

APPROVED
BEACH REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 2009 – 2:30 P.M.

BRAB MEMBERS	ATTENDANCE	CUMULATIVE	
		PRESENT	ABSENT
Ina Lee, Chair	P	3	0
Miranda Lopez	P	3	0
Carlos Molinet, Vice Chair (dep. 4:39)	P	2	1
Amaury Piedra	A	0	3
Aiton Yaari	P	1	2
Ramola Motwani	P	3	0
Jordana L. Jarjura	P	2	1
Melissa Milroy	P	2	1
Dan Matchette	P	2	0
Art Seitz	P	2	0

As of this date there were 10 appointed members to the Board, which means 6 would constitute a quorum.

Staff

Donald Morris, Beach CRA Director
Eileen Furedi, Economic Development Representative
Karen Reese, Economic Development Representative
Lindwell Bradley, Community Inspections Supervisor
Charlotte Rodstrom, City Commissioner
Wayne Jessup, Deputy Director of Planning and Zoning
Hilda Testa, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

- **Motion** made by Mr. Yaari that before the proposed Master Plan goes before the City Commission, the Board recommends that the Plan is discussed with approximately 10 major stakeholders from the CRA area, as well as clarifying more points with regard to specifications rather than suggestions, in order to create a more viable plan for everyone involved. Mr. Seitz offered the **amendment** that the Master Plan come before the Board once more before it comes before the City Commission in the future. Mr. Yaari accepted the **amendment** to his **motion**, which was seconded by Ms. Jarjura, and the **amendment** carried unanimously.

In a voice vote, the **motion** carried unanimously.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Lee called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m. Roll was called and it was determined a quorum was present.

She noted that former Board member Shirley Smith is no longer a member of the Board, and introduced new member Art Seitz. She recognized Ms. Smith for her years of service, and requested that Mr. Morris send her a letter of thanks on behalf of the Board.

Mr. Seitz introduced himself to the Board. He is a longtime resident of Fort Lauderdale, and of the Beach area in particular. He has an abiding interest in the Beach and feels that a good plan and design prevent accidents and make for an excellent recreational area.

II. Approval of Minutes: March 16, 2009

Motion made by Vice Chair Molinet, seconded by Ms. Jarjura, to approve the minutes of the March 16, 2009 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** carried unanimously.

As several members of the public were present at today's meeting, Chair Lee read the purpose statement of the Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board, which is as follows: "To implement a revitalization plan and to cause to be prepared a Community Redevelopment Plan for the Central Beach development area, subject to the approval of the City Commission, and to recommend actions to be taken by the City Commission to implement the Community Redevelopment Plan."

She added that the Board's area of interest reaches from south of Bahia Mar to the Sebastian Parking Lot.

Chair Lee noted that two items have been removed from today's Agenda, one of which is a recommendation for funding the Aquatic Center Action Plan. Mr. Morris explained that this is because the original conceptual plan approved by the City Commission was found to contain "a number of issues we need to address." It was decided that the new City Commission should first see the original presentation of this plan in order to provide input and direction before a decision is made to move forward.

Also removed from today's Agenda is Item VI, a recommendation for partial funding of a "turtle-friendly" electrical design. Mr. Morris continued that FDOT had previously guaranteed \$3.29 million toward a joint partnership agreement to fund the construction of these turtle lights; however, considering the budget constraints under which the City is currently operating, they have elected to wait until the budget is reviewed to ensure there are adequate funds for this project. It will be brought before the Board at a later date.

Chair Lee introduced District 2 Commissioner Charlotte Rodstrom, who was in attendance at the meeting, and thanked those members of City Staff, as well as the public, who were present.

The following Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

IV. Brief Discussion of Budget

Vice Chair Molinet stated that he had met with Mr. Morris and other Staff members to review the budget for fiscal 2008-09 and look toward fiscal 2009-10. He distributed a handout to the Board members.

He pointed out that \$2.6 million will be carried forward into the next fiscal year, with tax increment fund (TIF) revenues expected to be \$6.7 million. The interest earned on monies already in the bank will be \$200,000, and there will be a transfer of \$538,000 from the City Parking Fund, an Oceanside bond good through 2012.

The total sources for the coming fiscal year will be approximately \$10 million, Vice Chair Molinet continued. There has been very little increase in the operating budget, which includes personnel and other operating expenditures, as well as a capital outlay of \$5000. Total operating expenditures are \$692,000.

There are two major projects for this year: the Fort Lauderdale Aquatics Center, which is \$3 million for fiscal 2009-10 alone, and the Beach Streetscape Project, Phase I-B, which is \$2 million. The "wave wall" decorative lighting is \$150,000. Total project expenditures are \$5.1 million. The Beach CRA debt service bond, or the Oceanside bond referenced above, is \$540, 724. Total uses come to \$6,381,000 for fiscal 2009-10, which will leave an amount of \$3.6 million carrying over into fiscal 2010-11.

