



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
CITY HALL – CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 2019 – 6:00 P.M.

Cumulative

Board Members	Attendance	June 2019-May 2020	
		Present	Absent
Catherine Maus, Chair	P	1	0
Mary Fertig, Vice Chair	P	1	0
John Barranco	P	1	0
Brad Cohen	A	0	1
Coleman Prewitt	P	1	0
Jacquelyn Scott	P	1	0
Jay Shechtman	P	1	0
Alan Tinter	P	1	0
Michael Weymouth	P	1	0

It was noted that a quorum was present at the meeting.

Staff

Ella Parker, Urban Planning and Design Manager
D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
Anthony Fajardo, Director, Department of Sustainable Development
Linda Mia Franco, Urban Design and Planning
Nick Kalargyros, Urban Design and Planning
Randall Robinson, Urban Design and Planning
Yvonne Redding, Urban Design and Planning
Trisha Logan, Historic Preservation Planner
Benjamin Restrepo, Department of Transportation and Mobility
Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

Motion made by Vice Chair Fertig, seconded by Mr. Shechtman, that traffic analysis in the City is inadequate, [and that] current measurements of traffic impact should be investigated in terms of capturing opportunities in the development process to mitigate projects' impacts on the streets; and to also put additional emphasis on capturing amount of scooter and bicycle and pedestrian trips. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-2 (Mr. Tinter and Mr. Weymouth dissenting).

I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Maus called the meeting to order at 6:00 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 City Staff.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Motion made by Ms. Fertig, seconded by Ms. Scott, to approve.

The following correction was noted to the minutes:

- P.5, paragraph 1, the reference should be to parking under the bridge rather than over

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (as amended).

III. ELECTION OF BOARD CHAIR / VICE-CHAIRPERSON

Motion made by Ms. Scott, seconded by Ms. Fertig, to nominate Catherine Maus. In a roll call vote, Chair Maus was unanimously re-elected.

Motion made by Ms. Scott, seconded by Mr. Barranco, to nominate Mary Fertig [for Vice Chair]. In a roll call vote, Ms. Fertig was unanimously elected Vice Chair.

IV. PUBLIC SIGN-IN / SWEARING-IN

Individuals wishing to speak on tonight's Agenda Items were sworn in at this time.

V. AGENDA ITEMS

Index

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1. R18025**	KT Seabreeze Atlantic, LP
2. Z19001* **	City of Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Area; Sistrunk 2245, LLC; 220145, LLC; Urbana 500, LLC; and Anointed by Christ International; Christian Center Inc.
3. V19002**	City of Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Area; Sistrunk 2245, LLC; 220145, LLC; Urbana 500, LLC; and Anointed by Christ International; Christian Center Inc.
4. R19004**	City of Fort Lauderdale
5. V19004**	City of Fort Lauderdale
6. R18018**	Paul Kissinger EDSA, agent on behalf of the City of Fort Lauderdale
7. Z19002* **	Brady Family Investments, LLC
8. T19009	City of Fort Lauderdale
9. T19010	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.

Stephanie Toothaker, representing the Applicant of Item 1, requested that this Item be deferred for six months so the Applicant has additional time in which to address neighbors' concerns and revise the Site Plan accordingly. This Item would be deferred to the December 18, 2019 meeting.

Motion made by Vice Chair Fertig, seconded by Mr. Shechtman, for the deferral. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Ms. Parker noted that the Applicant of Item 7 has requested deferral to the July 17, 2019 meeting. The Board approved the deferral by unanimous consensus.

Deferral was requested until August 21, 2019 for Item 8. The Board approved the deferral by unanimous consensus.

It was requested that Items 2 and 3 be presented together and voted upon separately. The Board agreed to this request by unanimous consensus.

2. CASE:	Z19001
REQUEST: * **	Rezoning From Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/ Medium High Density (RMM-25) to Northwest Regional Activity Center - Mixed Use west (NWRAC-MUw)
APPLICANT:	City of Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Area; Sistrunk 2245, LLC; 220145, LLC; Urbano 500, LLC; and Anointed By Christ International; Christian Center Inc.
PROJECT NAME:	West Village
GENERAL LOCATION:	South of NW 6th Street, west of NW 7th Avenue, north of NW 5th Street and east of NW 8th Avenue
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	North Lauderdale 1-48 D Lots 27 Thru 47 Block 14
EXISTING ZONING:	Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/ Medium High Density (RMM-25)
PROPOSED	Northwest Regional Activity Center - Mixed Use west (NWRAC-

ZONING: MUw)
LAND USE: Northwest Regional Activity Center (NW-RAC)
COMMISSION DISTRICT: 3 - Robert L. McKinzie
CASE PLANNER: Yvonne Redding

3. CASE: V19002
REQUEST: ** Vacation of Right-of-Way
APPLICANT: City of Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Area; Sistrunk 2245, LLC; 220145, LLC; Urbano 500, LLC; and Anointed By Christ International; Christian Center Inc.
PROJECT NAME: West Village Right-of-Way Vacation
GENERAL LOCATION: North/South Right-of-Way between NW 5th Street and NW 6th Street
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: That certain 15.00 foot wide alley in Block 14, North Lauderdale, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 1, Page 48, of the public records of Dade County, Florida. Less the north 16.30 feet thereof. Said lands lying in the City of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida, and containing 9,506 square feet (0.218 acres) more or less.
ZONING DISTRICT: Northwest Regional Activity Center - Mixed Use west (NWRAC-MUw) and Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/ Medium High Density (RMM-25)
LAND USE: Northwest Regional Activity Center (NW-RAC)
COMMISSION DISTRICT: 3 - Robert L. McKinzie
CASE PLANNER: Linda Mia Franco, AICP

Disclosures for Items 2 and 3 were heard at this time.

Peter Flotz, representing the Applicant, introduced the rezoning and right-of-way vacation requests. The Applicant has assembled an entire block of property over approximately five years and plans to relocate the Anointed by Christ Church to the property when a new facility is built. The project has gone through the Development Review Committee (DRC) process and will go before the City Commission in September 2019.

Mike Vonder Muelen, also representing the Applicant, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the subject site, which consists of 34 fully owned parcels to be consolidated on 3.48 acres. The church itself was approved by the Planning and Zoning (PZ) Board in May 2019.

