

**APPROVED MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CENTRAL CITY REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD (CCRAB)
SPECIAL IN-PERSON & VIRTUAL MEETING
FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 2021 – 3:30 PM
CITY HALL – CHAMBER ROOM
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301**

September 2020 – August 2021

BOARD MEMBERS		<u>Regular Meetings</u>		<u>Special Meetings</u>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Luis Castillo-Olivera, Chair	P	6	0	1 in person	0
Laxmi Lalwani, Vice Chair	P	3	3	1 via zoom	0
Robert Ayen	P	6	0	1 via zoom	0
Pieter Coetzee	P	4	2	1 in person	0
Adam Gellar	P	6	0	1 in person	0
Charlene Gunn	P	4	2	1 via zoom	0
Peter Kosinski	A	3	3	0	1
Theodore Spiliotes	P	5	1	1 in person	0
Zachary Talbot	P	4	2	1 via zoom	0
Ray Thrower	P	2	0	1 via zoom	0
Dennis Ulmer	P	2	0	1 via zoom	0

At this time, there are 11 appointed members to the Board; therefore, 6 constitute a quorum.

Staff:

Cija Omengebar, CRA Planner/Liaison
Mauricio Baquero, City Moderator
D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
Lorraine Tappen, Principal Urban Planner – Department of Sustainability
Karen Warfel, Program Manager, Department of Transportation & Mobility
Crysta Parkinson, Prototype Inc.

Presenters:

Joe Corradino, President of the Corradino Group
Mark Alvarez, Manager of the Corradino Group
Edward Ng, The Corradino Group

I. Call to Order

Chair Castillo-Olivera called the Zoom meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. Roll was called, and it was noted that a quorum was present.

II. Central City Rezoning Project Presentation

• Path Forward – Addressing Gap Issues

Joe Corradino, President of the Corradino Group, Mark Alvarez, Director of the Corradino Group, and Edward Ng, with the Corradino Group, were present.

Mr. Alvarez presented a Power Point presentation titled “Fort Lauderdale CRA Central City Rezoning”. The purpose of this meeting was to pick up where the previous consultants left off as well as to reengage

stakeholders in the community, confirm the consensus of where they are, discuss issues, and determine how to move forward. He noted that Task 1 was finished, and the document in part informs them to go to Task 2, which is an analysis where they look at the code, the map, and how well the existing and proposed code support the redevelopment objectives of the Central City CRA. They discussed the gap between when the first consultant began the rezoning analysis and rewrite with a thorough series of public workshops and charrettes and the current process to complete the rezoning work. Combined, the prior effort and this process will take approximately 3½ years. For this continuation, the first CRA public meeting was held on February 1, 2021. Today is the second meeting and a third will be held in August, which is sequenced with the completion of the writing the draft code language. An analysis will be conducted and there will be meetings internally with staff prior to doing the draft rewrite of the proposed code, which will be brought back for a public meeting in August 2021.

The following points were highlighted:

- The timeline with the previous consultant began in May 2018.
- There was extensive stakeholder and community engagement, and there is a record of those meetings, the consensus, and what the next steps would be.
- Two well-attended workshops where there were a lot of visual preferencing to let people know the possibilities for Central City and to get feedback as to what everyone felt Central City should become.
- Extensive CRA meetings, which included the CRA Plan and a vision map of what the CRA could become.
- A proposed rezoning and an existing zoning map, which comes from the City's GIS, as well as the old zoning code that are currently informing development.
- There are modifications to the existing text for the RD-15 and three new Districts, which have entirely new text: the N-MXD, the TE, and the CCC.

Also discussed was the Scope and Approach, Objectives, and Task 2: Review Existing Policy and LDR Uses.

Photographs of existing conditions were shown in the area that is north of NW 13th Street and south of 16th between Powerline Road and 6th Avenue, where blighted conditions need to be addressed by stimulating redevelopment. It was noted that the neighborhood south of NW 13th Street is quite different and there are two characteristics of existing development, well-maintained homes and new development, which is good for redevelopment. To the east is the commercial core, mixed-use area and higher densities. This is a development area that could feed the transit system through first and last mile efforts, which is well on its way, at least as far as infrastructure goes. There are still some issues that could be addressed with zoning to make the area more attractive.