Vice Chair Molinet added that several projects are already underway, including the Central Beach Capital Improvement Plan Blanket Project, which has a

balance of \$1,150,000; the Beach Streetscape Master Plan, which will be discussed today; the new Aquatics Center, which presently has allocated \$5.7 million; the A1A median improvements, which have \$1.4 million allocated; Beach Streetscape Phase 1A, for \$34,000, most of which has been completed; Phase 1B, for \$2.3 million; public restrooms for \$796,000; \$1.9 million for the South Beach Wall improvements; \$193,849 for the South Beach Playground replacement; and \$2.096 million for beach improvements, including turtle lighting, pavers, trash receptacles, signage, coconut trees, and other considerations. The turtle lighting design is expected to cost \$130,000. The action plan for the Aquatics Center is fully funded by the Beach CRA, and will cost \$300,000 for the plan only.

Mr. Morris reminded Staff and the Board that money is directed toward two major projects, namely the Aquatics Center redevelopment and the Beach Streetscape Phase 1B, which is part of the Master Plan. Other items slated for improvement will be within the CRA and will hopefully be funded from that budget.

Chair Lee asked if a reduction in monies is anticipated due to the state of property taxes. Mr. Morris described this as “a pretty good bet,” noting that Staff strives to be consistently conservative in its estimates.

Chair Lee noted that the Board plans “a much more detailed discussion” of the budget before it goes before the City Commission in July.

Mr. Seitz stated that he is a previous member of the Central Beach Alliance, and that he was a participant in creating that advisory body’s basic goals. Among these goals is linking the Beach to the Downtown area. He added that he is attempting to have A1A designated a scenic highway in the State of Florida; should this application be approved, the area would receive additional funds, which could be used to hire a consultant to oversee the continuity of signage and other concerns. He felt the Board could put forth \$20,000 and retain an engineer to lay out a system of linked, connected routes from Downtown to the Beach area, with linkage to Riverwalk, Holiday Park, and other destinations.

Mr. Seitz described the situation for cyclists in the City as “appalling,” pointing out that Fort Lauderdale is continually among the most dangerous cities in the State to ride a bicycle or be a pedestrian, as well as in the United States.

Mr. Morris explained that an RFP had gone out in search of a company to develop a comprehensive way-finding system of signs; at this point they have contracted with such a company. Staff has met with them, and they will come before the BRAB, the Beach Business Improvement District Committee (BID),

and other stakeholders and advisory bodies to gain input before eventually appearing before the City Commission for approval.

He added that the Board will be involved, as will many others, on the appearance and other characteristics of the signage.

Mr. Seitz stated that the engineer he had named is an expert, and that the sooner this individual was hired, the closer the project he described would be to reality. He felt a signage company might not be the best fit for the task.

Chair Lee advised that the meeting should return to its Agenda, and noted that the Board looked forward to input from the company who had been selected through the RFP process.

III. Fence Mural Update

Chair Lee reminded the Board that this project refers to the white fence around the former Trump Las Olas parcel; the owner has agreed to allow murals to be painted onto this wall. At the March 2009 meeting, working with the Art Institute or Art Serve had been discussed; Chair Lee has since met with representatives of both entities, who are "very excited" about the project. The Art Institute has a class beginning in July called "Art in Public Places," and has offered to take on this project. Chair Lee added that she has spoken with the Convention Visitors Bureau (CVB) as well to involve them in the process. Her goal is to have a mural in place by the time of the Boat Show.

VII. Discussion of Beach Master Plan

Chair Lee stated that this Plan will also be presented publicly at the Hall of Fame this evening at 6:00 p.m. Since the Board is funding a portion of this study, Sasaki Associates has agreed to present to them before they go before the general public. Chair Lee requested that any questions and/or comments be written down and saved for when the presentation has been concluded; once Board members have no more questions, the discussion will be opened up to the public.

She recognized members of the Beach Business Improvement District Committee (BID), who were present as well.

Wayne Jessup, Deputy Director of Planning and Zoning, introduced Alan Ward and Ted Schumacher of Sasaki, noting that they have presented to the BRAB more than once during the development phase of the Beach Master Plan; this

input from stakeholders has been addressed by, and at times incorporated into, the Plan. He added that this phase of the Plan is also a draft, and input from the Board is, as always, welcome at the conclusion of the presentation.

Mr. Ward stated that he planned to spend more time on the updated parts of the presentation than on its summary, as most Board members have seen the presentation before. He identified the Assessment Summary as an overview of “where [they] have been” in terms of gathering input from the public and various stakeholders; the Framework Plan represents improvements in the public realm, which includes the City-owned parcels of land and public rights-of-way; the District Plans refer to each of the five thematic Districts of the Beach area; Implementation considers what is to be done first, as well as matters of timing related in setting forth on the plan.

These items refer primarily to enhancements to the Beach area’s pedestrian environment and creation of new public parks and green spaces, Mr. Ward continued. Many such spaces can be used to preserve views of the Intracoastal Waterway, enhance entry and arrival to the Beach, improve bike lanes and bike lane facilities, and support interconnectivity through use of bike lanes and multi-modal trails. Amenities for residents as well as tourists should also be provided, and activities should be planned for those areas beyond the Beach itself.

The Plan should also strive to promote a better mix of uses, provide parking in a variety of locations, improve the Sunrise Lane area, make Bonnet House more visible and accessible, and consider adjustments to those guidelines governing private parcels, as well as parking requirements. Mr. Ward noted that it is common to hear that there have been “too many waivers” granted for projects; in addition, many previous plans have never been fully realized. Many of the ideas included in the present plan are simply extensions or updates of plans previously made for the Beach area.

