



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, JULY 15, 2020 – 6:00 P.M.**

Cumulative

Board Members	Attendance	June 2020-May 2021	
		Present	Absent
Catherine Maus, Chair	P	2	0
Mary Fertig, Vice Chair	P	2	0
John Barranco	P	2	0
Brad Cohen (arr. 6:04)	P	2	0
Coleman Prewitt	P	2	0
William Rotella	P	2	0
Jacquelyn Scott	P	2	0
Jay Shechtman	P	2	0
Michael Weymouth (dep. 8:00)	P	2	0

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

Staff

- D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
- Shari Wallen, Assistant City Attorney
- Christopher Cooper, Deputy Director, Urban Design and Planning
- Jim Hetzel, Principal Planner
- Christian Cervantes, Urban Design and Planning
- Karlanne Grant, Urban Design and Planning
- Nicholas Kalargyros, Urban Design and Planning
- Trisha Logan, Urban Design and Planning
- Yvonne Redding, Urban Design and Planning
- Benjamin Restrepo, Transportation and Mobility
- Igor Vassiliev, Public Works
- 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 6:00 p.m. Roll was called and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

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

Mr. Cohen arrived at 6:04 p.m.

III. PUBLIC SIGN-IN / SWEARING-IN

Members of the public wishing to speak on any Item on tonight's Agenda were sworn in at this time.

IV. AGENDA ITEMS

Index

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1. PDD19001* **	KT Seabreeze Atlantic, LP
2. PLN-SITE-20010007**	Casa Murano, LLC
3. PLN-REZ-20010001**	800 Las Olas, LLC, and Mustang Properties, Inc.
4. PLN-PLAT-20030001**	BSREP III Fort Lauderdale, LLC
5. PLN-REZ-20060001* **	6500 4R3G, LLC; Poliakoff Becker & Streitfield

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.

1. CASE: REQUEST: * **

PDD19001

Site Plan Level IV Review: Rezoning from A-1-A Beachfront Area District (ABA) to Planned Development District (PDD) with Site Plan Approval for 215 Multi-family Residential Units, 5,150 Square-Feet of Retail and Restaurant Space, and Public Parking

**PROPERTY
OWNER/APPLICANT:
AGENT:
PROJECT NAME:
GENERAL LOCATION:
ABBREVIATED LEGAL
DESCRIPTION:**

KT Seabreeze Atlantic, LP.

Stephanie Toothaker, Toothaker.org

3000 Alhambra

3000 Alhambra Street

All of Lots 1 through 20, Block 5 LAUDER DEL MAR, according to the Plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book

	7, Page 30 of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	2 - Steven Glassman
NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:	Central Beach Alliance Homeowners Association
ZONING DISTRICT:	A-1A Beachfront Area District (ABA)
PROPOSED ZONING DISTRICT:	Planned Development District (PDD)
LAND USE:	Central Beach Regional Activity Center
CASE PLANNER:	Jim Hetzel

Disclosures were made at this time.

Stephanie Toothaker, representing the Applicant, requested 20 minutes' presentation time with an additional five minutes for rebuttal if necessary. The Board agreed by consensus to approve the request.

Ms. Toothaker stated that the request before the Board is for Site Plan Level IV review of a parcel that was the subject of a land swap agreement. The subject property was formerly owned by the City and has an existing land use designation of Central Beach Regional Activity Center (RAC). The Applicant has requested rezoning from A1A Beachfront Area (ABA) to Planned Development District (PDD).

Ms. Toothaker reviewed the heights of several nearby buildings, which range from 16 to 29 stories. The request is for Site Plan approval of 215 multi-family residential units with 5150 sq. ft. of retail and restaurant space. In 2016, the previous owner of the site, which is known as the Natchez property, made a land swap with the City in order to more intensely develop the subject site. Later on, a developer took title to the property and also purchased additional properties that completed the block and are currently under consideration.

The Applicant went back before the City Commission to request a Declaration of Restrictive Covenant for a triangular parcel east of the property. The restrictive covenant ensures that this parcel will never be developed. Trips were also allocated to the subject property at that time. The Applicant agreed to replace all 77 public parking spaces that currently exist. These spaces will be controlled and maintained by the City. The agreement also included 43 "semi-public" parking spaces, which were previously leased by another party. These spaces will be made available once more to that party.

