

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING
City of Fort Lauderdale
Wednesday, May 13, 2009 – 6:30 P.M.
City Hall City Commission Chambers – 1st Floor
100 North Andrews Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative Attendance	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Scott Strawbridge, Chair	P	10	1
Don Larson, Vice Chair	P	10	1
Diane Centorino	P	9	2
David Goldman	P	10	1
Gerald Jordan	P	11	0
Bruce Weihe	P	8	3
Birch Willey	P	10	1
<u>Alternates</u>			
Michael Madfis	P	9	2
Henry Sniezek	P	10	1
Karl Shallenberger	P	10	1

Staff

Bob Dunckel, Assistant City Attorney
Yvonne Blackman, Secretary
Cheryl Felder, Service Clerk
Terry Burgess, Zoning Administrator
Mohammed Malik, Chief Zoning Plans Examiner
B. Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, ProtoType Services

Communication to the City Commission

None

Purpose: Section 47-33.1.

The Board of Adjustment shall receive and hear appeals in cases involving the ULDR, to hear applications for temporary nonconforming use permits, special exceptions and variances to the terms of the ULDR, and grant relief where authorized under the ULDR. The Board of Adjustment shall also hear, determine and decide appeals from reviewable interpretations, applications or determinations made by an administrative official in the enforcement of the ULDR, as provided herein.

Index

	<u>Appeal Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.	09-08	Parkview Townhomes Homeowners Association	<u>2</u>
2.	09-03	Parkview Townhomes Homeowners Association	<u>3</u>
3.	08-34	BZ Holdings, LLC	<u>6</u>
4.	09-09	Phillip & Paula Bogdall	<u>6</u>
5.	09-10	Ellen & Emil Gasperoni	<u>9</u>
6.	09-11	Amor Fort Lauderdale, LLC	<u>14</u>
		For the Good of the City	<u>14</u>

Call to Order

Chair Strawbridge called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. He introduced the Board members and described the functions of the Board and procedures that would be followed for the meeting.

Approval of Minutes – April 2009

The Board requested two corrections to the minutes.

Motion made by Mr. Larson, seconded by Mr. Jordan, to approve the minutes of the Board's April meeting as amended. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Board members disclosed communications they had regarding items on the agenda.

All individuals wishing to speak on the matters listed on tonight's agenda were sworn in.

Chair Strawbridge announced that Appeal No. 08-34 and Appeal No. 09-11 had been withdrawn by the applicants.

1. Appeal No. 09-08

[Index](#)

APPLICANT: Parkview Townhomes Homeowners Association
LEGAL: "Coral Ridge," P.B. 21, P. 50, Block 11, Lot 11
ZONING: RMM-25 (Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density District)
STREET: 2800-2806 NE 15th Street
ADDRESS: Fort Lauderdale, FL

APPEALING: Section 47-19.3.A (Boat slips, docks, boat davits, hoists and similar mooring devices)

Appealing the interpretation of **Section 47-19.3.A** to allow one (1) additional boatlift, where it has been interpreted that there is a requirement for 100-foot separation of the 2 boatlifts.

[Deferred from April 8, 2009]

Mr. Dunckel advised the Board to consider the variance question in Appeal 09-03 first; if this were granted, the interpretation question in Appeal 09-08 would be moot. The Board agreed.

2. Appeal No. 09-03

[Index](#)

APPLICANT: Parkview Townhomes Homeowners Association
LEGAL: "Coral Ridge," P.B. 21, P. 50, Block 11, Lot 11
ZONING: RMM-25 (Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density District)
STREET: 2800-2806 NE 15th Street
ADDRESS: Fort Lauderdale, FL

APPEALING: Section 47-19.3.A (Boat slips, docks, boat davits, hoists and similar mooring devices)

Requesting a variance to build two (2) boatlifts on a lot of 183.78 foot in width, where code states Boat davits, hoists and similar mooring devices may be erected on seawall or dock and shall be limited to one (1) mooring device per the first one hundred (100) feet of lot width or portion thereof, and one mooring device for each additional one hundred (100) feet of lot width.

[Rehearing Granted at March 11, 2009 meeting]

[Deferred from April 8, 2009]

Mr. Fred Blitstein, representative of the applicant, reminded the Board that they had previously agreed that the location at the end of the property where the canal met the Intracoastal was a very dangerous place to board a boat. He pointed out that the code did not specify there must be a 100-foot separation between boatlifts. Mr. Blitstein explained that a boat kept near the end of the canal would be battered by wave action. He presented drawings showing the proposed boatlifts and explained that the type of lifts the applicant desired held the boats very close to the water so as not to interfere with view corridors. Mr. Blitstein added that separating the lifts would also be much more expensive.