To that end, several urban design principles have been adopted to guide the planning and design work that has gone into the Beach Master Plan:

- Enhance the walking experience at the Central Beach with connectivity, and expand the pedestrian experience along the Intracoastal Waterway;
- Create a focus, or “symbolic center,” at Las Olas Boulevard, where several activities can occur at this public gathering space;
- Create a variety of other usable public spaces, such as performances and events throughout the year as well as major activities (such as the Boat Show) at other times;
- Make the streets more pedestrian-oriented, with attractive sidewalks, cafés, restaurants, and shops;

- Create places for families and children;
- Find incentives to enhance architectural resources, such as in North Beach, where there are structures that can be preserved;
- Promote a mix of uses and users in the Beach area;
- Adopt a comprehensive way-finding system (already underway).

The Plan also breaks the Central Beach down into five “thematic districts,” which cover approximately 5 minutes’ walking distance in each direction. The distinctive character of each of these districts will be developed and enhanced by either the design or the guidelines. These are Central Beach, North Beach, South Beach, Mid-Beach, and Sunrise Lane, Mr. Ward advised.

Key opportunities for change lie within the City-owned parcels, he continued, much of which lies along the Intracoastal Waterway. This area could be a promenade along the Waterway, he explained, and provide a counterpoint to the wave wall or the promenade along the Beach. It could be considered a “21st century promenade” juxtaposed with the Beach promenade, Mr. Ward noted, and pointed out that inclusion of a “significant green setback” and a reimagining of the Hall of Fame plan could create a pedestrian zone extending to the Beach.

Central Beach includes the chance to create a “landmark public space” as travelers cross the bridge at Las Olas Boulevard, where the view is currently a parking lot. Mr. Ward suggested a sculpture or other sign to inform visitors that they have arrived at a “world-class Beach.” Supporting activities in this public space could be further amplified by redeveloping other parcels in the area, although this would necessitate some “consolidation of ownership.” One key adjoining street would be a retail street linking into the Plaza, then linking back into another prospective open public space at the Intracoastal Lot.

The Alhambra surface parking lot is located in the “mid-Beach” area, and could accommodate new public open space related toward the Beach. The right-of-way extends as far as the Intracoastal Waterway, so water taxi stops could be “linked in” to this area.

North Beach has fewer publicly owned parcels but does contain a significant number of rights-of-way, Mr. Ward pointed out, which are quite wide and could be enhanced. The owners of key parcels along A1A have proposed the idea of making Breakers Avenue “a more pedestrian-oriented retail, restaurant, and café street,” which could lead into the reopening of the historic entrance to the Bonnet House. There are some opportunities in this area to link to the Intracoastal Waterway, although all of them lie within privately owned parcels.

The business association along Sunrise Lane has a streetscape improvement plan, Mr. Ward noted, which is very much needed in this area, as is relief from parking requirements in order to allow for shared parking; this would alleviate the need for new parking lots to be created whenever any change is made. He also suggested the creation of a pedestrian or bike connection through the Bonnet House property.

More specific ideas for the key publicly owned parcels and streets, including the Beach, the parcels themselves, have been considered as well. For Oceanside Plaza, some expansion could extend onto the Beach itself, followed by the creation of a public open space at Las Olas Boulevard by taking the existing parking and placing it in a garage with ground-level use. The space could then become a performance or market space. Channel Square would feature a new water taxi stop and potential visitors' center, with office space above it. If existing parking is moved into a low-level parking structure, spaces such as park space, a boat basin, a children's play area, and restaurant space are opened up, particularly if the existing marina support building is moved as well.

He provided a visual showing a second option, which, instead of building a parking garage along the Beach, would place parking one level below ground and redevelop the site with an area featuring "positive activity" along the edge that would spill over into the park. This could be a market space, where open-air festivals, fairs, and performances could be held, if parking is located underground. The existing parking lot holds 386 cars; placed in a low garage, 618 spaces could be accommodated, while at the same time creating usable space along the water.

In order to pave for this large amount of public improvements, Mr. Ward stated that it is still suggested to erect a small hotel on a City-owned parcel. The public environment would remain essentially the same, and the hotel would run a small restaurant in its space. He described this as a potential "trade-off."

The current plan for the Swimming Hall of Fame was shown, featuring a water park, aquarium, pools, and the Hall of Fame itself. Mr. Ward pointed out that this seems like a great deal to accommodate on one site; in addition, these facilities are "squeezed right to the edge" of the public promenade. Prospective changes to D.C. Alexander Park were also shown, upgrading the lawn and trees to a more actively usable space featuring a play area and a fountain, among other elements. This would also serve to create a more active connection from the Hall of Fame to the Beach.

The City owns most of the Alhambra lot, and the plan suggests that most of the handicapped spaces be placed in a garage, reclaiming this as key park space along the Beach, as well as a pedestrian way linking back to the water taxi stop. Visitors would arrive at the water taxi stop from downtown hotels, and walk to the Beach through the park. Public parking could be added at a mid-Beach location.