The project has been designed to the existing zoning on the property, and a Site Plan for an 18-story project was submitted in March 2018 for Level IV review. The Applicant went through the Development Review Committee (DRC) process and met with neighboring property owners and the Central Beach Alliance (CBA). In response to concerns raised by the CBA, the Applicant redesigned the project in order to preserve view corridors on the site. Through this process, the Applicant learned that the current ABA zoning did not

allow for accommodation of view corridors, which led to the request for PDD rezoning. If this Site Plan is approved, a previous Site Plan submitted for the parcel will be withdrawn.

Ms. Toothaker reviewed the current Site Plan, which is significantly less intense than its predecessor. It proposes 215 units rather than the original 310 and reduces the retail/restaurant space by over 8000 sq. ft. The project was presented to the public in May 2019, June 2019, August 2019, October 2019, and June 2020, including presentations to the CBA and neighboring associations.

The PDD Site Plan moves entrances to the garages located off Birch Road for loading, public parking, and resident drop-off. The property is surrounded by linear parks, which are protected from development by restrictive covenant. The site is heavily landscaped and includes public art installations. Setbacks are consistent with PDD requirements. The project includes amenity decks and a large public plaza with pedestrian connectivity.

Ms. Toothaker compared the current project to its previous design under ABA zoning, explaining that PDD rezoning has significantly less impact on the area due to the 68 ft. 7 in. view corridor between the site's towers. PDD zoning does not include a density cap. The project proposes 95 units per acre, with no minimum lot width and a floor area ration (FAR) of 4.5 for residential and 2.5 for non-residential. The structure length is 356 ft. 3 in. The project's height is 299 ft. 6 in. for both towers against a limit of 300 ft. There will be 497 parking spaces, 121 of which are public, and 11,267 ft. of landscaped space.

Ms. Toothaker noted that City Code states residential density is limited to 50 dwelling units per acre or, when applicable, a maximum residential density permitted by the underlying land use designation. The project's underlying land use of Central Beach RAC ensures there is no density cap: instead, the project is limited by trips. 141 trips were reserved for the project. The traffic study for the PDD project requires approximately 127 gross p.m. peak hour trips.

With regard to height, the PDD Ordinance states that building height may be increased by an additional amount equivalent to 125% of the existing height identified in the zoning district, not to exceed 300 ft. Ms. Toothaker showed a number of renderings of the project, noting that an amenity deck is located above its entrance. An outdoor area lies between the eastern building and Seabreeze Boulevard. At the request of neighboring properties, the Applicant included "bullnosing" to further open the view corridors by an additional separation of 8.9 ft.

The project meets neighborhood compatibility requirements, as reflected in the Staff Report. The Applicant's parking analysis has been reviewed by Staff and determined to be appropriate to the demand. The project meets adequacy requirements for water and wastewater capacity. The Applicant's public improvement summary includes a public park, linear parks, art installations, and a crosswalk on Birch Road if approved. Another suggestion is a right turn only exit from the garage if permitted. The project meets criteria for rezoning and PDD.

Ms. Toothaker requested that another individual be permitted to address the Board. Jim Novick, president of the Alhambra Place Condominium Association, stated that the Alhambra property is directly affected by the project and is supportive of it. Alhambra Place believes the proposal is a dramatic improvement from its previous Site Plan. Mr. Novick characterized the project as responsible development.

The Board members agreed by consensus to include the Staff Report in the record.

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

William Brown, president of the Central Beach Alliance (CBA), recalled that there was limited resident participation in the organization's most recent meeting, as many residents have relocated north for the season. He confirmed the public participation meetings cited by the Applicant, and concurred with the vote at the final meeting. Since July 9, one or more surrounding condominiums have met with the development team to resolve differences.

Mr. Brown advised that the CBA's membership expressed the following concerns:

- Additional sewage/wastewater problems, including pump station #31
- Infrastructure Task Force (ITF) Committee has not met since February 2020 and could not provide guidance to the CBA
- Traffic and parking remain issues of concern
- Public art on parcel E, for which there is a verbal agreement

Mr. Brown concluded that while the CBA voted against the project on two separate occasions, he felt it was the best proposal for the site at this time.

Gregory Wright, private citizen, resident of Alhambra Place, emphasized that while the Applicant has worked with the community on the project, he remained concerned with its impact on traffic, sewage, and infrastructure, as does most of the community.

Dan Teixeira, president of Harbor House East Condominium, advised that the condominium board did not support two nearby projects which they felt were incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood; however, the Applicant has been responsive to concerns raised by neighbors, including Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access, parking for a nearby café, and design of an appealing structure. He spoke positively about the project's design and requested approval of the Site Plan.