Mr. Coetzee commented that the corridor north of 13th and east of 9th is blighted and many developers who do Housing Authority type developments would need a site like that. The thought of this Board was that the type of people who would be housed in such a development if the area turned around would be the ones currently living there because of the way the Housing Authority operates. Nothing has happened to that area and it is a problem area for the City. In looking at the map, he saw no density for RM-60 and

to him, the logical place would be close to the railroad tracks east of NE 4th Avenue. He mentioned RM-25 and questioned why the site is not RM-60. The City is growing and there is a need for accommodation. Currently, everyone wants to come to Fort Lauderdale and there is an opportunity to address zoning and do the best they can for this particular property. He mentioned RM-25 along Sunrise Boulevard and questioned why it cannot go all the way from left to right and cause a barrier between Sunrise Boulevard and the RD-15 behind it.

Mr. Alvarez advised he would talk to staff and review records from prior meetings between 2018 and 2019. He agreed it probably makes more sense to bring the proposed CCC all the way to the west, but as far as the RM-25 to RM-60, they must stay with what is feasible at this time. There is Comprehensive Plan language that creates an upper limit on density, and they would have to work with the County, State and an intergovernmental review to change that limit, so it is a longer process. Currently, they would make sure to maximize the RM-25 in the flex zones, but it must follow rules, be compatible and would be mixed use, so the buildings would get a ground floor layer that is retail with some services, assuming that parking would be moved to the second floor from ramps on the first floor, and then multi-family residential above. Those are probably in the range of five-story buildings because commercial is stacked underneath at the ground floor.

In response to Mr. Coetzee, Mr. Alvarez stated that a timeline for a companion Comprehensive Plan amendment would be in the range of 12 to 18 months. The time between the transmittal, which is a first reading item, and the second reading is a minimum of six months. There is a lot of work beforehand; traffic studies, transportation studies, infrastructure studies, and consultants must establish if there is a need to increase density. The County conducted the review and there is a lot of review before it can be transmitted. Every seven years, the City does an update of the Comprehensive Plan for the entire City, called a "EAR-Based Amendment", which means Evaluation and Appraisal Report. The last Amendment was two years ago in 2019, so there will be another in 2025. Typically, Amendments that come in between those periods would be a developer who wants to change the land use and they would pay for this. The City would have to pay itself, so typically, the City would wait until the next Amendment cycle. Even if they were to start now, they would be finishing in 2023, which is two years prior to the next Amendment. They do not have a current Market Study or Housing Needs Study, and do not see evidence north of Sunrise Boulevard and west of NW 4th Avenue for that kind of market absorption. They have decided to stay within the Comprehensive Plan to minimize delaying the process too long.

Mr. Coetzee questioned if there were concurrency issues in that area and he noted there were a lot of problems Downtown with infrastructure. He is also pressing because of the concurrency issues that exist elsewhere with the rising sea issues. He would rather take extra time and do this right.

Mr. Alvarez stated there were no concurrency issues in the area at this point, but it will be noted. They are trying to stay on the timeline and were scoped to work with the zoning code and finish what was started. On the other hand, he did not recommend a two-step process with some increase now and some later because when those kinds of sequences are done, basically the investment will wait for better investment returns.

Mr. Coetzee clarified that RM-25 stretches from North Andrews Avenue west towards 7th Avenue and he

believes RM-25 should go all the way from left to right as a barrier on Sunrise Boulevard to the neighborhood behind it.

Mr. Alvarez indicated that a CCC is proposed as a mixed-use, so there is commercial and residential. It would become the commercial front of the transition and then a transitional zoning is proposed to finish that block, which tapers it down.

Ms. Omengabar commented that she was collecting comments and noted that they would be addressed at the next meeting with staff.

Mr. Gellar mentioned the area between 13th and 16th, between Powerline and 7th Terrace. During the presentation it was mentioned that the current zoning is RDS-15, and the proposed rezoning would be RD-15. He noted that RDS gives density at maximum nine dwelling units per acre. He stated that it currently limits the form to single family and questioned if there were currently multi-family dwellings in the region. He noted that the proposed change would be to allow for multi-family.

