of-way or other public space is no longer needed for public purpose
- Alternative routes, if needed, are available and create no adverse effects for surrounding areas
- Closure of the right-of-way provides a safe area for vehicles to turn around and exit the area
- Closure of the right-of-way shall not adversely affect pedestrian traffic
- All utilities located within the right-of-way or other public space have been or will be relocated, and owner(s) of utility franchise(s) has consented to the vacation; or utilities easement has been retained over the right-of-way area; or an easement in a different location has been provided for the utilities to the satisfaction of the City, and utilities maintenance shall not be disrupted

The Applicant has provided letters of no objection from the utility providers as well as the City. Staff concurs with their assessment and recommends approval of the vacations with the following conditions:

- Any City infrastructure, known or unknown, and found to be within the vacated area shall be relocated at the expense of the Applicant, and the relocated facilities shall be required to be inspected and accepted by the City's Public Works Department
- Any other utility infrastructure, known or unknown, and found to be within the vacated area shall be relocated at the expense of the Applicant, and the relocated facilities shall be required to be inspected and accepted by the utility agency and service provider
- Vacating Ordinance shall be in full force and effect on the date the certificate executed by the City Engineer is recorded in the public record of Broward County, Florida; the certificate shall state that all conditions of vacation have been met, and a copy of the recorded certificate must be provided to the City

Mr. Tinter asked if the Applicant is requesting half of the right-of-way of the southern portion of the alley. Mr. Kalargyros confirmed that the Applicant is requesting 7.5 ft. of this right-of-way. The other half will not be vacated as part of the Application.

Ms. Golub asked if the Applicant has submitted a unified management contract or assured the City that such a contract will be in effect. Mr. Kalargyros advised that the Applicant has provided documentation showing that the property will be owned and managed by a single entity.

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

Jerry Carter, private citizen, stated that the surrounding neighborhood has concerns related to the traffic moving south from Sunrise Boulevard to Sistrunk Boulevard when the train gates are lowered. He pointed out that this could affect traffic attempting to leave the subject property's parking lot. He also expressed concern that Wawa is not a business at which grocery shopping is typically done. He concluded that he is also concerned with the bus shelter on the corner of S Federal Highway and 17th Street, which he characterized as an eyesore that would be inconsistent with the proposed development.

Ron Centamore, President of the Progresso Village Civic Association, advised that the proposed project came before both the Association's board of directors and its general membership more than once, and was approved each time it was presented. The Association was in favor of the redevelopment plan, although he was not aware of why its configuration was that of a U-shaped or L-shaped "strip center."

Mr. Centamore continued that the developer has accommodated the Association's concerns, including that the restaurant not include a drive-through facility and that its south end include a wall to prevent pedestrian traffic onto the site from back streets. The Association also asked that the Applicant provide lamp posts that match those in the surrounding area. He concluded that the neighborhood is in favor of the proposed grocery store and gas station.

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.

Ms. Orshefsky addressed the concerns raised during public comment, stating that the Applicant conducted a thorough traffic analysis for the project. Traffic professionals determined that turn lanes on the major roadways would be necessary to move traffic into and out of the site in an appropriate manner. She also noted that the surrounding neighborhood has struggled to attract investment. A management team will oversee the site, and each of the businesses has its own management and on-site security if necessary to address the challenges presented by the neighborhood, including an affirmative approach to the homeless population.

Mr. Heidelberger commented that while he had not been in favor of previous plans for the site, significant changes have been made since that time. He acknowledged that the Site Plan is very complicated and may involve a great deal of movement, particularly in the parking area during peak business hours.

Motion made by Mr. Heidelberger that the plan, as presented, be approved with any changes or additions.

Ms. Parker requested that the **motion** clarify any conditions of approval.

Mr. Tinter requested that the following **amendment** be attached to the **motion**: to channelize the driveways on Andrews Avenue to restrict the movements, right turn in only at the northern driveway and right turn in and out of [the] other driveway, subject to County approval. Mr. Heidelberger accepted the **amendment**.

It was noted that there were no Staff conditions attached to Item 2.

Mr. Cohen **seconded** the **amended motion**. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Motion made by Ms. Golub, seconded by Mr. Cohen, to approve [Item 3] subject to Staff conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Motion made by Mr. Tinter, seconded by Mr. Cohen, to approve Item 4 with Staff conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

5. CASE:	V18001
REQUEST: **	Vacation of Right-of-Way: Partial Right-of-Way
APPLICANT:	195 Federal, LLC.
PROJECT NAME:	195 N Federal Right-of Way Vacation
GENERAL LOCATION:	East of NE 3rd Avenue, south of NE 2nd Street, west of N Federal Highway and north of NE 1st Street
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	The South 6.00 Feet That 16.00 Foot Additional Thoroughfare Dedication Lying Adjacent To Parcel "B", "Federal Highway And 2nd Street CBD Plat", According To The Plat Thereof, As Recorded In Plat Book 153, Page 49, Of The Public Records Of Broward County, Florida.
ZONING DISTRICT:	Downtown Regional Activity Center – Urban Village (RAC-UV)
LAND USE:	Downtown Regional Activity Center (D-RAC)
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	2 – Steven Glassman
CASE PLANNER:	Nicholas Kclargyros

Disclosures were made at this time.