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 Mr. Shechtman, seconded by Mr. Weymouth, to approve with Staff conditions, as well as with the condition that, if possible, [the project] can have the right turnout, the crosswalk over Birch [Road], and the art installations.

Chair Maus observed that one of the Applicant's graphics showed many properties of similar heights located outside the subject zoning district. She noted that while the Applicant refers to replacement of 77 public parking spaces, those 77 spaces are included in the count toward their parking requirement, which is not fully met by the project. The Applicant also does not meet the landscaping requirement for the ABA zoning district. She expressed concern with these discrepancies, pointing out that PDD zoning is intended to include developments "of significant interest."

Chair Maus continued that the 68 ft. 7 in. separation between buildings only exceeds the requirements of the ABA zoning district for tower separation by 8 ft. 7 in. She also noted that one of the Applicant's renderings appeared to make the two proposed buildings seem smaller than their actual size and the surrounding buildings larger.

Vice Chair Fertig requested review of the project's public impacts. Ms. Toothaker reviewed the proposed landscaping, public art installations, alteration of the entrance to the garage, and accommodation of the nearby café's parking. She further clarified that the 77 parking spaces are not counted toward the Applicant's parking requirement, although they are included in the total number of spaces. She concluded that the project is 30% less intense than its previous iteration, with 95 fewer units.

Chair Maus advised that landscaping within the ABA district is 25% or 24,715 sq. ft., while the proposed PDD project includes an on-site pervious area and the off-site triangular parcel toward a total of 23,541 sq. ft. She also stated that 120 of the proposed parking spaces are intended to replace parking that the project is eliminating.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-1 (Chair Maus dissenting).

2. CASE:	PLN-SITE-20010007
REQUEST: **	Site Plan Level III Review: 8 Multifamily Residential Units, Waterway Use and Yard Modification
PROPERTY OWNER/APPLICANT:	Casa Murano, LLC.
AGENT:	Barbara Hall / Greenberg Traurig, P.A.
PROJECT NAME:	Casa Murano
GENERAL LOCATION:	141 Isle of Venice Drive
ABBREVIATEDLEGAL DESCRIPTION:	Lot 22 and 23 of Nurmi Island No. 4 Plat Book 24, Page 43
ZONING DISTRICT:	RMM-25
LAND USE:	Residential High
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	2 - Steven Glassman
CASE PLANNER:	Yvonne Redding

Disclosures were made at this time.

Barbara Hall, representing the Applicant, stated that the request is for Site Plan Level III review with waterway use and yard modification. The site is currently occupied by an older condominium building with nine small units and a total of 500 to 600 sq. ft., with backout parking and no sidewalk connection. The proposal would replace this structure with a modern building that is oriented to the street, with architectural elements including a staircase, overhangs, and landscaping.

The property will be developed with eight luxury units and parking inside the site, removing the need for backout parking. It will include a new sidewalk connection and base building setbacks of 15 ft. on each side. The waterway side is consistent with adjacent properties. The building is designed to be transparent with floor-to-ceiling windows and glass balconies. There will be 18 parking spaces at ground level, providing a parking ratio of 2.25 spaces per unit. The site will include a pool, summer kitchen, and bar. Units are almost 3000 sq. ft. each, with three bedrooms, 4.5 bathrooms, a den, and an entry foyer.

The landscape plan is intended to create lush surroundings for the property. The Applicant was asked by City Staff to include royal palms in the landscape plan, as these trees line the street in front of the project. The site's landscaping also includes pigeon plums, pink hibiscus, silver buttonwoods, and coco plums, among others.

Like many other new projects on the Isle of Venice, the property requires a yard modification. Proposed side setbacks are 9.9 ft. on one side and 7.5 ft. on the other. The building is concrete, with the green area central to the building envelope in the back but no green surrounding the property.

The request is for base building setbacks of 21 ft. 4 in. in the front, with a small area covering the stairwell at 18.5 ft. Side setbacks would be 15 ft., with 20 ft. in the rear and a small ground-level portion as the base. Above the first floor, the building will include a "bump-out" for the units' master bedrooms, which will take a portion of the rear yard to a 20 ft. setback. The front setback will be 15 ft. 4 in. to the glass balconies, while the side setbacks will be 11 ft. 11 ¾ in. to the spiral staircase. The building is divided into thirds, with setbacks at 12 ft., 15 ft., and 11 ft. 4 in. Rear setbacks are 17 ft. 3 in. to the spiral staircase, 17 ft. to the barbecue, and 14 ft. to the glass balconies. There is also a 5 ft. setback to the pool.