Mr. Alvarez advised that the permitted density in RDS-15 is 15 units per acre, but because it limits the form of housing to single family, it cannot be built to that density. He stated the RDS was implemented apparently to revitalize the area a decade and a half ago. He indicated that the proposed change would allow for multi-family forms, so it could redevelop to its potential of 15 units per acre. There is evidence that it works in the area south of 13th, so if the investment community could develop townhouses to a density of 15 whether it is two, three, or four together, that is working.

Mr. Gellar referenced current properties that are multi-family and grandfathered in that cannot be redeveloped and questioned if that was why they were not currently being redeveloped. He did not understand the difference between changing it to what is already the same thing.

Mr. Alvarez explained the properties are grandfathered in; he presumed before RDS-15 they were RD-15. As he understands from staff, there was a time where the City looked at that and said the solution was to create a single-family neighborhood with property ownership, but it backfired and went the other way. They need to put it back to RD-15 to get the maximum out of the 15 units per acre and to allow townhouses, duplexes, and row houses.

Mr. Gellar questioned the difference between what it is currently allowed and what it is proposed to change, particularly on 8th Avenue.

Mr. Alvarez stated sometimes the zoning code does not work because it is in conflict. RDS does not allow the 15 units per acre; it is a mismatch that they want to correct.

Chair Castillo-Rivera questioned the height limitation in this area and questioned if there could be three or four-stories to make it feasible for apartments.

Mr. Alvarez believed the height limitation was 35 feet; he would need to look to be sure. All heights need to be reviewed. Many zoning codes were based on the crown of the road and that is no longer what they

do. He thought townhouses and row houses need three floors because they need to have something on the bottom that looks like a house, which is usually a place to put the cars. It was noted that parking would be ideal in the back of the property. They need three stories and will make sure that is accommodated.

Mr. Spiliotes mentioned the railroad and streets in his neighborhood, which is part of Central City. The plan is to change everything west of Sunrise Boulevard and NE 4th Avenue and questioned how that would affect anything going east.

Mr. Alvarez advised that the Zoning Code Amendment says it is the entire Central City area. He has been making a distinction of 4th Avenue because it is the street that distinguishes the more commercial area, which would go to a more mixed-use area; commercial with residential vertically integrated in the building from what is more strictly a residential neighborhood in which there are transitions towards the edge of Sunrise Boulevard towards 13th.

Mr. Spiliotes commented on changes being made and questioned if 4th was going west and how it would affect businesses, etc. east of that area.

Mr. Alvarez stated changes are for both sides. The Zoning Code Amendments proposed are for the entire Central City CRA area; it goes from the FEC tracks to Powerline Road from Sunrise Boulevard to 13th or 16th.

Chair Castillo-Rivera thought the concern was what it would do to the Lake Ridge area east of the tracks.

Mr. Spiliotes stated if they are changing a business structure on Sunrise Boulevard heading west and then east and questioned how that would affect the businesses.

Mr. Alvarez advised the effect is positive. As the CRA area becomes more developed and popular, drawing more business traffic and people who are spending money spreads. Even along NE 13th Street, just outside the area is the brewery, which is a good example of how it affects the area to the outside. The CRA incentivizes development within its own boundaries, but there is a positive effect to the edges as well.

Mr. Coetzee requested Mr. Alvarez explain the density of Transitional Edge (TE).

Mr. Alvarez indicated they are working with what was left from 2019. The TE as designed was supposed to be at a higher density because when this process started in 2018, they were working with a different flex zone boundary. He thought the intent was to allow some of the flex units to create a little higher density in the TE. Currently, they cannot do that, the flex zone stops just west of NE 4th Avenue and covers the border of Sunrise Boulevard. That is one of the zoning districts that must be fixed to address how it interacts with the Comprehensive Plan. During the presentation he mentioned they were looking for tweaks within the current Comprehensive Plan. They want to add value to properties and the quality of life, so they need permission in the District to have live/work, which creates extra value and a small commercial establishment if the person lives in the back. It cannot be any kind of large-scale business;

it must be one-off production and must be a small proprietary use. They cannot guarantee if there is wiggle room, but they are going to work on that further. Whatever can be done to stimulate investment in the existing buildings will be done.