Robert Lochrie, representing the Applicant, explained that the request is for the vacation of a 6 ft. portion of right-of-way along NE 2nd Street. The property's boundary line is of an odd shape, as two separate plats were done for the property over time. The existing eastern right-of-way provides for a 40 ft. right-of-way, while the western portion of the property has a right-of-way of 66 ft.

Mr. Lochrie reviewed the configuration of the site, noting that rights-of-way within the Downtown area typically vary between 40 ft. and 60 ft. under the current Downtown Master Plan. The request is for vacation of the south 6 ft. of the right-of-way adjacent to the property, which will leave the City with a 60 ft. right-of-way. The Applicant also plans

to dedicate additional right-of-way on the east back to the City. The Applicant scheduled and held a public participation meeting with the surrounding neighborhood, although there were no attendees at this meeting.

Mr. Lochrie advised that the Applicant requests a modified condition of approval for the Application. Current conditions state that even if the vacation is approved by the Planning and Zoning Board and City Commission, the vacation will not become effective until any utilities are removed from the area. The Applicant requests that this condition be revised so it becomes effective either when all utilities are removed or if an easement is granted by the Applicant for any remaining utilities. This is due to the presence of two water meters within the right-of-way, as well as overhead power lines which the Applicant wishes to place underground.

Mr. Kalargyros of Urban Design and Planning stated that the original right-of-way was dedicated when the property was platted and does not reflect the local street section in the City's Downtown Master Plan. The original right-of-way also does not extend the full length of the property, which creates an inconsistent right-of-way edge along the property line.

The Application was reviewed by the DRC in February 2018 and is subject to the following criteria:

- The right-of-way or other public purpose is no longer needed, and alternate routes, if needed, are available and do not adversely affect surrounding areas
- The closure of the right-of-way provides safe areas for vehicles to turn or exit the area and does not adversely affect pedestrian traffic
- All utilities located within the right-of-way or public space have been or will be relocated, pursuant to a Relocation Plan, and the owners of the utilities have consented to the vacation, or a utility easement has been retained over the right-of-way area, or an easement in a different location has been provided by the owner to the satisfaction of the City

The Applicant proposes to relocate the easements and vacate the portion of right-of-way in compliance with the Downtown Master Plan's design guidelines. The existing development includes connections to the roadway network via both Federal Highway and NE 2nd Street. There is no negative impact to City infrastructure or services. Staff recommends approval of the request with the following proposed conditions as amended by the Applicant:

- Any other utility infrastructure, known or unknown, and found to be within the vacated area shall be relocated at the expense of the Applicant, and the relocated facilities shall be required to be inspected and accepted by the utility agency and service provider
- Alternatively, in lieu of relocating all City utilities within the vacated area, the Applicant shall dedicate a utility easement for City utilities that remain within the vacated area; any other utility infrastructure, known or unknown, and found to be within the vacated area shall be relocated at the expense of the Applicant, and

the relocated facilities shall be required to be inspected and accepted by the applicable utility agency or service providers; or, in lieu of relocating all utilities within the vacated area, the Applicant shall dedicate a utility easement for utilities that remain within the vacated area

- Vacating Ordinance shall be in full force and effect on the date the certificate executed by the City Engineer is recorded in the public record of Broward County, Florida; the certificate shall state that all conditions of vacation have been met, and a copy of the recorded certificate must be provided to the City

Chair Maus requested clarification that the City has adopted the requested modification as proposed by the Applicant. Mr. Kalargyros confirmed that this was the case.

Mr. Tinter asked if the property must be re-platted or modified. Mr. Lochrie replied that the plat will need to be modified. The Applicant must also request the vacation through Broward County, subsequent to the City's process.

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 Ms. Golub, seconded by Ms. Scott, to approve subject to the revised conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

6. CASE:	R17042
REQUEST: **	Site Plan Level III Review; Conditional Use for 12-Story Building with 271 Multifamily Residential Units in Downtown
APPLICANT:	A.TA Flagler Village II, LLC.
PROJECT NAME:	Alta Flagler Village Phase 2
GENERAL LOCATION:	444 NE 7 th Street
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	Progresso 2-18 D Lot 36 Blk 315
ZONING DISTRICT:	Downtown Regional Activity Center – Urban Village (RAC-UV)
LAND USE:	Downtown Regional Activity Center (D-RAC)
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	2 – Steven Glassman
CASE PLANNER:	Randall Robinson

Disclosures were made at this time.