Criteria for yard modifications require:

- Continuity of yards
- Architectural features that encourage pedestrian interaction
- Continuity of architectural features

The design exceeds the requirement of four named architectural features. Building height, lot size, lot density, lot width, and structure length requirements are met as well. No shadows are cast into more than 50% of the waterway. The project meets the intent of regulations regarding air and light through its use of transparent elements. Ms. Hall noted that both adjacent buildings were granted similar yard modifications within the last two years.

The Applicant held three virtual meetings to which nearby residents and homeowners' associations were invited. Of the 110 invitees, nine owners attended meetings. Comments were very positive.

The Board members agreed by consensus to include the Staff Report in the record.

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

Chair Maus recalled that she had opposed development of projects on either side of the subject site, as they did not meet setback requirements.

Ms. Scott asked if the Applicant would be willing to prepare an architectural resource report, including photos, for the existing building before it is demolished. Ms. Hall agreed to this suggestion.

Motion made by Vice Chair Fertig, seconded by Mr. Prewitt, to approve with [the architectural resource report proposed by Ms. Scott] condition and Staff conditions.

Chair Maus clarified that findings of fact from the Staff Report are included in the **motion**.

Assistant City Attorney Shari Wallen read the Resolution into the record:

A Resolution of the Planning and Zoning Board of the city of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, approving a Site Plan Level III development permit for the development known as 141 Isle of Venice, located at 141 Isle of Venice Drive, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in the RMM-25 zoning district, for the development of eight multi-family residential units; approving waterway use in accordance with Section 47-23.8 of the Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR); approving yard modifications for front, rear, and side yard setbacks; and approving the placement of the pool deck, barbecue, and wet bar within the 20 ft. landscaped area adjacent to the waterway.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-1 (Chair Maus dissenting).

	Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/ Medium High Density (RMM-25) District to Parking Lot (XP) District with Allocation of 0.25 Acres of Commercial Flexibility Acreage to Construct a Surface Parking Lot
PROPERTY OWNER/APPLICANT:	800 Las Olas, LLC., and Mustang Properties, Inc.
AGENT:	Robert Lochrie, Lochrie & Chakas P.A.
PROJECT NAME:	Las Olas East Parking
GENERAL LOCATION:	1016 SE 2 nd Court
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	LOTS 7 & 8, BLOCK 21, COLEE HAMMOCK, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 1, PAGE 17 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	4–Ben Sorenson
ZONING DISTRICT:	Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/ Medium High Density (RMM-25)
PROPOSED ZONING DISTRICT:	Parking Lot (XP)
LAND USE:	Medium – High Residential
CASE PLANNER:	Karlanne Grant

Disclosures were made at this time.

Robert Lochrie, representing the Applicant, stated that the request is for Site Plan Level IV review and rezoning approval. The project is currently vacant and serves as a parking lot with 17 spaces. The rezoning will convert the space to exclusive-use parking, which will provide 18 spaces.

The proposal will include circulation into the parking lot from the alley, with an access point on SE 2 Court removed and replaced with landscaping and sidewalk enhancements along this street and along SE 10 Terrace. The minimal sidewalk on SE 2 Court will be replaced by a 6 ft. landscaped strip, 8 ft. sidewalk, and another 5 ft. landscaped strip before the drive aisles are reached. SE 10 Terrace will have a 13 ft. sidewalk with additional street trees and a 12 to 22 ft. landscape buffer before the parking lot is reached. A 25 to 35 ft. buffer will be placed on SE 10 Terrace from the drive aisle to the parking lot.

The northern side of the site, which includes a minimal sidewalk, curb cut, and drainage issues, will be enhanced with landscaping strips, plantings, lighting, and sidewalk. Along SE 10 Terrace, the site will include a wider sidewalk, underground power lines, a pedestrian plaza, and street trees.

A public participation meeting was held in June 2020, with approximately six people in attendance, including immediate neighbors, by whom the project was well-received.

The Board members agreed by consensus to include the Staff Report in the record.

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

Eric Rajchel, private citizen, stated that he was supportive of the proposed project. He pointed out, however, that he is developing a property at 221 SE 10 Terrace, which will require street work to access a sewer. He encouraged the Applicant and the City to work together on rebuilding the street to meet the Applicant's needs after utility work is done so it does not have to be disturbed again.

Mr. Lochrie proposed the following condition to be added to any motion: [the Applicant will] coordinate with City Staff, particularly the Engineering Department, on improvements that the City will be making in the area [and] to coordinate the timing and minimize any impacts on adjacent properties.