Mr. Coetzee questioned if this was the map they were going forward with.

Mr. Alvarez advised that the existing map they are starting from has yellow and orange colors, with orange being the TE. TE was identified as one of the districts that is affected by the flex zone boundary change, so they have to try to work with it.

Mr. Coetzee mentioned terms of allowable units for the entire development and questioned if there were edits from the original map to the one proposed and if there was more density and what the ruling for density was to meet the goal and timeline.

Mr. Alvarez stated within the Mixed-Use District, anywhere in the flex zone they can have additional density and there are many rules to follow; it is on a site-level basis. Language would be created to make sure those rules are assured for compatibility, etc. They do not have flexibility on the west side of NW 4th Avenue, so no change can be made on the face by increasing density. Other things can be done to add value, but they cannot go beyond 15 units per acre, which is higher than what is currently there.

Mr. Thrower referenced the TE and 13th Street and noted nothing could be done north of 13th Street because it is not in the CRA. Perhaps the City could look at this at the same time, so the streets would be evenly matched.

Vice Chair Lalwani understood that Mr. Alvarez could only do what he could, and her concern was more about the timeline. The previous consultant's timeline got the Board excited because they started to think something would come of this project earlier than it has. She questioned if the timeline included a buffer or if it was his best guess estimate.

Mr. Alvarez indicated that their end of work would mostly be done by August. When they started the project, they tried to make sure it got adopted within the year, so they worked backwards through the hearing requirements. Work is to be done by August and then it would be carried to the CRA Board, the Planning Advisory Board, to two Readings of the Commission sitting as the CRA, and then to the Commission.

III. Public Comments

Ms. Omengebar indicated that she would check names from her notes. Javier was the only one who was not written on the screen.

Chair Castillo-Rivera opened discussion to the public and announced that everyone had three minutes to speak.

Javier Concha, Jr. questioned which plan Mr. Alvarez was going by and noted that his home is west of 4th Avenue, which is why he has been against the proposed plan. He likes that plan better because the residential use and neighborhood is being kept intact; however, he is totally against the proposed Zoning Map, but in favor of the Future Land Use Map. He mentioned a group from Turnstone Development is trying to build something behind his backyard, but they want to keep it central within the community. As far as east of 4th Avenue, Sistrunk Boulevard was approved \$5,000 for landscaping and to improve the front of their homes by the CRA and he questioned why that cannot be done east of 4th Avenue. There is a cluster, and it would be nice if the CRA would get involved.

Mr. Alvarez clarified as far as the border goes, properties facing 5th Avenue would come out of the Mixed-Use District because they do not have the flex zone. Slide #19 and #35 were shown.

Chair Castillo-Rivera commented that as far as he knew, the property line between 3rd and 4th is commercial and Mr. Concha's house is residential.

Mr. Concha stated he would email Ms. Omengebar because Abby mentioned the height of the buildings and if they could keep things like Cumberland Farms or Sherwin Williams, that would be great.

Chair Castillo-Rivera stated that is the problem; 3rd Avenue and 4th Avenue can go up to eight stories.

Ms. Omengebar opened discussion to attendees online.

Abby Laughlin commented this was the specificity they needed. Part of the problem with some of the rezoning was that it was not rezoned deep enough to let buildings fit. If they cannot park and stormwater manage it, it is not going to work. There was discussion about making sure similar properties get treated the same way and she thought the north side of 13th Street should be looked at because it should be treated the same as the south side. A corridor needs the scale of the buildings to match on both sides. It seems like 90% of the CB Zoning has been eliminated in the new plan and maybe it is time to eliminate the tiny stretch of CB. She thought changes should be for both sides of the corridor. She mentioned the possibility of demonstrating a need for housing in the area and questioned why they could not be considered a RAC like Uptown and Downtown. They are a spine connecting everything and are not being considered as a place that could accommodate additional housing.

Ms. Omengebar stated she would contact Ms. Laughlin regarding a document she sent as part of the backup. She asked if Ms. Laughlin wanted to read the document or explain if it was in support or against the project.

Ms. Laughlin advised that Transforma Realty, owned by Ken Zurelli, is in support of the new project. She read the last paragraph into the record regarding the need for more inclusion.