The requested right-of-way vacation will vacate a mid-block alley on the subject property. Criteria for vacation are as follows:

- Right-of-way or other public space is no longer needed for public purpose
- Alternate routes are available if needed
- Closure of right-of-way provides a safe area for vehicles to turn around
- Closure of right-of-way shall not adversely affect pedestrian traffic
- All public utilities within the right-of-way have been or will be relocated, pursuant to a utility relocation plan

Mr. Vonder Muelen continued that the alleyway is currently unimproved, with utility poles that will be relocated during redevelopment of the property.

Regarding the rezoning request, the subject area lies within the Northwest Regional Activity Center (RAC), with only a portion to be rezoned from RMM-25 to Northwest RAC – Mixed Use West. This will bring the entire site into a single zoning category. Rezoning criteria are as follows:

- Rezoning must be consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan
- Changes anticipated by the proposed rezoning will not adversely affect the character of development in or near the area under consideration
- Character of the area is suitable for the uses permitted in the rezoned district and are compatible with surrounding districts

Mr. Vonder Muelen asserted that the project is compatible with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as with employment opportunities identified in the Northwest RAC. The Applicant took guidance from the Northwest RAC Master Plan when developing the rezoning request. This Master Plan's fundamental planning principles include residential and mixed-use development to create a dynamic urban area, architecture on a human scale with appropriate form and massing, and landscaping to enhance the streetscape experience.

Parking on the proposed site is designated to ensure that on-site movement and storage of vehicles are as imperceptible as possible and does not interfere with pedestrian pathways.

Greg Brewton, also representing the Applicant, addressed the public participation process, advised that the Applicant worked with Dickey Consulting Services on these initiatives. They met one-on-one with individual property owners in the area, and held two public participation meetings on April 11 and May 6, 2019, at the Midtown Commerce Center and at City Commissioner Robert McKinzie's District meeting, respectively.

The Applicant also reached out to the neighborhood association located directly east of the project, although this was not required by Ordinance. While this association did not

take an official vote on the project, Mr. Brewton advised that the president of that entity did not express a negative opinion of it.

A Site Plan application for this project is currently going through the DRC process, which is expected to be completed in the near future.

Motion made by Vice Chair Fertig, seconded by Mr. Barranco, to incorporate the Staff Report into the record. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Tinter asked if the subject property needs to be platted. Yvonne Redding, representing Urban Design and Planning, replied that the parcels are part of the overall Progresso plat. The Board will not see the project's Site Plan for review.

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

Pamela Beasley-Pittman, president of the Historic Dorsey Riverbend Civic Association, advised that the project will be located within the boundary of this organization. Members of the association have met with the Applicant's team. While most are excited about the prospect of this project, they have concerns including the proposed rezoning. Dorsey Riverbend is considered a "front porch" community and wishes to retain this image.

Ms. Beasley-Pittman continued that members of the community are also concerned that the redevelopment not trigger further movement into the residential neighborhood, as there are additional parcels of land available for redevelopment. There are concerns with the project's height and type of buildings as well.

With regard to the right-of-way vacation, Ms. Beasley-Pittman requested clarification of ownership of the land in the alleyway to be vacated. Chair Maus advised that the alley is a City-owned right-of-way which the Applicant proposes to vacate, at which time that land would go to the Applicant, who owns or controls both sides of the street.

Ms. Beasley-Pittman continued that neighborhood residents are also concerned regarding roughly 58 trees on the Applicant's property. They hope to ensure that healthy trees are preserved on the site and used within the project, or relocated elsewhere within the community. They have spoken to the developer regarding this concern but have received no assurance on this topic thus far.

Chair Maus recommended that Ms. Beasley-Pittman address this concern directly once again with the Applicant. With respect to the character of the community, she continued that while the Board has not seen renderings of the proposed project, a graphic posted on the property shows what it would look like. She noted that if the Application is approved by the Board and goes to the City Commission, it would be best for the community to remain in touch with its planners for additional details. Chair Maus also cautioned that the Application could be considered to set a precedent if passed.

Mr. Brewton advised that the Applicant is receptive to “doing as much as possible” to retain many of the trees on the property. There is a tree mitigation process that will apply as the Site Plan application advances, and the Applicant will continue to meet with the community on this issue and work toward resolving concerns or differences.

Mr. Brewton continued that the proposed development includes town homes with front porches facing the 7th Terrace side of the property. He reiterated that the developer will work to address neighborhood concerns. While he was not certain that retention/relocation of trees could be made a condition of rezoning, he felt it could be made a condition of the upcoming Site Plan approval process.

Vice Chair Fertig pointed out that the Board cannot place a condition regarding trees on the Site Plan process, as the project’s Site Plan will not come before them for approval. Assistant City Attorney D’Wayne Spence confirmed that rezoning is not conducive to a condition of this nature, although the proximity of some trees may be sufficiently close to the right-of-way to affect its vacation.

Mr. Brewton stated that he was not aware of a condition that could be suitable for attachment to either request before the Board at tonight’s meeting. He reiterated that the Applicant meets regularly with the community and has committed, as part of the public record, to save trees within the community.

Ms. Scott commented that it can be frustrating for the Board to hear the public express concerns but lack the authority to address them. She also asked how the proposed project would integrate into a front porch community, and asked if the Applicant could provide some reassurance to the neighborhood regarding this aspect of the project. Mr. Brewton characterized the project’s town homes as part of the transition from the project into the neighborhood, stating that the porches will face the western side of the property, where there is residential development.

Mr. Shechtman recommended that concerned members of the community attend upcoming DRC hearings, which will include public review of the project’s Site Plan. With regard to relocation of the trees, he suggested that the neighborhood identify potential locations to which the trees might be moved.

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

Chair Maus stated that she felt any future rezoning of areas adjacent to the Northwest RAC should be done in a comprehensive and cohesive pattern rather than a manner in which properties are easily acquired. She asserted that there was no assurance of transition or buffering between the proposed project and the residential neighborhood to the west, as the Board has not seen a Site Plan; nor was she certain that the project

would have any type of connection or compatibility with the neighborhood into which it is moving.