Another proposal, which Mr. Ward allowed has not met with public acclaim in the past, would add hotel and residential use to the Alhambra's upper levels in order to help pay for the development of public spaces along A1A. He pointed out that the City would need to work with the owners of several parcels along the block in any case if they moved forward with the proposed improvements.

The streetscapes are intended to "tie all this together," he continued, noting that Birch Road currently provides little in the way of a pedestrian environment. The Plan includes planting a green median with a walkway, moving one lane in each direction, curbside parking, and a sidewalk placed in the setback for shaded walking. The same plan is in effect on "typical neighborhood street[s]." Mr. Ward pointed out that curbside parking could be made into overnight parking with permits, so visitors could park in those spaces.

Breakers Avenue is shown to have median parking with "a fairly wide setback" and a 20-ft. zone for outdoor dining and walking, assuming that owners allow conversion of some buildings to retail and restaurant space.

Three proposals were identified for A1A, the first being "a subtle adjustment" to the bike lanes, creating a single 10-ft. two-way bike lane on the east side while keeping bicycles moving close to traffic.

Another option assumes some of the "through traffic" will find other routes, and creates a single wide moving lane in each direction, with turning lanes. A 12-ft. bike lane exists on the east side, and a wide promenade with sidewalk planting is featured on the west side. This creates more pedestrian space and more planting, and changes dominance of the street from cars to people. It would, however, require a traffic study to determine capacity.

The third option also proposes a significant change for A1A by leaving the existing two lanes in each direction but planting the bike lane in key areas, so planting and trees are beside each pedestrian zone. This creates a 10-ft. multipurpose bicycle trail, just east of the wave wall. This would reclaim the current maintenance zone in the 10-ft. setback for a multipurpose path along the Beach. Mr. Ward noted that this plan has environmental issues, but pointed out that a "continuous Beach trail system" could be a marketing tool for the City.

He reiterated that all three plans require further environmental study and traffic pattern analysis.

Mr. Ward moved on to expanded water taxi stops, noting that one would be placed at Channel Square, as well as a potential stop at the right-of-way connecting along the Alhambra passage. Another would ideally be set in a private parcel, which would require negotiation with the owners.

Other key links to connectivity include promenades, as well as the Sun Trolley system. As there is a gap in its zone, service extended to Sunrise Lane is suggested. A specific trolley loop that links all area parking garages is recommended as well, so beachgoers could arrive by car and travel back and forth to the Beach via the Sun Trolley. It could also link to the various water taxi stops.

Mr. Ward moved on to guidelines, which refer to how private development reinforces some of the ideas created by the public environment. He pointed out that many other cities provide an “interesting continuity” of pedestrian areas along their waterways, in conjunction with boating; they also establish guidelines that cover the majority of the buildings in that area. These have been studied as recommendations rather than as requirements.

He noted that concerns have been expressed regarding “massing” of projects, and the volume of bulk included in some buildings. A setback along the Beach was shown, which has been fairly effective in allowing light onto the Beach. Some cities have elected to build higher buildings in their Beach areas while restricting the buildings’ “footprint,” although Mr. Ward allowed that this was most likely not a possibility for the City; there is also concern for how buildings relate to the pedestrian environment.

He summed up that the guidelines deal with street design, building design, the individual character of the areas, and environmental concerns. Street classifications are primarily important because they are concerned with the manner in which properties relate to key streets. Tertiary streets, or serviceways, face fewer restrictions; the main concern is for “people streets,” or key fronts along the Beach. Where a street is located is an important consideration for development of a pedestrian environment.

Another issue occurs when parcels are added together, which can lead to very large developments. One idea to discourage this practice involves roadway design guidelines, which subtly adjust 11- or 12-ft. travel lanes down to 10- or 11-

ft. lanes. Studies show that cars tend to move slower in smaller lanes, and a small space is gained for planting, as well as the easing of setbacks for trees.

Regarding how buildings relate to streets, Mr. Ward noted that parking should be behind a building, with an entryway and façade in front. This encourages a “more suburban” environment. With structured parking, it is encouraged to be placed in the middle of a block so it is less visible from the street.

On important pedestrian streets, buildings should be encouraged to build out to an edge in order to provide an interesting backdrop. This is called “building a street wall.” Taller buildings are set back slightly. In order to create some relief, there is a maximum 200 ft. of this type of street wall before there is a break or adjustment.

Regarding building bulk, there is no limit on a building’s “footprint;” however, as height increases, the Plan seeks to reduce the footprint of buildings over 65 ft. in height. This is encouraged but not required, Mr. Ward pointed out. The Plan also seeks to collect open space together into a single area rather than having small pieces of open space between sites.

Parking structures are discouraged along primary or “people streets” in favor of underground parking wherever possible, and active, inhabited uses are encouraged, including retail or residential properties. Mid-rise or larger buildings are asked to maximize pedestrian-oriented uses on their lower levels on key streets. The retail suggested by the Plan is intended to “add up to something,” or focus most retail establishments along a single block or street in a given area.

The character area guidelines are based on a “distinct pattern of use” in each area. Public access should be unrestricted along the publicly controlled waterfront edges, such as Bahia Mar, and should be encouraged along the privately held edges once redevelopment has occurred.