Mary McKinley stated her focus was on two points, Powerline Road, and NW 8th Avenue, north of 13th Street and south of 16th Street, and commercial properties on Sunrise Boulevard. She mentioned that one map looked like some sort of transition, but it did not appear that it went all the way to the south side of 11th Street, which was requested. She asked for clarification as to whether it meant a front

facing could be done on a building on Sunrise Boulevard with parking all the way to 11th or what the depth would be at the end of Sunrise Boulevard.

Mr. Alvarez indicated that the map was a starting point and he noted this is one of the problematic areas. The proposed map on the screen, which is the proposed Zoning Map as it left off in 2019, has the Community Commercial Corridor District, (CCC), and it is deeper. That thought was addressed; however, when the flex zone boundary was changed, it came back to approximately 125 feet, so there is a problem having commercial go further back into the flex zone. It is a matter of allowing the automotive commercial corridor uses beyond the flex zone in a compatible way. They are locked into where the flex zone line is, and they must look at the existing line and properties; for the most part, they seem to be 125 feet. The Zoning code cannot solve every problem, particularly when it comes to density and lot depths, but there can be requirements that require a greater depth; however, they do not want to create legally non-compliant uses; they want it to be open to the neighborhood so people can walk. They are going to work with the depth they have and see what could work as far as defining the CCC District to address it; the real issues are the transition. He thinks a commercial corridor such as Sunrise Boulevard is automotive oriented, and people drive to those uses.

Chair Castillo-Rivera questioned if they were leaving Sunrise Boulevard as an automotive corridor and noted the community was expecting to have all those things solved. He emphasized this is what the community needs; many properties between Sunrise Boulevard and 11th are investor properties waiting and they are not going to sell or do anything until something changes. He noted there are many apartment buildings that are totally substandard.

Mr. Alvarez stated they are going to have to address this; they may have to work with the County and City staff to see what can be done.

Latrinsha Greaves questioned if anything was going to change from Sunrise Boulevard to 13th Street, west of Andrews Avenue, east of NW 7th Avenue, specifically between NW 11th Street and NW 12th Street.

Mr. Alvarez advised that area is proposed to be RD-15, which is what it is now. Currently, the area functions quite well and there is good maintenance of the properties and reinvestment in some of the properties that go vacant, which is what they want to see. There is little change; there will be some small tweaks addressing parking and where parking goes, trying to alleviate smaller issues in that area. They see a stable neighborhood and want to keep it stable.

William Cody questioned plans for Powerline Road between 13th Street and 16th Street and if there was going to be any change.

Mr. Alvarez stated that the area would go from RDS-15 to RD-15. As far as Powerline Road, they will be looking at a transitional edge type of treatment in that area. He stated that Powerline Road was a hostile environment for single family residential homes and it is probably a good place for redevelopment. They cannot get the density up, but they can change the housing form and try to permit

live/work situations and create more activity to take advantage of the fact that there is higher traffic along Powerline Road. There will be some changes.

Attorney Jason Crush stated that his firm represents several property owners in the area. He did not think this should be pushed quickly just to get something done. He thought if they had to analyze amending the Flex Map and doing the Land Use Plan Amendment to expand north of 13th pushing that area along Sunrise Boulevard currently labeled TE, it should be considered. Making a change that is not really a change just to get it done by the end of the year is not going to revitalize the area. He agreed with Abby Laughlin and stated that they need to make a difference, specifically in the area east of 4th Avenue. Perhaps exploring amending the XP Zoning ordinance so Sunrise Boulevard and the TE area could provide parking could be done. He agreed with one of the Board members; there is a lot of institutional ownership of what is now residential waiting to change to something else. He thought that could be done without affecting the RD-15 area in the core, making residents who live there happy in their residential island in the middle. He will follow up with Ms. Omengabar to schedule individual meetings with the consultants and Mr. Alvarez.

Moshe Yehoshoua indicated that he has a lot of property south of 13th Street on 2nd Avenue and questioned how flexible they were south of 13th Street to become a CCC.

