

A G E N D A

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT WORKSHOP

MARCH 10, 2004

5:00 to 7:00 P.M.

CITY HALL

CAFETERIA – 8TH Floor

100 ANDREWS AVENUE, FT. LAUDERDALE, FL

(A meal will be provided)

1. STAFF COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Is the Board in favor of altering the procedure Staff currently follows in presenting cases? Specifically, does the Board want the staff to review each application; measure it against the criteria in the Code and make a finding as to whether or not the applicant has met the criteria, and to make a recommendation for approval or denial of the variance?

Is enough information being provided to the Board members in their packages and what suggestions do they have for additional information or improved backup?

Does the Board want DRC comments, if available, in their packages?

Should the package be amended to provide for staff comments (as opposed to recommendations) for technical issues? It was anticipated that not every application would have such comments; it would be the responsibility of Zoning staff to elicit comments from other departments on a case-by-case basis.

2. SPECIFIC CHANGES TO APPLICATION PROCESS AND MATERIALS PROVIDED TO APPLICANTS

- A. One year temporary use permits: does the Board want to make it a requirement that an applicant go through staff review (DRC) before coming before the Board with a temporary use request? In the alternative, does the Board want the application to be amended to specifically address certain types of requests (parking variances;

temporary use permits) to strongly recommend that the applicant go through a DRC review (temporary use permits) or parking reduction request (parking variances) prior to coming before the Board, indicating in the application that those applicants not choosing to accept this recommendation will be expected to provide a significant reason for their election not to follow this recommendation.

B. Signs. Does the Board want the application amended with language addressing the Applicant's responsibility to post signage in accordance with code provisions and to state that in some cases, more than one sign might be necessary to achieve the intent that the public be apprised of the pending application? Staff indicates that an applicant may have as many signs as he/she wishes at no additional cost.

C. Signs. Should the applicant have a further burden with respect to sign verification such as the submission of a photograph including the placement of the sign?

3. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DISCUSSION/REVIEW BOB'S MEMOS ON THE SUBJECT HANDED OUT TO BOARD SEVERAL MONTHS AGO FOR QUESTIONS/COMMENTS.

ITEMS RECEIVED FROM BOARD MEMBERS:

4. MEETING TIMES. IS THE BOARD IN FAVOR OF ALTERING THE TIME FOR MEETINGS? NOTE: THIS WOULD REQUIRE A CITY COMMISSION ORDINANCE AS THE MEETING DATE AND TIME IS SET IN THE CITY CODE.

5. PENDING ITEMS LIST. IS THE BOARD IN FAVOR OF RECOMMENDING THAT THE COMMISSION REVIEW ANY SPECIFIC ITEMS OF CONCERN WITH RESPECT TO THE CODE, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO:

- a. Parking Reduction/parking variance requests
- b. Setback measurement
- c. Carport enclosures