In South Beach, new corridors through to the Intracoastal Waterway should be encouraged, as well as the requirement of a setback for buildings along the water, in order to create zones for public access. The result is “a better pedestrian edge.” Parking adjacent to the water would be discouraged. New development where there is access to boating and marinas should allow limited points of control, rather than controlling the whole edge, to allow more continuous public access.

For Central Beach, a base of 35 ft. is encouraged for buildings; it is suggested that once a building rises above 65 ft. in height, residential property be limited to

10,000 sq. ft. and hotel property to 12,000 sq. ft. This is aimed at reducing bulk. Major public spaces would be encouraged to feature active uses at the ground floor level to make spaces “come to life.”

For the Mid-Beach area, setbacks and recommended floor plates are similar to what has been shown for the two previous character areas.

Mr. Ward advised that testing had been done on some sites in North Beach, with the result that the 65 ft. height could easily accommodate the relaxation of some side yard setbacks. The Plan suggests, instead of relaxing setbacks, encouraging buildings to limit themselves to 65 ft., and to limit their footprint in other ways if they are built taller.

Due to the scale of North Beach, relief is suggested every 80 ft. or so, as there tends to be a pattern of smaller buildings in this area. He showed an example of a reduced setback, with a building at 65 ft. in height. Normally, the required setback would be half of the building’s height; however, if the height is limited, the developer is given a “bigger volume” within which to work. Any new construction may not feature parking in its front under the Plan. Also recommended are setbacks and shoulders on key streets in the area. Free FAR is recommended to the existing buildings on these parcels, which allows developers to save old buildings with interesting architecture at no cost while realizing the potential value of the land.

The aim for the Sunrise Lane area is to facilitate the proposed Plan for streetscapes and to consider adjusting the requirements for parking, so reuse and upgrades are encouraged. A “continuous street wall” and continuity of retail are emphasized as well; a greater variety of commercial uses to support residents and visitors is also encouraged, as there is presently a restriction on this.

Environmental guidelines, Mr. Ward continued, encourages building massing, reducing heat gain, encouraging shared parking and the use of mass transit, capture of rainwater for use in irrigation, and applying the LEED energy-efficiency standard to buildings. The initiatives these guidelines aimed to achieve included public access to the waterway, more active uses at street level, buildings with less bulk, different uses at strategic locations (including retail), preservation of significant buildings such as those in North Beach, encouraging less visible parking, and more sustainable building practices.

The discussion moved on to means of phasing in the Plan. Mr. Ward stated that in the first five years, the Plan would focus on the central square of Las Olas

Plaza, Channel Square, D.C. Alexander Park, and Oceanside Plaza; for the following five years, the Alhambra and Almond Street; and in 10 to 20 years, the Plan would move closer to the Intracoastal Waterway and Sunset Point. He speculated that the initial phase might involve Channel Square and placing offices above a visitors' center, as well as the design of Oceanside Plaza.

Funding for the Plan could include the General Fund, bond initiatives, the CRA, or "innovative public/private partnerships."

The market demand is figured over a 10-year horizon, Mr. Ward continued, and the total cost is projected to be \$385 million; the preliminary cost of public improvements to parks, garages, and other public structures is estimated at \$80 million. This creates a leverage ratio of 1 to 5. Mr. Ward noted that most comparable cities have ratios of 1 to 3. Benefits of implementing the plan include one-time output of sales taxes; continuing benefits include property taxes, sales and lodging taxes, ongoing jobs, and new residents.

Mr. Ward urged the Board and all present to review how public enhancements are funded, analyze the impact of the initiatives to A1A and other roadways, and study the related environmental issues. As public spaces take shape, he noted that programming for these spaces should be developed. Finally, the financial feasibility of acquiring additional parcels to the north of the City should be considered as well.

Mr. Ward offered to take questions from the Board at this time.

Mr. Yaari thanked Mr. Ward and other representatives of Sasaki for the presentation. He recalled the reference to Las Olas Boulevard as a gateway or walkway to the Beach area, and asked how much the piece of land in question cost its private owners, explaining that the plan is encouraging use of this property that may be required as part of the zoning requirements when the property is developed. Mr. Ward stated that the Plan simply presents the possibility of making a connection through certain properties, but there is no intent to modify the zoning of the area.

Mr. Yaari advised that plans such as this concern many of the private owners in the area, who hear recommendations made by the plan but are concerned that the City will make certain aspects of the Plan requirements instead of suggestions. Mr. Ward assured him that this is not the Plan's intent.

Mr. Yaari also expressed concern with the 35 ft. height limitation allowed on a particular block in conjunction with a proposed setback, pointing out that this

would create a very tall, narrow building and could possibly lead to the block in question never becoming developed. He added that many of the property owners who have invested in condominiums and other properties along the Beach feel that the Plan is “chopping” into their properties. His overlying concern was that the Plan may never be developed by the City because it is not feasible; in addition, if aspects of the Plan are included in the Code and in zoning requirements going forward, it could “chase away all the developers.” He indicated they are a very large group in terms of size, money and power. The City would have to commit money to fight the Harris Act. He and many other developers will “go after the City” and the City may owe them hundreds of millions. This is something was to benefit the beach and people are being scared away.