Mr. Shechtman also expressed concern with the Board's inability to see a Site Plan for the project in conjunction with the rezoning request. He pointed out that the Board has voiced its concerns with this process in the past. Vice Chair Fertig recommended that this be further addressed before the conclusion of tonight's meeting.

Mr. Barranco noted that the underlying land use of the area supports the rezoning request, and the project is located on a commercial corridor. He also pointed out that the DRC process may require additional changes to the project. Vice Chair Fertig observed that there were no outright objections to the project stated by the public, and the Applicant's two public outreach meetings were well-attended.

Motion made by Mr. Tinter, seconded by Mr. Weymouth, to approve [Item Z19001]. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-2 (Chair Maus and Mr. Shechtman dissenting).

Motion made by Mr. Tinter, seconded by Mr. Weymouth, to approve [Item V19002] with Staff comments.

Vice Chair Fertig asked if it would be possible to include a comment regarding trees on the property in the **motion** so the DRC is aware of this concern. Mr. Tinter replied that this would be superfluous, and that Staff was aware of the Board's discussion on this topic.

Linda Mia Franco, representing Urban Design and Planning, requested clarification of whether or not the **motion** included the conditions included in the Staff Report. Mr. Tinter confirmed that the conditions were included.

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

The Board agreed by consensus to hear Items 4 and 5 together but vote upon them separately.

4. CASE:	R19004
REQUEST: **	Site Plan Level IV Review: Public Purpose Use For 71,737 Square Foot Community Center With 5,271 Square Feet of Retail and Request for Relief for Setbacks, Landscape Buffer, and Other Dimensional Requirements
APPLICANT:	City of Fort Lauderdale
PROJECT NAME:	LA Lee YMCA Mizell Community Center
GENERAL LOCATION:	1409 NW 6th Street

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lincoln Park Corr Plat 5-2 B Lots 1 Thru 8 Less Road Right-of-Way, 9 Thru 16, 42 Thru 50 Block 2 and Lots 39 and 48 Block 3

ZONING DISTRICT: Park (P) and Residential Single Family and Cluster / Medium Density (RC-15)

LAND USE: Northwest Regional Activity Center (NW-RAC)

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 3 - Robert L. McKinzie

CASE PLANNER: Nicholas Kalargyros

5. CASE: **V19004**

REQUEST: ** Vacation of Right-of-Way

APPLICANT: City of Fort Lauderdale

PROJECT NAME: LA Lee YMCA Mizell Community Center

GENERAL LOCATION: East/West Right-of-Way east of NW 14th Terrace, north of NW 6th Street

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A Portion of Lots 5, 6, 7 and 8, Block "2", "Lincoln Park", According to the Plat thereof, As recorded in Plat Book 5, Page 2 on the Public Records of Broward County, Florida

ZONING DISTRICT: Park (P) and Residential Single Family and Cluster / Medium Density (RC-15)

LAND USE: Northwest Regional Activity Center (NW-RAC)

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 3 - Robert L. McKinzie

CASE PLANNER: Nicholas Kalargyros

Disclosures were made at this time.

Robert Lochrie, representing the Applicant, explained that the YMCA is the lessee of a parcel owned by the City of Fort Lauderdale. The lease was executed on October 9, 2017 by the Mayor at that time. Zoning on either side of the subject property is Northwest RAC – WU; however, because the property is owned by the City, it continues to be zoned as Park (P).

The former building on the site was located close to Sistrunk Boulevard, with parking in the rear of the building. The proposed development essentially follows this plan within a slightly larger footprint. The lease requires that the project include retail stores facing Sistrunk Boulevard, a preschool, wellness center, gymnasium and fitness studio, community space, “black box” theater, multi-purpose rooms, shared work space, education classrooms, a swimming pool, and a playground.

The parking field to the north and west of the project currently exists, although the proposed project will significantly enhance this area with additional landscaping and buffering. Mr. Lochrie reviewed the uses on the site, including:

- First floor: retail in the front of the property, facing Sistrunk Boulevard, with YMCA offices and community rooms behind;
- Second floor: gymnasium, wellness center, locker rooms, and YMCA offices
- Third floor: meeting rooms, theater, community room, and youth center
- Fourth floor: Broward College classrooms and computer room, Broward College academic services building, additional classrooms, and rooftop patio

The building is 71,737 sq. ft. in size, which is consistent with all the uses required by the lease.

The project is presented as a public purpose use with Park zoning. While Park zoning permits these types of uses, the Applicant feels that due to the character and nature of the area, it is not necessary to meet all requirements for this zoning category. The northern portion of the property is zoned RC-15. While the building is close to its property line, it is not very close to the street itself. The Applicant considered the Northwest RAC zoning regulations, which would apply to the property if it were privately owned, as a guideline for development. This would allow setback requirements along Sistrunk Boulevard to be dependent upon the right-of-way, with a landscape buffer and a minimum 10 ft. sidewalk.

The retail area is set back an additional 10 ft. due to a covered arcade, placing retail doors 30 ft. from the curb. East and west setbacks are 7 and 8 ft. against a Northwest RAC requirement of 5 ft. At the rear of the property, which borders residential development, the setback is 127 ft. against a Code requirement of 15 ft. The Applicant is redesigning the parking area to provide as much landscaping as possible without changing its general configuration.

Motion made by Mr. Weymouth, seconded by Ms. Scott, to incorporate the Staff Report in the record. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Tinter requested additional information on a trip generation study for the project. Benjamin Restrepo, representing the Department of Transportation and Mobility, replied that a traffic statement was submitted, which showed fewer than 1000 trips generated by the project. While the uses by themselves would generate more than 1000 trips, existing uses were removed to bring this below the threshold that would require a full traffic study. This determination was based on the previously existing Mizell Center. Relocation of the YMCA is expected to generate fewer trips within the surrounding network.

Mr. Tinter moved on to parking, noting that the requirement of 161 parking spaces was addressed by separating the various uses within the project. The shared parking study states that 76 parking spaces are required, which represents a nearly 50% reduction. Mr.

Restrepo stated that this analysis was based on observations of parking currently generated by the YMCA, as well as the additional uses required by the City. He felt the Applicant's proposed 80 parking spaces would be adequate "for the most part" for the uses on the site.