Mr. Blitstein requested "a minor modification of what you approved at the last hearing" to allow the applicant to put the boatlifts together as a single unit.

Mr. Angelo Costello, adjacent neighbor, agreed with Mr. Blitstein that the safety issues in that area of the canal made this request a necessity, not a luxury. He stated his view would be most affected by this, and he believed it would be far less blocked by two small boatlifts than by a larger boat that would be kept in the water, which would be permitted at this location.

Mr. Troy Wilson, Southeast Marine, explained he would construct low-profile lifts for this site.

Mr. Larson asked if they could install one six to eight-foot walkway between the boats and cut off the walkway that was closest to the Intracoastal. Mr. Wilson agreed to this.

Mr. Wilson informed Mr. Dunckel that the distance between the mean high water mark and the keel would be 12 inches and the highest point on the vessel would be 6'3" above the sea wall.

Chair Strawbridge asked Mr. Burgess "how we're currently employing the code" regarding the 100 feet per boatlift. Mr. Burgess said one boatlift was allowed per 100 feet of lot width on the waterway; if there was less than a second 100 feet, a variance was required for the second lift. The applicant in this case did not have the second hundred feet for the second boatlift.

Chair Strawbridge opened the public hearing. There being no members of the public wishing to address the Board on this item, Chair Strawbridge closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Dunckel explained to Mr. Willey that the variance the applicant had previously been granted was vacated when the applicant requested a re-hearing.

Mr. Jordan said he did not object, since the adjacent owner did not. He agreed the lift was needed for safety reasons.

Mr. Weihe agreed this was advisable for safety, and acknowledged that 183 feet was "pretty close to 200, so I'm going to vote in favor of it"

Mr. Goldman quoted the motion from the February minutes: "Boats shall not exceed 28 feet in length; boats shall not exceed a 9-foot beam; keels cannot be lifted higher than 15" above the mean high water mark; lifts must be 75 feet apart." This motion had passed 5 – 2.

Motion made by Mr. Larson, seconded by Mr. Jordan, to approve, with the following conditions: Boats shall not exceed 28 feet in length; boats shall not exceed a 9-foot beam; keels cannot be lifted higher than 15" above the mean high water mark; widen the walkway between the lifts and do away with the walkway to the east.

Mr. Larson said he did not object to placing the lifts side-by-side. Mr. Jordan agreed, and said he thought the motion was for this configuration, as shown in Mr. Blitstein's graphic.

Mr. Burgess confirmed that the side yard setback for a townhouse group in an RMM-25 zone was 20 feet. Since a request for a variance from the 20-foot side yard had not been noticed for this hearing, Mr. Dunckel stated the Board could not specify a 10-foot minimum setback. Mr. Blitstein stated they would accommodate this.

In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Ms. Centorino – no; Mr. Goldman – yes; Mr. Jordan - yes; Mr. Larson – yes; Mr. Weihe – yes; Mr. Willey – no; Chair Strawbridge - no. Motion **failed** 4 - 3.

Mr. Dunckel advised the Board they could choose to keep going to find a combination of factors that would grant the applicant some relief, or consider the interpretation question.

Mr. Willey suggested they return to the motion that had passed in February, because this included the separation and solved the safety and maintenance issues. Mr. Larson was concerned that requiring the 75-foot separation would push one lift close to the dangerous Intracoastal intersection.

Motion made by Mr. Willey, seconded by Mr. Larson, to approve with the following conditions: Boats shall not exceed 28 feet in length; boats shall not exceed a 9-foot beam; keels cannot be lifted higher than 15" above the mean high water mark; lifts must be 50 feet apart.

Mr. Weihe felt the separation requirement was unreasonable. He believed the applicant's proposal would provide safety, and noted that the neighbor did not object to that design. Mr. Jordan agreed, and felt it would be less safe to separate the lifts. He added that the lifts as proposed were more accessible to the parking area for loading and unloading.

Mr. Goldman reminded the Board that they must consider the criteria, not just the neighbor's opinion.

In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Ms. Centorino – yes; Mr. Goldman – yes; Mr. Jordan - yes; Mr. Larson – yes; Mr. Weihe – yes; Mr. Willey – yes; Chair Strawbridge - yes. Motion passed 7 - 0.