Deputy Director Jessup agreed that when these and other aspects of the Plan were first presented to Staff, they recognized that some of the suggestions would have to be carefully considered before the City moved forward with them. He felt they should “respect the rights” of other developers who had not yet built in the Beach area, with regard to whether they should be limited to building the same types of structures. He assured Mr. Yaari that the City wanted to ensure developers could work within the Plan, while at the same time improving the Beach and the pedestrian environment. He described the situation as achieving a balance between these two goals.

Mr. Yaari continued that members of the public, who did not necessarily share the developers’ interests, could easily support the Plan and urge the City to go forward with it against the stakeholders’ wishes. He felt it was unfortunate that zoning issues such as the ones he had described were only raised “at the last minute” and the end of the Plan’s presentation.

Deputy Director Jessup reiterated that no zoning modifications were proposed, but would remain the same, and the Plan suggested only guidelines. He added that perhaps the guidelines appeared more “onerous” than originally intended, while the intention was only to generate successful redevelopment and improve the pedestrian environment.

Mr. Yaari pointed out that the Plan is “beautiful,” but warned that the “big picture” must be kept in mind.

Ms. Motwani noted that State, City, and zoning requirements must be considered with respect to the FAR, and that the goal of the City, developers, and property owners is to create the best Beach experience possible. She requested a clarification regarding height requirements.

Mr. Ward advised that while a height limit is encouraged, and relief from setbacks is offered for buildings below the height limit, 65 ft. is still allowed. Deputy Director Jessup explained that the Plan seeks to establish a way to maintain a small scale without affecting the density allowed, which will also maintain the character of the area, particularly as the North Beach neighborhood was identified as having a separate quality from the rest of the Beach area.

Ms. Jarjura referred to the recognition that some of the suggested restrictions are more limiting than what the Planning and Zoning Department might consider, and asked how it could be recommended to the public if the Department is not itself in agreement with those numbers. It was reiterated that the Plan as presented was “only a draft” and was before the Board, as it would be before the public, so feedback could be obtained.

Ms. Jarjura followed up by asking how some of the numbers were determined, such as floor plate size, as they greatly differed from what is currently permitted by Code. It was noted that several major cities have opted to change their Codes to smaller floor plates, and that existing buildings in the City were taken into this consideration.

Ms. Jarjura expressed concern regarding where the financing of the Plan might occur – for example, if development or public/private partnerships are restricted, how can sufficient funds be generated for the project. Deputy Director Jessup advised that should the means of funding proposed in the Plan not be available, bonding issues, the General Fund, or seeking of grants could be options as well.

He returned to the discussion of square footage, pointing out that the limitations on square footage in Fort Lauderdale’s downtown area have proven successful. While this does not mean the limitations would work as well for the Beach area, he noted that Sasaki has looked into ways to maintain light and air at the pedestrian level, although this must be mitigated against the viability of development on the Beach.

Mr. Seitz felt the area’s restaurants and bars should take greater advantage of the view the Beach area has to offer, perhaps using roofs as a seating area toward this end. He cited several areas in the U.S. and Europe that have transitioned to more pedestrian-friendly environments and alternative transportation, and felt the traffic in a Beach area should be appropriately slower, particularly along A1A.

He continued that revenues could come from some of the multi-use purposes arising from development of “prime land” facing the Intracoastal Waterway. He added that he is in favor of additions to the Beach, such as piers, volleyball courts, or children’s parks.

Mr. Yaari commented that making the Las Olas parking lot into a public space is an “amazing idea;” however, a new and “very strict” noise ordinance has recently been enacted by the City, which raises questions about how this could become a public space. He felt Code Enforcement and other City Departments should review the Master Plan and determine for themselves whether these were appropriate spaces for public events. He added that condominium owners in that area would be displeased with the amount of noise such a public space could create, and reiterated that the City and the Master Plan should ensure that they are “on the same page.”

Vice Chair Molinet agreed that the City should be developed as a “five-star destination” and the Master Plan presented steps toward this goal; however, he felt what he had heard from City representatives as well as stakeholders pointed toward a “breakdown in communication.” He recommended heightened collaboration between these groups as the project progressed. Overall, however, he felt “a lot of positives” could result from the Plan.

Ms. Lopez suggested the addition of a supermarket in the Beach area at large, and asked which of the character areas Sasaki would recommend for a business of that nature. Mr. Ward felt it would be a “market issue” for the buildings in an area, and noted that a supermarket is certainly not precluded by the Plan. He pointed out that the area would need sufficient population to support a supermarket.

Chair Lee noted that the issue of the NBRA arises from time to time, with the accompanying question of how to make a “mixed-use feel” financially viable for a particular area. She continued that the Board represents a variety of constituents, including stakeholders in the Beach area, and that creating a “grand entryway” in the Las Olas parking lot is the most exciting aspect of the plan for her, although it raises budgeting questions.

Mr. Ward identified Breakers Avenue as the potential location of café or restaurant uses, which, he stated, arose from the input of the Golden Square Association, a group of adjacent property owners. The economic consultant to Sasaki’s team, however, had had some questions as to whether this area was a viable retail or mixed-use environment, and was not “strongly supportive” of this proposal.

With regard to funding, he recalled that while there had been some negative reactions to showing the possibility of development on the Point and Alhambra sites, it had been shown as a way to pay for “more strategically located” public open spaces. He noted that no recommendation had been made on this funding, however.

