

**APPROVED MEETING MINUTES
 SPECIAL REZONING MEETING
 CENTRAL CITY REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD (CCRAB)
 CITY HALL
 100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
 COMMISSION CHAMBERS
 FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
 WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2018 – 6:00 PM**

September 2018 – August 2019

REGULAR MEETINGS

SPECIAL MEETINGS

Board Members

		<u>PRESENT</u>	<u>ABSENT</u>		<u>PRESENT</u>	<u>ABSENT</u>
Justin Greenbaum (chair)	P	1	0		1	0
Mark Antonelli (vice chair)	P	1	0		1	0
Pieter Coetzee	A	0	1		0	1
Alex Karamanoglou	A	0	1		0	1
Peter Kosinski	P	1	0		1	0
Laxmi Lalwani	P	1	1		1	0
Colleen Lockwood	A	0	0		0	1
Theodore Spiliotes	P	1	0		1	0
Zachary Talbot	P	1	0		1	0
Ray Thrower	P	1	0		1	0
Danella Williams	P	1	0		1	0

At this time, there are 11 appointed members to the Board, which means 6 would constitute a quorum.

Staff:

Don Morris, Central Beach/ Central City Manager
 Cija Omengebar, CRA Planner/Liaison
 Lizeth DeTorres, BCH CRA
 Sandra Doughlin, NPF CRA

I. Call to Order

Chair Greenbaum called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. It was noted that a quorum was present.

Also in attendance were approximately 60 members of the public.

Chair Greenbaum recognized Commissioner Glassman, who welcomed the attendees and thanked them for their participation.

Members of the board were advised that if they owned property that might be affected by the rezoning they would be able to discuss but not vote on the rezoning of the Central City Redevelopment area. Conflict of interest forms were provided to all board members that were completed and submitted to board liaison Cija Omengebar. The following members submitting conflict of interest forms were: Chair Greenbaum, Vice Chair Antonelli, members Thrower, Kosinski and Williams. Only members who do not have a conflict would be able to vote.

Don Morris, Central City CRA Manager, advised the group that although it would be nice to have a vote, the primary purpose of the workshop is primarily to get input as to the direction that would be taken. Go through process, listen to the comments from the neighborhood and the board and after all that everything would be taken into consideration if there's no formal vote after the fact will come up with a decision as to what the general consensus is which will allow everyone to move forward with the process.

II. Proposed Mixed-Use Rezoning Discussion – Althea Jefferson

Althea Jefferson, of the Mellgren Planning Group also present was Michelle Mellgren representing the firm. Ms. Jefferson shared a power-point presentation, (see attached). Ms. Jefferson went on to explain the process and exercises undertaken and findings thus far, community feedback to date. She told the board that the workshop would be used to go over the project summary, community feedback and discuss any proposed changes with regard to the zoning. She explained that this is an effort to match up the land development code with the redevelopment plan.

The presentation provided a number of zoning recommendations for residential, commercial and mixed use. Neighbors wanted gateway signage, civic and public spaces for socializing, pedestrian scale streetscape for business areas. Images selected were eight stories and below, 5 to 7 stories; however between 3 to 5 stories appeared to be most popular; with primarily 1-2 stories for residential areas. For parking the preference was structured parking and angled street parking.

The zoning recommendations were:

- Create new opportunities for residential and commercial
- Maintain diverse character of housing
- Mixed uses; and
- Protect existing residents from displacements

Workshop #2 discussion and vote results were:

Area 1

- Proposed some permissible adaptable reuse (home can be turned in office)
- 1-5 stories in orange area

- 1-2 stories in green area
- Current allowable height is 35 feet/3 stories

Area 2

- Neighborhood wants no change
- Current allowable 35 feet/3stories
- No change unless the board recommends differently

Area 3

- West on Sunrise, currently commercial photos shown represents what neighbors prefer, support mix-use in this area
- 2 to5 stories are supported
- Current allowable height is 150 feet/15 stories
- Additional comments area listed on the slide

Area 4

- Multi-family is proposed for this area
- Feedback supports 3stories/already allowed in this area
- 9th Avenue east 3 stories are currently allowed
- Additional comments do not object up to 7 stories
- 3-5 stories were supported
- Comments for this area allows/supports up to 5 stories

Area 5

- NE 4th avenue
- Support for mixed use and multi family
- Scale of 3 – 5 stories
- Allows up to 150 feet
- Feedback recommended merging areas 6 and 7

Area 6

- Supports for 1- 2 stories
- 3 stories are currently allowed
- Additional comments included recommendation for under 3 stories for this area

Area 7

- Allowable height is 150 feet
- Recommended merging areas 5, 6 and 7
- Questions on TOD

Area 8

- 5-7 stories are supported
- Mix use and multifamily

Area 9

- 5-7 stories are preferred
- Mixed use and multifamily
- Highest votes supported images presented on the slides

Area 10

- Support for proposed multifamily
- Blended in

Member Talbot asked if the height of 7 stories was across the board should areas 5, 6 and 7 be combined. The response from TMPG was that it will pull the depth back to where it exists, and allow scale and intensity in the front while down-scaling the back towards the neighborhood.