Mr. Dunckel stated the Board need not consider the interpretation question.

3. Appeal No. 08-34

[Index](#)

APPLICANT: BZ Holdings, LLC
LEGAL: "Beverly Heights", P.B. 1, P. 30, Block 18, Lots 1 and 2
ZONING: RO (Residential Office District)
STREET: 1116 and 1120 E. Broward Boulevard
ADDRESS: Fort Lauderdale, FL

APPEALING: **Section 47-21.9.2.a.** (Landscape requirements for vehicular use areas - Perimeter landscape area)

Requesting a variance to allow a perimeter landscape area of 0 feet – 28 feet and an average of 12 feet 1¾ inches, where the code provides that the depth of the perimeter landscape shall be a minimum of five (5) feet, a maximum of twenty-eight (28) feet, and an average of ten (10) feet.

APPEALING: **Section 47-21.10.B.3.** (Landscape requirements for all zoned district)

Requesting a variance to allow 32.91% of landscape area, where the Code requires a minimum of thirty-five percent (35%) of the gross lot square footage shall be in landscaping, maintained by an irrigation system.

Withdrawn by the applicant.

4. Appeal No. 09-09

[Index](#)

APPLICANT: Philip and Paula Bogdall
LEGAL: "CJ Hectors Resub of Rio Vista", P.B. 1, P. 24, Block 22, Lot 12
ZONING: RS-8 (Residential Single Family Low Medium Density District)
STREET: 708 SE 8th Street
ADDRESS: Fort Lauderdale, FL

APPEALING: Section 47-5.31 (Table of Dimensional Requirements for the RS-8 District)

Requesting a variance to allow a 1.7-foot side yard setback, where Code requires a five (5) foot side yard setback.

Mr. Robert Lochrie, representative of the applicant, displayed an aerial photo and site plan of the property. He explained the request was to accommodate a structure that had been present on the property for some time. There was a 21-foot area on the west side of the property where the variance was needed.

Mr. Lochrie stated the request was not the result of any City enforcement action or neighborhood complaint; the property was up for sale and the prospective buyer had noticed the issue and asked that it be resolved. Mr. Lochrie said the house and carport structure had been on the property since 1947. According to a 1983 survey, at some point prior to 1983 the carport was enclosed and made part of the house. An architect had been unable to find any permit issued to enclose the carport.

Mr. Lochrie continued that since 1983, the property had been issued several permits and passed several inspections.

Mr. Lochrie reminded the Board that the carport was permitted with the original construction, and "these changes in the code which affect this structure are unique." He believed the situation was unique because the house had already been used for this purpose for at least 32 years and the owners wished to continue with this use.

Mr. Lochrie stated the specific conditions here were peculiar to this and a small number of other properties that constituted marked exceptions to the general zoning district rules. Mr. Lochrie said there was no precedent because a variance would be unique to this fact pattern and this category of property. There was nothing to be gained by denying the variance, and this would deprive the owner of the use of the property as enjoyed for many years. The variance requested was the minimum required to allow continued use of the existing structure. As to neighborhood compatibility, Mr. Lochrie said the fact that the structure had existed for so long without complaint or objection indicated it was not incompatible. He noted there were other properties in Rio Vista with

similar circumstances. Mr. Lochrie had letters of support from several neighbors, including those immediately adjacent to the property.

Chair Strawbridge opened the public hearing.

Mr. Phil Keagy, listing agent for the house, said the buyer would not purchase the home without the variance. He presented a letter from the buyer stating his intent to continue using the house as it stood, without change or addition.

Mr. Sam Hill, Rio Vista resident, felt it would be a "punishment" to the Bogdalls to deny them a variance for something that might have been an error on the part of the City.

Mr. Kent Infante, adjacent property owner, said he considered this a "complete non-event;" this was a unique situation that was not bothersome.

Ms. Jean Mysells, Rio Vista resident, felt denying the variance would amount to taking away the owner's property.

Ms. Ann Henderson, adjacent property owner, agreed this structure posed no problem, and she hoped the Board granted the variance.

Mr. Mario Pape, neighbor, said he had no objection to the structure.

Mr. St. George Guardabassia, Rio Vista resident, did not believe this would set a precedent, and hoped the variance would be granted. Chair Strawbridge informed everyone that granting a variance would not set a precedent.

Mr. Joel Jones, neighbor, said he had no objection to the structure.

Mr. Ed Bleckner, Rio Vista resident, said he hoped the Board would grant the variance.