Chair Lee stated while she was also hearing several options, she did not feel she was hearing what the experts actually recommended, as with the example of restaurant use on Golden Square. It was noted that there was a series of recommendations about where to start with regard to the proposed project; in addition, as the area in question is over two miles long, some options from which to select must be necessary.

Mr. Matchette referred to the Las Olas Plaza area, recalling that it was the City’s earlier desire to maintain this as open space, so when travelers crossed the bridge, the ocean was visible. He added that there has been consistent worry in the community that the current parking lot space might eventually be developed into something that would not accomplish this original goal. He personally encouraged development of an underground parking garage if it is cost-effective, as an above-ground parking garage would play into these concerns.

He also wished to address the concerns of property owners, stating that he did not understand how this group had not had significant input prior to this stage in the Plan’s development. He encouraged planners and major property owners to consult going forward.

Mr. Seitz felt there should be greater input from the residents of Broward County as well, and provided a copy of the Central Beach Alliance’s goals to be entered into the record.

The goals are as follows:

GOALS OF THE CENTRAL BEACH ALLIANCE OF FORT LAUDERDALE

1. The Beach Master Plan must be extended (north and south) the length of the City’s boundaries.
2. Execute and construct the A1A/Barrier Island Greenway to include: wider sidewalks, wider bicycle pathways, linking to downtown, and coordinating with the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

3. Protect City-owned barrier island property by ensuring a city referendum to sell or change use of the land. This is to be approved by a super-majority of the voters of the city of Fort Lauderdale.asas
4. Amend ULDR Section 47-23.6 – Beach Shadow Restrictions so that shadows on the beach must be measured from 9am to 5pm on November 21 as opposed to the current date of March 21.
5. Regarding the NBRA district of the Central Beach: all future construction should be limited to 50 feet at the highest point. Owners of current property in the NBRA need to be afforded tax breaks and incentives, flexible building codes, parking flexibility, and the leniency regarding a change of use. The above is needed to provide property owners the economic feasibility and incentive to remain in business on the beach. In addition, Historic Preservation should be encouraged throughout the NBRA
6. All future construction on remaining undeveloped property in the IOA (Intracoastal) District shall not exceed 70 feet at the highest point.
7. All future development of hotels on A1A must provide accessible, public restrooms and reasonably priced public parking not to exceed rates at City-owned public lots.
8. Where new buildings on the beach are presently permitted to be constructed 120 feet high or more, such developments shall be reduced in height by 20%.
9. The City should purchase undeveloped land on the barrier island for use as parks and public parking.
10. The City should mandate that all barrier island vacant buildings be demolished and that the land be sodded and landscaped to avoid the ever-increasing “scars” on the beach.

Chair Lee opened the discussion to the public at this time.

Tim Schiavone, business owner in the Sunrise Lane area, encouraged Sasaki to “draw a line” under their encouragement for reduction of parking and change of use. He cited his neighborhood as an example of one which is “stalled” for change of use, as there are no resources to add the parking spots required by Code, which greatly limits the businesses that can move into adjacent lots. He added that this is a similar problem in the Downtown area, and can be very costly

and time-consuming; in addition, he noted that the answers are often in the negative.

He also asked why greater consideration was not given to Sunrise Boulevard, as it is the only Boulevard in the City which extends to I-95 and the turnpike, which he felt qualified it as a "gateway" as well. He believed there should be a "tremendous...visual" from this viewpoint as well as from Las Olas.

In conclusion, he noted that his neighborhood has roughly \$160,000 in BCIP funds to match with grants in order to create a wider sidewalk and accomplish some neighborhood painting as well.

City Commissioner Charlotte Rodstrom stated she wished to make sure the boundaries of both the Board's area of influence and the Sasaki plan as well were clearly explained, in order to ensure there was no question of how far-reaching the Master Plan extended.

Deputy Director Jessup explained the Master Plan covers from Bahia Mar to Sunrise Boulevard, which he agreed should be a gateway as well. Chair Lee reiterated the Board's boundaries as well.

Mel Rubenstein, resident, complimented the Sasaki Group for a fantastic job. As a beach activist, he did not agree with everything in it. It will not be possible to please everyone. Something happened here today that he had never seen before. Mr. Yaari has a right to his opinion, but he does not have a right to threaten you. There was a very clear threat made here today: "You do it the way the developers or property owners want or we're going to bring you to court." He felt the other side of that coin has to be mentioned here today also. He felt he was speaking for a lot of community people who are taxpayers. One should not lose sight of the community and the neighborhood and the future generations on this beach. There are many who are fighting not to make Fort Lauderdale a North Miami, a Hallandale, or a Manhattan. Fort Lauderdale is unique. They want to preserve what's unique. He didn't hear any discussion of compromise; do it their way because they have the money, they have the power, they have the land and because they bought the land they think they own the beach and the future. That is not the case. He referred to Ina Lee's repeated suggestion to get people together and both sides compromising. No one was forced to buy the land; buyer beware. The responsibility of our City Commission is to provide for the future of Fort Lauderdale residents, the community and families and tourists, not only to developers, which has been the case.

With inaudible multiple voices, the Chair allowed Mr. Rubenstein to continue.