Member Antonelli asked about the area 5, along 4th Avenue where the zoning is CB, 150 feet/15 stories, there's an imaginary line between 3rd and 4th Avenues, RD-15; however, there is no zoning classification that scales it down. The concern is due to the lack of depth it would be difficult to encourage investors with a worthwhile project. He continued that the higher density encumbers half of a lot and needs to be pushed back, and this would encourage development in the area. TMPG agreed that the depth is too narrow to implement ideas from the neighborhood. Even though the criteria do not allow it, zoning does.

He had some technical questions on area 3 with a scale 2 to 5 ft. and very small strip where homes behind are in a very small scale He mentioned that the recommendation of the board 5 stories will not be permissible, they need to scale down to 11. Same comments at area one Powerline.

Vice Chair Greenbaum asked about area 2 as it compared to other areas. He recommended looking at other areas to see where larger developments could occur. He suggested that they use Flagler Village as an example. TMPG agreed with the recommendation and will provide commercial project examples which would show the difference in scale, height and density and what a scaled down version looks like.

Member Kosinski asked if the possibility of minimum height standards particularly along thoroughfares where there is continuous bands of structures was ever considered and not have mixed heights. TMPG explained that there are a lot of design features in the draft and will continue to work with city staff. Member Kosinski also inquired about parking provisions. TMPG responded that everything can be discussed; however, parking issues were not part of the discussion there is still a lot more to discuss. It will be discussed in future opportunities and decided if they keep it as is or make some changes.

Member Lalwani asked if they showed people illustrations with building height that they will be getting in this area. TMPG said they showed images and photos and they posted on line as well including scale renderings. Area 4 is drawn as it's shown on the screen because the depth issue trying to scale down 2 to 3 stories as neighbors preferred and permitted. TGMP mentioned that even though there is other preferences and is permitted is not feasible by not having much property to meet regulations then they will have to scale down.

Member Williams asked if when they discussed with neighbors they mentioned which factors to take in consideration areas 1 to 2 versus 3 to 5 in certain areas. TMPG said only in instances when they provided comments were given.

Chair Greenbaum mentioned that one of the special attributes of central city is the proximity to Flagler Village area with amazing views, he said they would like to be close to that concept in the area and recommended to flying some drowns to have a better view of the infrastructure and buildings.

Member Thrower expressed his support for minimum heights. He also mentioned road closures and suggested that "dead" parcels be looked at more favorably. He also asked if members could see some of the vacant areas between Powerline and NE 4th Avenue; between NE 10th and 11th Streets; in between there is a road closure and dead right of way.

Vice chair Antonelli wanted to know the depth that's being proposed for area 4 to extend to business uses.

Open Public comment at 7:21 p.m.

1. Lake Ridge resident, Dick Haliburton wants to see the rezoning done as part of the entire City.
2. Past chair, Randall Klett questioned why current maps related to the rezoning discussion are not being displayed. He stated that he is not happy with the process which is being delayed for years and mentioned that in 2015 a consultant was hired and as a result they had a previous plan approved by City Commission and nothing was done. Neighbors want to have walkable areas and recommended to wait another year if necessary in order to have the right drawings with needs they want. He asked if depth was added to W of 4th Avenue.
3. Former member, Kathryn Barry requested a current and more visible map and asked if they are available online so they can print them. On 13th Street she asked what can be done, the street is not deep enough.
4. Gus Carbonell local architect and property owner at 4th Avenue, he considers depth very important. Mentioned that some of the projects mentioned on area 3 are no feasible weather 5 stories or more they will need construction parking and depth for loading. Along Sunrise Blvd.,

suggested one zoning district all the way to 11th Street and create a guideline. He agree with Member Kosisnski about urban fabric, they need a minimum number of stories no more single tenant places with a parking lot around it.