Mr. Fred Strasau, resident, said it was difficult for him to believe that this situation was not self-created, or that "this is a reasonable use of the land, when in fact all the houses that are constructed in single-family zoning have the same setback." Mr. Stresau recalled that in the past few years, this Board had denied variance requests for at least three properties and required new construction to be torn down. Mr. Stresau felt this was "pretty simple; somebody illegally enclosed the space, they ignored the land development code and I don't believe that they meet the five criteria."

There being no other members of the public wishing to address the Board on this item, Chair Strawbridge closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Lochrie felt this situation was unique, and reiterated that the encroachment had existed since 1947. He pointed out that this was a small house, and a much larger house could someday be constructed on the property, but the purchaser wanted to maintain the current home intact, so granting the variance would preserve the existing house.

Mr. Lochrie said he would agree to a condition of the variance that if the house were torn down, the 5-foot setback would be back in place. He also agreed to stipulate that the variance only applied to the portion of the existing building that was encroaching.

Mr. Dunckel noted that this encroachment also interfered with the 10-foot distance separation required by the fire code. Mr. Burgess stated this requirement could be overcome with an increased fire rating. Mr. Lochrie assumed this would be a requirement of the after-the-fact permit his client must obtain.

Mr. Art Bengochea, architect, explained there were no windows on the west wall of the structure and the wall was block with stucco. He agreed they might need to increase the fire rating because of the distance separation.

Mr. Jordan said he favored granting the variance and was please the owners intended to preserve the house.

Mr. Weihe felt "62 years is enough time to have waived any requirements that the code may have imposed" and said he was in favor of the variance.

Chair Strawbridge had calculated that the encroachment was 69.3 square feet, which seemed de minimis.

Motion made by Mr. Jordan seconded by Mr. Goldman, to approve the request, with the condition that if the existing structure were damaged or demolished more than 50%, the property would have the original setbacks per Section 47-3 of the ULDR, and that the variance applied to the existing 22 lineal feet on the west side of the house only. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Ms. Centorino – yes; Mr. Goldman – yes; Mr. Jordan - yes; Mr. Larson – yes; Mr. Weihe – yes; Mr. Willey – yes; Chair Strawbridge - yes. Motion passed 7 - 0.

5. Appeal No. 09-10

[Index](#)

APPLICANT: Ellen & Emil Gasperoni
LEGAL: "Coral Ridge Commercial Blvd. Add." P.B. 43, P. 13, Block 7, Lots 12-17
ZONING: CB (Community Business District)
STREET: 3100 E. Commercial Boulevard
ADDRESS: Fort Lauderdale, FL

APPEALING: **Section 47-25.3.d.iii** (Neighborhood compatibility requirements – Dumpster regulations)

Requesting a variance to allow a one (1) foot setback for a 215 sq. ft. dumpster area (20' x 10.75') within the required twelve (12) foot setback when contiguous to residentially zoned property.

APPEALING: **Section 47-21.11.A.6** (Additional landscape requirements for special uses and districts- Backout parking)

Requesting a variance to allow a 48 inches landscape buffer (includes vehicle overhang) in lieu of a required five-foot landscape buffer along the front of the back-out parking spaces adjacent to the existing building.

APPEALING: **Section 47-25.3.d** (Neighborhood compatibility requirements- Bufferyard requirements)

Requesting a variance to allow a wall of 48 foot long, in lieu of the required 210-foot long wall between commercial property and the residential property.

Mr. Dunckel referred to parking requirements in Section 47-25.3.d.ii, which prohibited parking within 12 feet of the property line within the yard area, which he thought should apply to this property because there was an alley not greater than 20 feet separating this use from residential property. Mr. Burgess agreed, but felt the applicant would argue that the addition was less than 50% of what existed, so they could maintain the back-out parking.

Mr. Dunckel did not see the required wall on the site plan, and Mr. Burgess explained that the wall would be required for the new portion of the property if it was determined that it exceeded 50%. Mr. Burgess confirmed that the other requirement in subsection c, for a wall at least five feet from a right-of-way line located closest to the non-residential property applied to only the new building as well.

Regarding the first request, for the 1-foot dumpster setback, Mr. Matthew Doyle, landscape architect, explained that two dumpsters were required, so the pad size must be increased over the size shown on the original drawings submitted to DRC. He submitted a sketch showing one possible solution to comply with code.

Mr. Doyle said there were other properties' dumpsters all along the alleyway, within the 12-foot setback. The applicant was requesting a variance to have a dumpster that would be in conformity with those other properties. Mr. Doyle noted that the dumpster must be moved farther away from the building to accommodate the larger size, and it could not be turned any more or it would not accommodate the truck's turning radius.