Vice Chair Fertig requested additional information regarding the south side setbacks. Mr. Lochrie explained that a landscape buffer of approximately 10 ft. extends from the curb to the sidewalk. The sidewalk, which is in the public right-of-way, is an additional 11 ft. in width. This places the building itself roughly 22 ft. from the curb and 1 ft. from the property line. The retail space, which is beneath an arcade, is set back 10 ft. further.

Vice Chair Fertig continued that the proposed side yard setbacks are 7 to 8 ft. against a requirement of 25 ft. Mr. Lochrie stated that while the setback requirement for a park is 25 ft., the Northwest RAC guidelines, which apply to other properties in the area, require a 5 ft. setback. He emphasized that the City has requested the sidewalk widths provided by the Applicant within the 7 to 8 ft. setbacks. Landscaping will be significantly enhanced near the northern property line. The City's Urban Forester required that oak trees on the western side of the parking lot be retained, which resulted in the loss of some parking spaces.

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 these Items, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Attorney Spence noted that the right-of-way referred to in R19004 includes a dedication for a bus shelter and bench. Under a 2012 agreement with Broward County, the County will install this shelter but the City must maintain it. He requested that the vacation of a 5 ft. wide and 20 ft. long bus shelter easement and relocation of the 7 ft. wide prefabricated shelter to the new easement be considered as part of the Application. County Staff has reviewed the Site Plan and concurs with its proposed modifications. Mr. Lochrie confirmed that this is acceptable to the Applicant as well.

Motion made by Mr. Shechtman, seconded by Ms. Scott, to approve Item 4 with the condition just stated. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

Motion made by Mr. Shechtman, seconded by Mr. Tinter, to approve [Item 5] including the Staff Condition read into the record by D'Wayne Spence. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

6. CASE: R18018

REQUEST: ** Site Plan Level IV Review: Conditional Use for Marina, 11,231 Square Foot Restaurant, 24,401 Square Foot Marina Services Building and 2,266 Square Feet of Ancillary Structures

APPLICANT: Paul Kissinger EDSA, agent on behalf of the City of Fort Lauderdale

PROJECT NAME: Las Olas Marina
GENERAL LOCATION: 151 Las Olas Circle
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A portion of Parcel A, Las Olas Del Mar I Plat, Plat Book 147, Page 20 of the public records of Broward County, Florida
ZONING DISTRICT: Planned Resort Development (PRD) and Intracoastal Overlook Area District (IOA)
LAND USE: Central Beach Regional Activity Center (C-RAC)
COMMISSION DISTRICT: 2 - Steven Glassman
CASE PLANNER: Randall Robinson

Disclosures were made at this time.

Robert Lochrie, representing the Applicant, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the project, which is located on a property owned by the City of Fort Lauderdale. It is before the Board for Site Plan Level IV review. The Applicant hopes to realize the concept of a mega-yacht marina with accessory retail and amenity uses for both the marina and the general public.

Mr. Lochrie briefly reviewed the project's history, recalling that some years ago, the City's Marine Advisory Board (MAB) proposed construction of a mega-yacht marina on the north side of the Las Olas Boulevard bridge. In 2016, an RFP submitted by the City acquired a developer to design the project. A lease was signed in 2018, and a Site Plan was submitted to the City the same year, followed by significant neighborhood outreach in relation to the project.

Mr. Lochrie noted the proximity of the Portofino, Jackson Tower, Leisure Beach, Leisure Beach South, and Venetian condominiums to the site. All these properties are located within the City's Planned Resort Development (PRD) zoning district, which has a maximum height limitation of 200 ft. by right and up to 240 ft. through bonuses. The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) requirement for this district is 6. There are additional entitlements that come with properties located in the PRD district.

The marina property was platted by the City in 1989, including a specific plat restriction limiting what can be developed on the site to the following:

- 350 hotel rooms
- 150 marina slips
- 199,000 sq. ft. of commercial space

Mr. Lochrie advised that the proposed project includes a parking facility to serve the marina, which can accommodate 68 mega-yachts with additional availability to smaller or

transient vessels, particularly during the off-season. It will also include a marine services building, which provides amenities for the yachting and marina communities. Finally, a restaurant building and promenade will be constructed as part of the project.

A key component of both the Beach Redevelopment Master Plan and the marina's RFP and lease was the need to bring the public to the marina site. This will be accomplished by the promenade, which is approximately 2200 linear ft. with a width reaching up to 20 ft. The public will have access to the promenade from the site's restaurant to the Venetian condominium and Oceanside Park, extending beneath the Las Olas Bridge and connecting to Birch Road. The promenade also includes a landscape buffer between the street and itself, as well as outdoor furniture.

Mr. Lochrie reviewed other key elements of the project, including the marine services and restaurant buildings. The three-story marine services building is 43 ft. tall, while the two-story restaurant building is 30 ft. 5 in. The proposed FAR on the site is 0.18, while the marine services building length is 190 ft. 11 in. against a maximum of 200 ft.

The restaurant building faces the Intracoastal Waterway and includes outdoor seating on its top deck. Its ground floor is 6848 sq. ft., including kitchen as well as restaurant space, while the second floor has 4383 sq. ft. of interior space. The marine services building will include a second restaurant of 2500 sq. ft., as well as a marine store of approximately 1500 sq. ft., a dockmaster's office of 1100 sq. ft., and three yacht brokerage offices. The second floor includes additional marine industry uses, while the third floor houses marina components, a fitness facility, marine amenities, and an outdoor pool and patio. The gap between the restaurant and marine services buildings is 20 ft.

Because the Applicant received comments regarding the appearance of the restaurant building, they are suggesting the following enhancements:

- Concrete block material on the top half of the building to be incorporated within
- Cladded metal bronze on the bottom half, with landscaping between
- Signage at the corner to highlight entry points for the building

The marine services building will include bronze metal cladding at the top and bottom, glass on the north face, and a concrete finish in the center. Portions of the building step in and out between the first and second floors, creating vertical movement rather than a flat façade.

The Applicant met public participation requirements by providing a formal presentation to the Central Beach Alliance (CBA). Since the time the project was first submitted to the DRC, there have been additional meetings with neighborhood groups, which have contributed to the current version of the project.