5. Deborah Kerr, Chair Greenbaum made the call and she was no longer in the audience.
6. Obirssent Sylvain, He mentioned his question was already answered with some of the input from previous questions.
7. Abby Laughlin, she mentioned the number one priority is to see redevelopment, by downzoning the commercial area without the right depth needed, they will not accomplish the CRA main goal which is to eliminate slum and blithe. She mentioned that the consultant didn't include input from the expert panel. Recommended strongly not to vote at this meeting and last petition to include food trucks in the area.
8. Catherine Howell, question being answered with previous information given.
9. Yeika Mikulji, computer consultant, mentioned that communication is lacking she hasn't seen any updates on the website or been able to understand the progress of this project. Request to not only talk and about areas on Sunrise but depth on 13th street too.
10. Michael Alaovi, represent property owners on the area. He asked if the consultant factored the impact that the rezoning will have on the capital that is being invested on these areas. He asked if reducing the entitlements, if there will be some value in return as property owners.
11. Homeowner Latrinsha Greaves, is concern with parking and code enforcement issues in the area at Sunrise and 13th street. She mentioned is in agreement with City staff to make something good in the area but requested to consider dead end on streets and empty parcels where criminals gathers to eliminate safety issues.
12. Edward Catalano, resident at 13st. mentioned does not agree with the plan and adding commercial to the area where there is no consistency with lots sizes at NE 4th street all over 11th street. The way is planned doesn't make sense.
13. Teri Sesto, she welcome the redevelopment on the Sunrise area and requested for people in the areas one, ten and two should be more informed of the outcome of this project and how taxes will be used. She said that if skyscrapers will be built on these area, it will not be affordable for people due to tax increments. She request to consider where residents will can be relocated. Concern of where these people will going to live.
14. Kevin Fernandez mentioned that part of the process is missing, concern about commercial adding into neighborhoods, taxes increments, depth. He said retail is dead and he thinks City needs to be progressive. Congestion is misunderstood, traffic getting worse, pros and cons that

residents need to be informed so they can make the rights decisions.

Public hearing closed at 7:48 p.m.

Board comments

Member Antonelli mentioned that as homeowner tax increase is capped at a certain percent per year so as property value increases dramatically as a result of the revalidation of the area the taxes do not grow that much. All new developments will be built to the code and parking and flooding areas will be improved.

CRA Manager, Donald Morris mentioned that due to the comments received, he anticipated coming back in November for a follow up meeting to address some of the comments and provide more input of what is being discussed in order to make a recommendation.

Althea Jefferson, of the Mellgren Group responded to the questions posed by the audience

- i) How does this rezoning project impact the city; the response was that it does not, it will only impact the Central City Area.
- ii) Responding to a question about the map was that until the rezoning regulations are worked out there is no map; the reason for the workshops is to get public input and give direction to what is currently in the area such as density and permitted use. The feedback from workshop #2 was provided to the planning staff; however it was not useable or feasible; so, it's back to the drawing board. The maps will not be posted to the website since it could create some confusion; since what's currently on the map is no longer relevant.
- iii) Responding to the question "What's another year?" It's up to the group to consider.
- iv) Regarding the question on permitted uses, Mellgren was told not to provide information regarding regulations; since nothing has been worked through with the planning staff.
- v) Input for industry experts; the response was that it was a regulatory discussion and will be addressed with planning staff. That information will be posted and made available online.
- vi) Regarding the loss of height, Ms. Jefferson's response was that there is currently no proposal to reduce height; however, for those buildings 5-stories or higher developers will be asked to provide 7 1/2% of public open space, which should have benches, lighting, dog stations, and a water feature which would benefit the community and add value to the area

- vii) Regarding the question on how are “they” going to put commercial properties on 13th Street, the audience was told that currently there are commercial properties on 13th Street.

In closing, Ms. Michele Mellgren, of the Mellgren Group addressed the board and audience telling them that they’ve heard the recommendations from the residents, that they are not hard and fast recommendations; it will a collaborative effort that will include the planning staff aso saying that there might be the need to scale back; and hopefully to bring forth a solution that will be a win win for everyone. They will review the input from tonight’s meeting and refine the process and come back to the board.

Chair Greenbaum asked about the land use amendment and the time it takes; from her experience she feels that the land use plan amendment is not necessary.

CRA Manager Don Morris asked the board to consider cancelling the October 3rd meeting. Motion made by vice chair Antonelli, seconded by member Thrower to cancel the October 3, 2018 meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by member Thrower, seconded by member Laxmi to have only one item on the agenda, “The Proposed Rezoning Presentation” on the November 7th 2018, agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

III. Communications to City Commission

There was none

IV. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by member Laxmi, seconded by the board. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m.