Regarding the second request for reduction of the landscape buffer, Mr. Doyle said the site currently had back-out parking into the alleyway, which they wanted to remove to meet landscape requirements. He said City staff had suggested reducing the parking spaces to 16 feet, installing a curb for a wheel stop with a 2-foot overhang and a 2-foot buffer.

Regarding the last request to allow a 48-foot long wall, instead of 210-foot long wall where this property abutted residential property, Mr. Doyle said they were trying to stop the wall as close to the parking lot as possible, and they were snaking the wall around the parking spaces they wanted to keep. They did not want to wall in the parking lot against the alley for safety reasons, but intended to install a hedge for aesthetics.

Mr. Sam Gasperoni, applicant, explained that the existing building was approximately 6,000 square feet and the drug rehabilitation center tenant desired a separate 2,500 square foot addition for their administration, separate from the counseling center.

Mr. Chris Scott, manager of the property, confirmed the center was licensed through the Department of Family Services as a social service residential facility [SSRF]. He said they needed additional room for their offices.

Mr. Goldman asked if the second request regarding the landscape buffer pertained to the area near the two parking spaces to the south of the building. Mr. Doyle said this referred to the four spaces to the east side, next to the dumpster.

Chair Strawbridge asked Mr. Doyle to refer to the criteria for a variance. Mr. Doyle said the dumpster was already being used in this location; they just wanted to make it more aesthetic. Mr. Doyle stated they were reconfiguring the parking area and moving accessways to meet code. He said enclosing the dumpster would be more aesthetic for the neighborhood as well.

Chair Strawbridge said he was having a difficult time interpreting the request as anything but an economic and self-imposed hardship.

Mr. Doyle said there was no other place they could put the dumpster, considering the design of the site and the fact that they were trying to maximize parking. He reminded

the Board that other properties were doing the same thing with their dumpsters in the alley.

Mr. Dunckel asked if Mr. Doyle was arguing that the buffer wall requirement should only relate to the area of the new addition. Mr. Doyle said their interpretation was that the wall had to start from the existing building and continue west because the building wall acted as the buffer wall. They were requesting a variance to allow a break in the wall for the parking area so they could see in at night.

Mr. Larson agreed a solid wall would be both a safety hazard and less attractive than a hedge.

Mr. Goldman asked if this was the minimum variance required to make possible reasonable use of the property. Mr. Doyle said he would rather put the dumpster right on the property line, but he was trying not to do that.

Chair Strawbridge opened the public hearing.

Mr. Lodge Weber, representative of the Royal Manor Condominium Association, said The Recovery Place originally opened on Commercial Boulevard, but later on their clients had moved into the apartment complex across the street from his condominium/townhome complex. Mr. Weber did not know if the apartment complex had been rezoned to allow this use. He said the apartment complex was utilized as a halfway house for the clients, and this had interfered with the condominium residents' peaceful enjoyment of their properties. Mr. Weber stated this use constituted a business and brought noise to the neighborhood because meetings were sometimes held outside. Staff also patrolled the building frequently, and Mr. Weber said this resulted in "not a very comfortable feeling all the time for the residences." He added that there was no parking issue because none of the clients had cars.

Mr. Weber said The Recovery Place was in partnership with another business, The Advantage Auto and Marine Detailing Company, which brought a generator in front of the apartment building to wash cars and trucks there three days a week. This was operation of a business on 49th Street and was also a noise issue.

Mr. Weber presented a petition from 27 of the townhome owners and 19 of the condominium residents opposing the requests. The petition indicated the request was meant to "make it easier for their subscribers and associates to cut through an alley and access an apartment complex...on Northeast 49th Street that they utilize as a part of their business." The petition stated denial of the requests would preserve the quiet enjoyment of their residential properties, which the bufferyard requirements were meant to protect. The petition stated the residents did not believe any of the criteria for a variance had been met.

Mr. Jordan said, "So the neighbors aren't happy because you have a big operation going on when it should be kind of a quiet neighborhood." Mr. Weber said the townhome association had recently made renovations to their property, and The Recovery Place was not helping their property values.

Mr. Weber reiterated that the applicant wanted relief from the wall requirement "so it's easier for their band of clients to walk back and forth to the alley and come back up in front of the apartment complex; it's a convenience, it's not detrimental to their business, it may be detrimental to where they are boarding their clients."