Mr. Lochrie, representing the Applicant, advised that the request is for Site Plan Review and conditional use approval. He showed an aerial map of the site, noting that approval

is requested for the second phase of a two-phase project. Phase 1 was approved in 2016 and is currently under construction.

Phase 2 is comprised of 267 residential units with a five-story parking podium and seven stories of residential use above it, totaling 12 stories in two towers. The project would be 132 ft. in height, while the maximum height in the zoning district is 150 ft. One key element of the project's use of the entire block will be a mid-block crossing, implemented at the request of both Staff and the surrounding neighborhood. The Applicant will provide a pedestrian access point and pedestrian easements through the site. All driveways for Phases 1 and 2, including entrances to the garage and loading/unloading staging areas, are contained in an internal private driveway. There are no direct driveways from any garage or other service access onto the street.

Mr. Lochrie stated that Phase 2 is consistent with the plan submitted for Phase 1: the garage is in the center of the building and is completely lined with residential units on the east, northwest, and south sides. The garage is not visible from the street. The top of the garage is landscaped with an amenity deck. The building is lined on the east and west with walk-up units, and an amenity area and main lobby entrance are positioned on the north side.

When the project was first presented, the Board had expressed concern for the amount of open space, landscaping, and plazas surrounding the plan. The building was moved back at its northeast corner to accommodate a mahogany tree, and the remainder of the project will be designed with similar features. The building will include a landscaped patio, other mahogany trees, and royal poincianas.

The garage on the 5th floor includes a façade so the facility itself cannot be seen, and the ground floor includes walk-up and amenity areas. The project's two towers, which are atop the garage, have floor plates of only 10,000 sq. ft. each, and are separated so there is light and air around the buildings. The towers are also stepped back 12 ft. on the east and west from the overall podium. A pedestrian easement will be provided along the central driveway.

Mr. Lochrie reviewed other specific features of the plan, noting that the residential towers line up with towers being constructed for the nearby Alta project. The owner has elected to break up the building to accommodate a new street and mid-block crossing. A plaza is located at ground level on the northwest corner, with a water feature, outdoor seating, rain gardens, and additional landscaping. The eastern corner has a similar treatment. A typical sidewalk section includes existing mahogany trees, planters, and outdoor seating.

The site is designed to exceed all City requirements for landscaping and open space. Where Code requires 26,700 sq. ft. of open space, the plan provides over 41,000 sq. ft. It will create 27 on-street parking spaces as well as additional parking. Where Code

requires 321 parking spaces, the project will include 376 spaces as well as storage space for 52 bicycles.

The project has been presented to the surrounding neighborhood multiple times. An original presentation was made for both Phases 1 and 2; however, in subsequent years, the Applicant met again with both the neighborhood association's board and general membership. They have received a letter of support from the Flagler Village Civic Association.

Mr. Tinter noted that the plans for Phase 2 show driveways in and out of the garage which do not line up, and asked if this could be corrected. Mr. Lochrie confirmed that the project's architects state this can be done, subject to final DRC review.

Ms. Golub asked if the developer learned anything in Phase 1 that has been incorporated into Phase 2. Mr. Lochrie replied that the developer plans more open space than is contained in other projects, including the outdoor seating area. He also cited the internal driveway as a benefit.

Randall Robinson, representing Urban Design and Planning, stated that the request is for Site Plan Level III approval, with a conditional use request for building height. Buildings over 50 ft. and up to 150 ft. in height in an RAC/urban village zoning district are subject to a conditional use permit. The review criteria are as follows:

- Impact on abutting properties is evaluated under neighborhood compatibility requirements
- Access, traffic generation, and road capabilities are addressed, as well as the number of parking spaces per dwelling unit
- Applicant must show that the following have been met:
 - Location of use or structure is not in conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan
 - Off- or on-site conditions exist which reduce the impact of permitting the use or structure
 - On-site improvements have been incorporated into the Site Plan to minimize any adverse effects that may result from permitting the use or structure
 - Location of the use in proximity to a similar use does not affect the character of the zoning district
 - There are no adverse effects of the use on the health, safety, or welfare of the adjacent properties

Staff feels the proposal meets the guidelines of the Downtown Master Plan. Mr. Robinson referred to the project's open space in particular, noting that most of the open space planned in Phase 1 was provided outside retail/restaurant uses; however, there are no such uses on Phase 2, which faces 7th Street. The intent was to create active and inviting spaces at the ground level in the absence of these uses. There are 18,869

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.	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, 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