Mr. Weymouth commented that alleys on the north and south sides of Las Olas Boulevard are poorly identified with regard to the flow of traffic. He recommended that the Applicant include pavement marking or one-way signage to identify the way traffic is supposed to flow. He noted that it was not necessary to make this part of any motion, but that this suggestion will be raised again under For the Good of the City.

Motion made by Vice Chair Fertig, seconded by Mr. Weymouth, to approve with Staff conditions and any findings and the City, and also with the added condition of coordinating with the City to minimize the impact on surrounding properties. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 9-0.

4. CASE:	PLN-PLAT-20030001
REQUEST: **	Plat Review
PROPERTY OWNER/APPLICANT:	BSREP III Fort Lauderdale, LLC.
AGENT:	Stephanie Toothaker, Toothaker.org
PROJECT NAME:	Hilton Marina Hotel Plat
GENERAL LOCATION:	1881 SE 17 th Street
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	Portion of 13 and 14-50-42 Acreage
ZONING DISTRICT:	Boulevard Business (B-1) and Residential Multifamily High Rise/ High Density (RMH-60)
LAND USE:	High Residential / Commercial
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	4 – Ben Sorensen
CASE PLANNER:	Christian Cervantes

Disclosures were made at this time.

Stephanie Toothaker, representing the Applicant, explained that the request is for Plat Review for an existing hotel on the 17 Street Causeway. The proposed plat is 420,387 sq. ft. on 9.8 acres of land and includes 39,000 sq. ft. of commercial use, a 33-slip marina, and a 589-room hotel.

Ms. Toothaker recalled that in 2019, the Planning and Zoning Board approved a Site Plan for replacement of a rooftop restaurant and event space on the subject site. During development of the Site Plan, it was discovered that the property had never been platted. The Applicant's team worked with the Broward County Planning Council and Fort Lauderdale City Staff to develop the plat, which will accommodate the previously approved Site Plan.

Because a number of different easements have been recorded near the subject property, the Applicant's team reached out to the nearby Harbordale Condominium Association and residents of the Port Condominiums. Residents of both developments wished to ensure that their current access to the property is codified in the plat, which the Applicant has accommodated.

The Board members agreed by consensus to include the Staff Report in the record.

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

Captain Ryan Sweeney, president of the Port Everglades Pilots Association, advised that this organization's property is enclosed by two parcels of the subject site and the Seminole River. He explained that he would like the Applicant to acknowledge the Association's access to easements, including ingress/egress, utility easements, and a parking easement. He also wished to ensure that the property line is clear, as there is an overhang onto the Association's property due to an old easement.

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

Ms. Toothaker advised that the easements to which Capt. Sweeney had referred are shown on the project's Site Plan. Jim McLaughlin, also representing the Applicant, identified several easements shown on the plat, including ingress/egress, the overhang area, and multiple parking easements. Capt. Sweeney confirmed that these included the easements to which he had referred.

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

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

Chair Maus asked what had precipitated the need to plat the property, as well as whether everything stipulated in the plat was consistent with the previous Site Plan approval. Jim Hetzel, Principal Planner, replied that the Applicant's building permit for the site did not meet the requirements that would have prevented the need for a plat under County regulations and City Code. There is slightly more commercial square footage indicated on the plat than on the Site Plan, which is acceptable, as enough space was provided to accommodate the use.

Christian Cervantes, also representing Urban Design and Planning, further clarified that the total proposed use of the final Site Plan is 60,531 sq. ft. Mr. Hetzel reiterated that it is permitted for the square footage of the plat to exceed the square footage of the Site Plan. If the Applicant chooses, he may reduce the square footage of the plat to fit the Site Plan after the plat has been recorded.

Chair Maus noted that the plat contains the possibility of greater development than the previously approved Site Plan. Mr. Hetzel advised that the Applicant is renovating a portion of the property. The Site Plan, which was approved in November 2019, showed these renovations.

Assistant City Attorney D'Wayne Spence further clarified that the platting process does not invest further rights in the property: it subdivides land that is also used in Broward County's concurrency system to ensure that certain impact fees are paid. The development rights are secured through the development permit and Site Plan process. To secure greater rights, the Site Plan would have to be amended. It may not be amended to provide a greater development level than what is shown on the Site Plan.

Chair Maus explained that she was concerned approval of the plat could be misconstrued as tacit approval of a new Site Plan with greater intensity. Attorney Spence reiterated that the Board may expressly state that this is not their intent if they wish.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 9-0.