Vice Chair Fertig requested input from Staff with regard to the availability of parking. Mr. Lochrie advised that when a pro forma was created for the garage, the marina was assumed to generate at least 115 parking spaces; in addition, the former Director of

Transportation and Mobility had assumed approximately 200 of the garage's 600 spaces would be used for the marina.

Mr. Restrepo of the Department of Transportation and Mobility stated that the Applicant's analysis for the parking requirement was straightforward, taking neither peak hours nor demand periods into account. He felt the amount of parking the marina will need may be less than the 155 spaces planned within the parking garage. The garage is typically only full to capacity during the spring break period.

Chair Maus asked if the parking demand in the garage might increase over time. Mr. Restrepo replied that it is possible. He added that the demand created by restaurants and office spaces on the marina property may also come from other nearby uses or locations.

Vice Chair Fertig pointed out that traffic intrudes into residential neighborhoods more and more as drivers find themselves unable to park throughout the City. Mr. Restrepo replied that many individuals do not like to pay for parking and seek locations other than City parking facilities.

Vice Chair Fertig also addressed trips, noting that she had received a requested copy of the most recent documentation on trip schedules. The site's parking represents a 49% reduction given the seats in the restaurant, marina slips, and commercial space calculated together. Mr. Restrepo stated that reductions are typically based upon two factors, the largest of which reduces the existing use on the site; another factor takes "pass-by" and internal counts into consideration.

Vice Chair Fertig pointed out that the calculation does not properly take the 68 marina slips into account. She continued that in September 2018, Staff estimated there would be 181 trips generated by the project; however, this number decreased from that time to the present. She noted that the driveway between the garage and the marine services building is a public road controlled by the City, which will continue to be used as a shortcut by nearby residents.

Mr. Lochrie replied that the road in question was designed and built by the City: it is not within the limits of the subject site. The Applicant has cooperated with the City on several off-site improvements, but does not own the roadway and cannot make promises regarding its condition.

Vice Chair Fertig concluded by asking if the Fort Lauderdale International Boat Show will continue to operate at the redeveloped marina. Mr. Lochrie explained that the Applicant's lease requires them to enter into an agreement with the Boat Show. The agreement has not yet been signed. The Applicant has a plan for the Boat Show during the site's construction process.

Mr. Tinter observed that the Applicant's Site Plan identifies necessary space by the number of square feet, while the traffic study calculates by seats. He asked if the Applicant was comfortable limiting approval of the project to 375 restaurant seats. Mr. Lochrie confirmed this, pointing out that the Institute of Parking Engineers (ITE) manual refers only to interior space.

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

Debra Rosenbaum, president of the Central Beach Alliance (CBA), confirmed that a public meeting was held and a presentation shown to the membership on May 16, 2019. While no vote was taken, she characterized the project as well-received. The Applicant was responsive to questions from the membership. No vote was taken because she had felt there was not sufficient notice to inform the full membership of the meeting.

Heidi Davis, attorney representing the Jackson Tower Condominium Association, Inc., advised that the proposed project would make Birch Road a dangerous roadway for the general public as well as for residents of this adjacent condominium. It is a 24 ft. wide two-lane roadway, with one lane intended for use as a bypass lane for emergency vehicles or cars entering/leaving the Jackson Tower garage. Ingress/egress for residents is just past a sharp curve in Birch Road, and its electronic entrance can create stacking on the roadway.

Ms. Davis stated that the new two-way roadway has no bypass lane or other facility to help navigate around stopped cars at this location. She reviewed additional potentially dangerous elements of the roadway, including a blind curve, limited sight distance from the garage, and blocking by service vehicles. The Applicant has agreed to provide 10 ft. to increase the right-of-way to a width of 34 ft. A "bulbed" area constructed to push traffic away from cars using the garage will create a safer traffic pattern.

Ms. Davis concluded that the Jackson Tower Condominium Association will work with the City to retain a revocable license for the subject area. She stated that the road shown in the Applicant's plans is not safe, but can be made safer with the right improvements.

Chair Maus asked who would construct the improvement Jackson Tower is seeking. Ms. Davis explained that this has yet to be determined between the Association, the City, and the Applicant.

Ms. Scott noted that the proposed roadway improvements are not part of the Site Plan submitted to the Board. Ms. Davis replied that the roadway is part of the Site Plan due to changes planned by the Applicant; however, these changes do not include additional safety improvements to Birch Road other than the additional 10 ft. of right-of-way.

Ms. Scott asked if a temporary stop sign in the area could be made permanent to help alleviate safety concerns related to ingress/egress from the garage. Ms. Davis pointed

out that this would back up traffic on Las Olas Circle and does not improve the view on the blind curve.

Ms. Davis explained that she was bringing the issue to the Board's attention to ensure the reconfigured roadway is made safer as part of the Site Plan. The reconfiguration is a result of the Applicant's plans for the marina. While the Applicant has agreed to the additional 10 ft. of right-of-way, the Association does not have a way to ensure this improvement is built.

Mr. Tinter commented that there is a loading zone on Birch Road in association with the condominium, although it has not been fully formalized or used by all deliveries. Ms. Davis replied that the 10 ft. addition would attempt to formalize this use, which is located partly on City property and partly on condominium property. At present, cars continue to use this space for parking despite loading zone signage. There is currently no way for trucks to access the condominium's garage or service elevators from the loading zone. Mr. Tinter pointed out that this is a currently existing condition that results from the approved site plan for the condominium, not a condition created by the proposed marina.

Mr. Prewitt commented that when the site plan was approved for Jackson Tower, the roadway's configuration was the same as today, and did not contemplate the possibility of two-way traffic in front of the garage.

Barbara McGuire, private citizen, stated that while Jackson Tower is generally supportive of the marina project, they are concerned with the safety of making Birch Road a two-way roadway. She concluded that the Board should approve the project with a condition related to the proposed settlement agreement, with some details yet to be determined.

Bernie Schinder, private citizen, advised that while he was in favor of the marina project, he also felt reconfiguration of the roadway would make it unsafe for Jackson Tower residents leaving their garage as well as the general public using the road.

Dr. Ino Halegua, private citizen, stated that he is in favor of the marina redevelopment, although he shared the traffic concerns expressed by residents of Jackson Tower.