Mr. Scott informed Chair Strawbridge that The Recovery Place had a long-term lease on the apartment building with an option to buy, and reiterated that they had a license to operate a residential facility. He said the detailing business owner was a friend who cleaned their vehicles, and used Mr. Scott's email address. Mr. Scott intended to limit his friend's visits to Wednesdays and promised he would be relocated to the alley to clean the cars.

Mr. Weber wanted the Board to investigate the facility's license. Mr. Larson stated this was not within the Board's purview but Chair Strawbridge believed it concerned neighborhood compatibility. Mr. Dunckel said it seemed that the site plan was being driven by the SSRF on the other side of the alley. If the SSRF were not legal, then the site plan might not have the same driving force. Since they were not sure whether the SSRF was legally permitted, Mr. Dunckel felt it might be advisable to defer the case until that could be investigated.

Chair Strawbridge felt the request was to allow the facility to work "more like a campus" which he felt ran contrary to neighborhood compatibility. He stated, "If the apartment building isn't being absolutely 100% legitimately operated, then all we're doing is aiding and abetting." Chair Strawbridge added that this was a rental property and they were considering variances that would run with the land.

Mr. Dunckel felt this warranted further investigation.

There being no members of the public wishing to address the Board on this item, Chair Strawbridge closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Weihe, seconded by Mr. Jordan, to approve.

Mr. Larson was concerned that the Board had discussed the SSRF facility but the public had not been noticed regarding this. He added that the Board was dealing with one piece of property, not the apartment building that was owned by someone else. Mr.

Burgess agreed they must deal with each site individually because they were separate development sites.

Mr. Willey said, "Whether we had the apartment house under consideration...I don't think they'd qualify for variances, so I can give them a 'no' vote now or I can give them a 'no' vote later."

Ms. Centorino agreed there was no unique situation, but the hardship was strictly economic.

In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Ms. Centorino – no; Mr. Goldman – no; Mr. Jordan - no; Mr. Larson – no; Mr. Weihe – no; Mr. Willey – no; Chair Strawbridge - no. Motion **failed** 0 - 7.

6. Appeal No. 09-11

[Index](#)

APPLICANT: Amor Fort Lauderdale, LLC
LEGAL: A portion of the Southwest one-quarter (S.W. ¼) of Section 35, Township 49 South, Range 42 East, Broward County, Florida, being more particularly described in the application for a variance for Appeal No. 09-11, on file with the Clerk of the City of Fort Lauderdale Board of Adjustment
ZONING: B-3 (Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial Business)
STREET: 1375-1379 Progresso Drive
ADDRESS: Fort Lauderdale, FL

APPEALING: Section 47-6.20 (Table of dimensional requirements)
Requesting a variance to allow a rear yard setback of 14 feet 9 inches, where Code requires a minimum of 25 feet rear yard setback when contiguous to residential property.

Withdrawn by the applicant.

Report and For the Good of the City

[Index](#)

Better Meetings Academy

Mr. Goldman announced that the Better Meetings Academy had taken place the previous Monday. He said information had been provided regarding the Sunshine Law and communications between Board members. Mr. Goldman reported the Board minutes would contain a new section for the Board to communicate recommendations

and concerns to the City Commission. Mr. Goldman advised that Chairs were permitted to make motions, but were advised to pass the gavel to the vice Chair prior to doing so.

Mr. Goldman cautioned Board members to refrain from leaning back in their chairs for private conversations during proceedings. Mr. Goldman said if there were concerns about a Board's member's ability to be impartial, one Board member should not confront another either during the meeting or privately. Any Board member with a concern should discuss this with the City Attorney's office, which would follow up.

City Commission Conference Meeting

Mr. Goldman had attended a City Commission conference meeting on May 5, and the Commissioners had noted there was no member appointed to the Board of Adjustment from District three. The Commission indicated they would like a representative from district three, but this would necessitate that one existing Board member step down or request not to be reappointed. The issue of Board member qualifications had been raised; a Board member must have served one year on the Planning and Zoning Board or be otherwise equally qualified as determined by the City Commission. Chair Strawbridge advised Board members to take this up with the Mayor and Commissioners, and noted that Board members were appointed by consensus; they were not bound to particular districts. He did not know why having district representation would be critical.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at **9:03 p.m.**

Vice Chair:

Don Larson

Attest:

ProtoType Inc.

A digital recording was made of these proceedings, of which these minutes are a part, and is on file in the Planning and Zoning offices for period of two years.