Mr. Alvarez advised that the issue would be reviewed as regulations are developed for the TE. Bringing it further with greater depth south of 13th is a matter of whether it is functional and if achieves a purpose and remains compatible with the neighborhood. He noted there is an issue with lot depth and how it could accommodate development. There was a somewhat different idea during meetings that occurred two years ago as to what TE would mean and there was more focus on the assembly of lots and having unified development on those half blocks. They must look at this carefully to make sure it is still a viable concept. If they can keep it deep without doing harm to the neighborhood that would be fine, but if they think there would be harm to the neighborhood, that would take priority over making it deep.

Mr. Yehoshoua thought an art gallery would add a lot of value to the neighborhood.

Mr. Alvarez stated an art gallery is a desirable use in most cases. The idea of having commercial uses at the front of residential as a live/work is something to approach with a lot of care. They like it, it is a traditional sort of concept. They will be working through these questions in tasks 2 and 4. The TE area is a big question as to how to treat those, work with those, make them have more value, and how much depth they should have. Based on prior comments, they will look at the depth on the CCC, work with the limitations, and do what they can to make it work.

Edward Catalano, Treasurer the South Meadow River Civic Association, commented that he mentioned this meeting at the last Board meeting at which time the Board appointed him to attend and represent the Civic Association. They are concerned about the removal of the northwest section of the CRA from the rezoning changes; the RD-15 being changed from 13th to 16th. The Civic Association has been concerned about their neighborhood for many years and have attempted to clean up the area to no avail. Their attempts and expectations were rekindled when the CRA zoning changes in 2018 were proposed. The crime and code violations in this area have increased every year and the only way to

solve those problems is to rezone the area. During 2020, the area of South Middle River had 729 code violations, which covered 107 properties located in that area. South Middle River has one of the highest crime rates in District 2, which also includes Lauderdale Manor. More than half the crimes are in that area and they want changes. He emphasized that a zoning change is needed now, not in several years.

Mr. Alvarez stated the focus of the presentation was to have the zoning change adopted by the end of this year. The “Now” is important and creates certain limitations they have to live with. The proposal is to rezone the area; however, only the Commission can rezone it. They are also looking at issues of creating more value by getting rid of the single-family limits allowing it to fulfill its density as it is on the Comprehensive Plan and addressing the Powerline Road issue as being a hostile environment. They would like that area to become stable and developable as the neighborhood to the south of 13th Street.

Katherine Barry, with Homes, Inc., which is a charity, commented that they own two acres at 13th Street and Dixie Highway, which is also NE 7th, and have owned the property since 2006. She explained that this has been going on since 2011 when the CRA was started, and they were already talking about more flexible zoning. Homes, Inc. is thrilled they are in the mixed-use zoning area. She is glad they are moving away from specific names of businesses, in which charities and non-profits are not listed. People have asked her why CRA boundaries cannot be expanded. She questioned why they cannot do what Abby Laughlin asked and combine a few non CRA areas with the CRA to make it more holistic. She reiterated what other people said about Powerline Road, and to do nothing there, but keeping it RD-15 is not enough. It has been a terrible area forever and has not improved; it cannot improve if something more drastic is not proposed. She mentioned Sunrise Boulevard west of 4th and noted the entry is not appealing when entering the City of Fort Lauderdale; from I-95 it looks terrible and will continue to look that way unless they can find a creative way to address possibilities. She hoped they would think about what could be done north on Powerline Road along Sunrise Boulevard near I-95. She mentioned the list of what is important in the neighborhood and hoped the green space was part of the quality urban design.

Ms. Omengabar asked Ms. Barry to call her, so they could discuss her question about the CRA. Other comments have been noted and staff will work with the consultant as they move forward.

Chair Castillo-Rivera referenced Police calls in 2020 on the nine square blocks they have been discussing. There were 22 pages with 75 lines per page, and this is what they call quality of life.

Ms. Omengabar indicated there was a discussion regarding Code Enforcement and she was glad he was able to get the information, but it is on the next agenda for the next regular meeting. She asked Mr. Alvarez to remind everyone of the next Workshop meeting in August.

Mr. Alvarez stated the meeting would be formal and noted that he would be attending all the CRA meetings.

IV. Adjournment

The next CCRAB meeting will be held via Zoom on Wednesday, May 5, 2021.

Motion to adjourn the meeting was duly made and seconded. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

[Minutes written by C. Guifarro, Prototype, Inc.]