Joe Gale, private citizen, asserted that it is difficult to access the Venetian condominium due to the proximity of the City parking garage and other traffic issues. He felt a restaurant with 375 seats could not be expected to succeed with a traffic calculation showing only 150 trips per day.

Drazia Simon, private citizen, explained that while she is supportive of the marina project, she is concerned with roadway safety as a resident of Jackson Tower. While a temporary stop sign has been provided on Birch Road, few drivers are obeying it. She spoke in favor of the 10 ft. buffer zone agreed to by the Applicant. Ms. Simon also referred to a small City roadway connecting Las Olas Circle to Birch Road, suggesting that the City be asked to address this road as a safety concern for emergency vehicles.

Ms. Scott asked if condominium residents have met with City Staff to discuss their concerns regarding safety conditions in the area. Ms. Simon replied that the 10 ft. buffer should be included as a condition of approval, as it will give residents the opportunity to continue negotiations with City Staff and other parties.

Mr. Shechtman requested clarification of concerns other than the 10 ft. buffer. Ms. Simon replied that residents are also asking the Board to call attention to the small roadway she had mentioned, which will serve both condominium and marina project traffic, and ask the City to take a closer look at its conditions.

Elizabeth Tamayo, private citizen, advised that while she is happy with the proposed marina, she is concerned with traffic in the area, particularly egress from the Jackson Tower garage.

John Kelly, private citizen, also addressed ingress/egress from the Jackson Tower garage, stating that the proposed buffer would improve safety. He asked that the Board approve the project with the condition relating to the buffer.

Phil Purcell, CEO of the Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF), stated that this organization, which owns the Boat Show, has worked closely with the Applicant to ensure the Site Plan is operational for this annual event. He stated that the project benefits both the Boat Show and the marine industry.

Joseph Zonerega, private citizen, recalled that the Applicant held a meeting with surrounding condominiums, including his residence of Leisure Beach South, to discuss plans for the marina project. The plan upon which most nearby residents agreed at that time was very different from the Site Plan proposed tonight. He asserted that the Applicant never met with Leisure Beach South to show the current plans, although the condominium had invited the Applicant to do so.

Mr. Lochrie advised that Leisure Beach South was represented at meetings held in October 2018, and its association president was at the recent CBA meeting at which the current plans were presented. There was an additional independent meeting with Leisure Beach and Leisure Beach South approximately one month ago to show the current plans. Both condominiums are part of the CBA.

Paul Chettle, private citizen, addressed the project's public-private partnership, recalling that the Applicant was the only entity to respond to the City RFP for marina redevelopment in 2016. He also recalled that the five adjacent condominiums had seen and approved plans for the marina in 2016, which were subsequently approved by the City Commission. In 2018, the Applicant informed residents that the plans they had approved could not be used for the project.

Mr. Chettle continued that City Staff signed off on the current plans for the project, which are significantly different from the 2016 plans, without benefit of a DRC meeting or other public outreach to review the Site Plan. He pointed out that this removed the public input process from the public-private partnership, and echoed Ms. Simon's concern with emergency traffic using the small roadway between Birch Road and Las Olas Circle. He requested that the Board defer the Item and add a condition that the Applicant meet again with Leisure Beach South and the City's Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board (BRAB) for public input.

Vice Chair Fertig asked if the Site Plan has gone before the DRC. Ms. Parker explained that the most recent Site Plan has not, although the previous Site Plan went through the process for technical comments. Because it is subject to Site Plan Level IV review, its public hearing is before the Planning and Zoning Board and City Commission rather than the DRC.

Anthony Fajardo, Director of the Department of Sustainable Development, added that the project has changed since its original submittal to the DRC. Code allows for projects to continue through the approval process if Staff judges this to be appropriate.

Vice Chair Fertig requested clarification of changes made to the Site Plan without the requirement that it go back to the DRC. Mr. Lochrie replied that the restaurant was moved from the northeast corner of the site. The DRC had instructed the Applicant to meet with neighbors of the project to discuss it further; following these discussions, it was determined that the restaurant's location would be moved to the west side of the site.

Mr. Fajardo explained that at this level, the DRC serves to provide technical review of projects that advances them forward to the ultimate approving body. If the proposal was entirely different from its original state, it would have been required to begin the process again. Change during the DRC process is not uncommon. He clarified that the RFP process to which Mr. Chettle had referred is a separate process from DRC.

Vice Chair Fertig asked if the project had ever gone before the BRAB for approval. Mr. Chettle replied that the previous version of the project had gone to the BRAB.

Attorney Spence advised that the Planning and Zoning Board serves in a regulatory capacity, while the BRAB is a proprietary entity of the City. He further clarified that the Department of Sustainable Development's purview is not related to the Applicant's lease. There is no requirement for the BRAB to review the project's Site Plan, as they have no regulatory function.

Mr. Chettle asserted that the Applicant did not meet with Leisure Beach South. He added that the current proposal adds two new buildings to the site, which he characterized as a drastic change.

Chair Maus requested clarification of the restaurant's location in the plans originally approved by nearby condominium residents. Mr. Chettle replied that it was next to a previously proposed Water Taxi stop. The original proposal also included one 7000 sq. ft. marine service building in addition to the 10,000 sq. ft. restaurant on a 5000 sq. ft. footprint.

Mr. Shechtman noted that the DRC process involves less public input than the public hearing before the Board. Mr. Chettle stated that Jackson Tower condominium needs more time to address their concerns with the roadway before the project goes before the City Commission. He felt that deferral of the Item would also provide additional time for City Commissioner Steven Glassman to meet with the presidents of the five surrounding condominiums, City Staff, and the project's developer.

John Burns, president of the Venetian Condominium Association, expressed concern with the density, size, height, and locations of the project's proposed buildings, which are significantly different than the plans first presented to DRC or the plans approved by the nearby public, with much greater square footage, height, and mass. He concluded that the Board should deny the Application.

Shirley Smith, private citizen, reiterated that the Applicant met with residents of the surrounding condominium communities and selected a proposed Site Plan which is very different from the Site Plan before the Board tonight. She reviewed some of the size, height, and mass differences that have occurred to the Site Plan since the original proposal.