Mr. Weymouth left the meeting at 8 p.m.

5. CASE:	PLN-REZ-20060001
REQUEST: * **	Rezoning from Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial Business District (B-3) to Uptown Urban Village Northeast District (UUV-NE)
PROPERTY OWNER/APPLICANT:	6500 4R3G, LLC; Poliakoff Becker & Streitfield
AGENT:	City of Fort Lauderdale
PROJECT NAME:	Fairfield Cypress Creek
GENERAL LOCATION:	6500 and 6520 N. Andrews Avenue
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	Pine Crest Isles 63-48 B

COMMISSION DISTRICT:	1 – Heather Moraitis
NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:	N/A
ZONING DISTRICT:	Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial Business (B-3)
PROPOSED ZONING DISTRICT:	Uptown Urban Village Northeast (UUV-NE)
LAND USE:	Employment Center
CASE PLANNER:	Jim Hetzel

Disclosures were made at this time.

Jim Hetzel, Principal Planner, stated that this is a City-initiated Application to rezone a parcel from Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial Business (B-3) to Uptown Urban Village Northeast (UUV-NE). The subject property is located in the Uptown project area, for which an Uptown Master Plan was adopted by the City Commission in November 2019. With that approval came the creation of zoning districts specific to the project area.

The City Commission had also expressed interest in identifying incentives that could be offered by the City for development. Because financial incentives were not an option, Staff proposed that properties could be rezoned on behalf of their owners through an expedited process. This Application is the first such expedited request on behalf of a property owner. A Site Plan has been submitted for Site Plan Level III review, which will come before the Board at a later date.

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.

Motion made by Vice Chair Fertig, seconded by Ms. Scott, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.

V. COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION

Vice Chair Fertig commented that she was in favor of Mr. Weymouth's earlier suggestion of including directional indicators and/or signage showing patterns of movement. Mr. Hetzel proposed that Staff look into this to determine if there are any plans to include this from the Parks and Recreation or Public Works Departments before a formal communication is sent to the City Commission. Ms. Scott suggested that any such plans also indicate the locations of potholes or other issues in need of improvement in alleyways.

VI. FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

Ms. Scott recalled that Mr. Weymouth had sent an email to Staff regarding the inclusion of items on Agendas, which referred to moving less time-consuming Items to a higher

position on the Agenda than those that may require a great deal of time and discussion. Chair Maus pointed out that Agendas are set by Urban Design and Planning, and it is their place to reorder Agenda Items prior to the time of the actual meeting.

Ms. Scott asked if the Board could vote, at the time of a meeting, to reorder an Agenda so Items that may be decided more quickly are moved to the top. Chair Maus cautioned that this could result in losing the input of participants who have planned their participation in the meeting according to the Item's position. These individuals might not be in attendance when the Item is called.

Attorney Wallen advised that this is left to the Board's discretion. She also cautioned against any two-way communication between individual Board members outside of meetings, as this would constitute a violation of the Sunshine Law.

Mr. Hetzel explained that the order of Agenda Items is determined by the order in which they were submitted, with the exception of deferrals, which are typically the very first Item on the Agenda to which they were deferred.

The Board discussed the proposal, with Mr. Cooper of Urban Design and Planning requesting additional direction from the Chair or Board on how to arrange Agenda order. Mr. Barranco advised that this should be left to the discretion of the Board on a meeting-by-meeting basis. Mr. Shechtman suggested that the Board hear an opinion from Attorney Spence on this proposal, pointing out that it may be difficult to either group Items represented by the same attorney together as well as moving Items with a great deal of public interest to the forefront.

Mr. Prewitt stated that while he agreed with Mr. Barranco to a degree, it is also problematic to make a large number of individuals wishing to provide public input wait to hear their Item. He emphasized that members of the public make their plans according to the published Agendas, and recommended that changes only be made under extraordinary circumstances.

Chair Maus proposed that the Board direct Mr. Cooper to review the Agenda before it is finalized and group multiple presentations by a single Applicant together, as well as considering the potential for significant public response to some Items and moving them to the end of the Agenda. Vice Chair Fertig and Ms. Scott both agreed with this suggestion.

Mr. Hetzel concluded that Staff will look into possible ways to reorder Agendas and bring them back to the next meeting for additional discussion. He cautioned that there may be certain requirements for Agenda placement which would need to be satisfied. The Board members agreed with this proposal by consensus.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.

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

Catherine Mauro

Chair

Brigitte Chiappetta

Prototype

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