Rose Kurlander, private citizen, stated that the Applicant came to the Venetian Condominium the previous week to meet with residents. She described the residents' response as "very supportive" of the marina and its amenities; however, their concerns included changes from the original site plan approved by condominium residents in 2016, including mass, scale, and location of buildings. Another concern was a 20 ft. neighborhood roadway shortcut near the parking garage, which lacks defined sidewalks and will have to accommodate significantly more traffic when the marina is built. She asked that approval of the Item be deferred until residents of the surrounding condominiums can meet with Commissioner Glassman and the Applicant.

John Davanzo, private citizen, commented that the schematic for the Site Plan shows no consistent sidewalks for residents or pedestrians accessing the restaurant. He expressed concern with traffic and parking to, from, and on the site, concluding that the Item should be deferred until these issues are properly addressed.

Abby Laughlin, private citizen, stated that she was supportive of the project, as it would enlarge the marina, accommodate mega-yachts, and provide connectivity to other projects on the beach.

Randall Roger, representing residents of Portofino on the Intracoastal, stated that the individuals he represents are supportive of the project and appreciate the relocation of its restaurant. He expressed concern, however, with the riparian lines of the Intracoastal Waterway's navigable area, which the residents felt should be maintained in their current state and should not be affected if the project is approved by the Board. These lines were identified in a 2005 engineering report secured with involvement from the engineering firm, the City, and the Portofino.

Attorney Spence advised that the Board may only approve Site Plans with respect to the development controlled by the Applicant. Determination of riparian rights is not part of the Board's purview, as this is a legal determination.

Mr. Prewitt asked if Mr. Roger felt the Site Plan violates existing riparian lines. Mr. Roger replied that it is his clients' position that the riparian lines may be affected to the detriment of the Portofino, as they perceive an encroachment upon the correct location.

Richard Zaretsky, attorney representing a resident of the Leisure Beach Condominium, submitted a document and attachments into the record. He characterized the Item before the Board as a new Site Plan which significantly expands the marine services building, changes its location, and is not part of the original site plan attached to the Applicant's lease. Mr. Zaretsky concluded that his client does not oppose enhancement of the marina, but is concerned with its significant changes with no public input.

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.

Mr. Lochrie addressed the ingress/egress concerns expressed by residents of Jackson Tower and Ms. Davis, stating that the Applicant is willing to "curve its Site Plan back" if they can find a way to accommodate this change. This 10 ft. modification has been planned, with the removal of additional parking that originally existed in the subject area. The modification is already within the right-of-way.

With respect to relocation of the site's restaurant, Mr. Lochrie pointed out that the alternative approved by condominium residents in 2016 is not the concept before the Board tonight. Because that alternative is a lease issue, it is not within the purview of the Board. He noted other changes to the Site Plan since 2018, including a decrease in both restaurants' overall square footage and an increase in the marine facilities building's square footage. Restaurant seating used in the parking calculation includes both indoor and outdoor seating.

Vice Chair Fertig asked if the Applicant can accommodate nearby residents' concerns with the width of the roadway connecting to Las Olas Circle. Mr. Lochrie replied that one difficulty with this proposal is the location of utilities serving a garage, which are located in City-owned green space beside this roadway. Use of this space may result in a decrease to the Applicant's landscaped area and proposed promenade.

Mr. Tinter asked if the Applicant would accept a condition of approval requiring them to work with the City and Jackson Tower Condominium residents to resolve the Birch Road issue prior to City Commission approval. Mr. Lochrie confirmed that the Applicant was willing to comply with this condition.

Vice Chair Fertig asked if the Applicant would agree to a condition to review their trip generation figures to ensure accuracy, and to ask for additional trips if necessary. Mr. Lochrie also agreed to this proposal.

Mr. Shechtman asked if spaces within the garage would be reserved exclusively for the project's use. Mr. Lochrie replied that the Applicant will discuss this with the City's Parking Division. They feel that reserving a number of these spaces would make sense for the project.

Vice Chair Fertig asked if the Applicant would agree to a condition that by the time the project goes before the City Commission, there would be a plan for Boat Show operations during construction. Mr. Lochrie confirmed this.

Mr. Tinter asked if the project required any variances or waivers. Randall Robinson, representing Urban Design and Planning, replied that because the project is relatively small in comparison to the size of the lot, it was easy to address criteria for approval, including dimensional requirements and neighborhood compatibility.

Vice Chair Fertig asserted that the City's Comprehensive Plan requires trip calculation to be made in a certain manner, and she was not certain whether or not the Board had heard a definitive answer regarding the accuracy of this calculation.

Motion made by Mr. Tinter, seconded by Mr. Barranco, to approve, subject to Staff conditions and additional conditions that would:

- Limit the restaurant space to 375 seats
- That the Applicant meet with City Staff and representatives of Jackson Tower to try to resolve the issue of the access along Birch Road prior to City Commission meeting
- Reconfirm the trip count in compliance with the [Comprehensive] Plan
- That there be a phasing plan to minimize interference with the Boat Show during construction
- That [the Applicant] work with the City regarding Las Olas Circle and Birch Road widening to make each lane 10 ft. [wide]

Mr. Zaretsky, who had addressed the Board during the public hearing, stated that the material he had submitted at tonight's meeting was sent electronically on Monday, June 17, 2019. He objected to the fact that the Board had not received this material prior to the meeting. Attorney Spence noted that the documents were presented to the Board prior to

their vote on the Item. Ms. Parker added that the Board had also received these documents via an email from Staff.

Mr. Shechtman advised that he would like the **motion** to directly address the issue of the Applicant providing 10 ft. of space on Birch Road. Mr. Tinter noted that this space is identified on the Site Plan, although it is not described as a dedicated right-of-way.

Vice Chair Fertig expressed concern that there are a number of “unknowns” associated with the project, as well as new information which has not yet been verified. She asked if other Board members wished to defer the Item until the July 17, 2019 meeting. Chair Maus pointed out that a **motion** for approval has been made.

Attorney Spence stated that if the current **motion** fails, this would result in denial of the project. The Board may defer if they feel there is insufficient evidence on which to base a decision. Should the **motion** fail, the Applicant could move forward to the City Commission with the recommendation for denial; alternatively, a motion to reconsider the Item could be made by a Board member who had been on the prevailing side of the vote.

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

9. CASE:	T19010
REQUEST:	Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) Section 47-20.3, Parking and Loading Requirements, Reductions and Exemptions, to provide parking reduction and exemption options for historic resources.
APPLICANT:	City of Fort Lauderdale
GENERAL LOCATION:	City-Wide
CASE PLANNER:	Trisha Logan

Trisha Logan, representing Urban Design and Planning, explained that this Item is included in Phase 2 of proposed Historic Preservation Amendments to the Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR). This phase proposes amendments that can help incentivize property owners into redeveloping or rehabilitating their properties that have been designated as historic by the City.

The proposed amendments include parking reductions and exemptions for historic resources, such as:

- Allowing a residential property to include only one parking space per residential unit
- Allowing a commercial property to designate the first 2500 sq. ft. of the property to be exempt from parking requirements, with any square footage over this amount to be parked at 60% of its requirement

- Allowing any property within a RAC to be exempt from that district's parking requirements in addition to existing parking exemptions for resources located in H-1 zoning districts
- Allowing parking reduction requests for historic resources to go through Site Plan Level I review rather than Site Plan Level III

The Historic Preservation Board (HPB) has reviewed these proposed amendments. Because changing parking reduction requests to Site Plan Level I would not require nearby property owners to be notified of the request, the HPB asked Staff to look into this possibility.

Ms. Logan noted a verbal amendment to the proposed Ordinance: beginning on p.7 of the Staff Report, under Item E1, letter "C" would be changed to number "2." This item must stand on its own as it refers to the H-1 district. Parking exemptions are only related to adaptive re-use projects for historic resources. Attorney Spence added that Roman numeral "i" should also be changed to letter "a" for consistency in numbering.

There being no questions from the Board at this time, Chair Maus 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.

Mr. Barranco commented that Staff should be able to address the proposed incentives rather than having property owners go through the more lengthy Site Plan Level III process as recommended by the HPB.

Mr. Tinter noted that p.8 allows for property owners to count on-street parking spaces toward the parking requirement for residential units in addition to on-site parking. He recommended that the reference to off-street parking be removed in order to provide a minimum of one parking space, with on-street parking to be counted separately.

Mr. Tinter continued that the reductions in parking requirements appear to be generous, particularly in residential developments that typically require two parking spaces per unit. This represents a 50% reduction in residential parking and a 40% reduction for non-residential development. Mr. Restrepo explained that the ITE parking generation manual for residential development in urban areas requires 0.77 space. The requirement for non-residential development mimics the Code requirement for RACs in the area, which can be a requirement of zero spaces within the Central City RAC and an exemption for the first 2500 spaces within the Northwest RAC. The number and total square footage of historic resources within those districts is also taken into consideration.

Mr. Tinter also observed that allowing reductions for these uses in conjunction with the shared parking analyses permitted for mixed-use development could result in providing mixed-use developments in historic districts with double opportunities for reductions. He recommended modifying the amendments' language to prevent further reduction for mixed-use development.

Mr. Shechtman pointed out that the goal of the incentive is not only to address existing historic resources in historic districts, but to encourage property owners to seek a historic designation for their properties in order to take advantage of the proposed parking reductions.

Motion made by Mr. Barranco, seconded by Vice Chair Fertig, to approve with the amendment to the section that [Mr. Tinter] was looking at, with the one minimum parking, taking off the designation of the off-street, and to also include the modifications that Staff suggested on the scriveners' corrections to the sections.

Mr. Tinter proposed the following **amendment** to the **motion**: to add a section C under the shared parking portion of the Ordinance that says in areas where the reduction has been associated with a historic designation, shared parking won't be permitted.

Mr. Tinter clarified that the intent of his **amendment** was for property owners taking advantage of the historic district parking reduction to have access to this reduction only, without access to any additional shared parking reduction. A homeowner may use one of these two options to reduce the parking requirement, but not both.

Mr. Barranco and Vice Chair Fertig accepted the **amendment**.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-1 (Ms. Scott dissenting).

VI. COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION

• Vote on communication proposed on May 15, 2019

Chair Maus recalled that at the May 15, 2019 meeting, she had introduced a discussion of parking, which resulted in the following motion to be communicated to the City Commission: that traffic analysis in the City is inadequate, [and that] current measurements of traffic impact should be investigated in terms of capturing opportunities in the development process to mitigate projects' impacts on the streets. However, the motion could not be communicated to the City Commission at that time, as the Board had not taken a vote to approve it.

Vice Chair Fertig stated she would make this **motion**, and Mr. Shechtman **seconded** it.

It was noted that at present, new development requires a traffic study. If that study shows the development generates fewer than 1000 trips, the applicant provides this study as a traffic statement. Mr. Tinter asserted that the Board's backup materials should include this study, as well as the City's approval or disapproval of this study, rather than the executive summary they currently receive. He proposed that one alternative to this could be expanding the executive summary so levels of service at intersections and roadway

segments are included in the documentation. This information would be provided whether or not the project generates 1000 or more trips.

Chair Maus advised that her original intent was to inform the City Commission that even if the Board is given this additional documentation, the members feel the current system of capturing traffic on the roads is not being measured adequately. Vice Chair Fertig added that the motion should also be intended to identify how a development can help address some of these traffic issues.

Mr. Shechtman added that the motion should also provide a sense of how many individuals may access a given development by alternative means of transportation, such as bicycles or scooters, using some of the local greenways and bicycle trails in which the City has invested.

Vice Chair Fertig and Mr. Shechtman accepted the following **amendment** to their **motion** and **second**: to also put additional emphasis on capturing amount of scooter and bicycle and pedestrian trips.

It was further clarified that this addition would refer to capturing data on the use of alternative means of transportation such as bicycle and scooter use.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-2 (Mr. Tinter and Mr. Weymouth dissenting).

VII. FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE


Ms. Parker advised that there has been discussion of the possibility that the upcoming public hearing on changes to the City's Comprehensive Plan might not capture all public comment due to the summer season. Staff recommends that the special meeting on this topic scheduled for June 26, 2019 be kept, and that a public open house be scheduled for September 2019 in order to hear additional comment. The July 2019 Board meeting would be held in October 2019. The Board accepted this proposal by consensus.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.



Chair



Planning and Zoning Board
June 19, 2019
Page 26

Prototype

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]