Mr. Rubenstein commented how everyone wears many hats. The threat is unfortunate. He hoped there is not caving in because a great job has been done.

Dev Motwani, representing Merrimac Ventures, felt Sasaki had done "a great job" in amassing public input, but pointed out that he felt private input could have been greater, and hoped this would be taken into consideration going forward. He requested clarification, with many of the proposals characterized as "recommendations," of how the Master Plan would coincide with existing Code.

Deputy Director Jessup stated that the Code would remain the same, and the proposed guidelines of the Plan would "overlay" Code. As an intent for creation of a public realm has been established by the Plan, the guidelines would serve as a "road map" on how to reach the desired public experience; should other means to reach the same goal arise, they would be as viable as the suggestions generated by the Master Plan. He pointed out that this has been successfully achieved by the Downtown Master Plan, and hoped the Beach Master Plan could negotiate a similar consensus between the different interests in the community.

Courtney Crush, private citizen, felt there should be attention paid to neighborhood compatibility, as this is a criterion by which proposals of the Plan's nature often fail, particularly with square footage and FAR in mind. She cautioned that if 40,000 sq. ft. are proposed, it could be difficult to prove that a project meets the "intent" of, for example, 12,000 sq. ft. She recommended the inclusion of language that helped the Plan "get a handle on" the floor plate question in particular.

Deputy Director Jessup felt this was "a fair point," and noted that the Plan attempts to identify intent with respect to the size designation of a floor plate: for instance, the intent would be to allow light and air to continue to reach the street. He asserted that whatever the number, it should be predicated upon the intent of allowing light and air to the street and not creating an "urban canyon." Floor plate size is one quantifiable manner in which this could be accomplished, he noted, although there could be other ways to realize this goal as well.

Geri Manning-Udell, president of the Sunrise Intracoastal Homeowners' Association and board member of the Bonnet House, asserted that meetings such as this one can bring forward too many "self-interests," and the opinions of the residents of the neighborhoods in question should be taken into the greatest consideration. She added that Beach areas need protection and felt the Master Plan is a creative way to accomplish this.

Nectaria Chakas, representing “a number of Beach property owners,” expressed concern with the Master Plan’s take on floor plates, setbacks, parking variances, and reserve trips. She cited height restrictions and setbacks as “problematic” on some of the smaller properties; additionally, while parking changes are suggested, she felt these should be studied before the Plan is adopted rather than afterward.

She continued that variances are more properly identified as “incentives” or “bonuses,” as there are criteria that must be met by developers in order to achieve these; the discussion in the Master Plan that suggests eliminating some of these is of concern to residents as well, and she noted that “it would be a mistake” to eliminate these, as it could mean the City opened itself up to potential lawsuits by doing so. She requested that all involved be “mindful of property owners’ rights.”

Ms. Chakas concluded by mentioning that the City is encouraged to reserve trips from the “RAC trip pool,” and again cautioned that, as these trips are allocated on a first-come-first-served basis, it is not something open to arbitrary change.

There being no further members of the public wishing to speak on the matter at this time, Chair Lee closed the floor to the public and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Morris explained that one of the Plan’s goals was to “build in some certainties,” as currently developers bring projects to the Beach area with no prior knowledge of whether they will be approved, and they may have requests that require special approval. He felt a key aspect of the Plan is to include some certainties for development that are not currently part of the approval process.

Mr. Seitz felt the possibility of gambling coming to the Beach area should be studied, as this could dramatically affect development in the area on many levels.

Chair Lee asked the Sasaki representatives what would be the “next step” after the public meeting to be held that evening. Deputy Director Jessup replied that they would take the input received at the two meetings and develop a final version of the Master Plan to present to the City Commission. He was not aware of the time frame this might involve.

Motion made by Mr. Yaari that before the proposed Master Plan goes before the City Commission, the Board recommends that the Plan is discussed with approximately 10 major stakeholders from the CRA area, as well as clarifying

more points with regard to specifications rather than suggestions, in order to create a more viable plan for everyone involved.

Mr. Morris suggested these concerns be included under the “Communications to City Commission” section of the Agenda rather than as a motion.

Mr. Matchette felt the stakeholders’ investment is such that their interests should not risk being represented after the Plan is in place. He **seconded** Mr. Yaari’s **motion**.

Ms. Motwani agreed that stakeholders in the business community should have more information on the specifics of the Plan, and felt the Plan should be brought back to the Board before a final presentation is made to the City Commission.

Ms. Lopez felt all members have been invited to attend multiple meetings regarding the development of the Plan, and all had the opportunity to attend. In addition, she felt a distinction is made between the ULDR specifications and any recommendations made by Sasaki, which she felt clarified the matter.

Mr. Seitz felt there should be a separate motion, or an **amendment** to Mr. Yaari’s motion, requiring the Plan come before the Board once more before it proceeds to the City Commission. Mr. Yaari accepted the **amendment** to his **motion**, seconded by Ms. Jarjura. The **amendment** carried unanimously.

In a voice vote, the **motion** carried unanimously.

Chair Lee stated that she felt communication was key to success as well as access to power, and thanked all Board members for their opinions, however they may have differed, and their contributions to the discussion. She thanked the representatives of Sasaki, Staff, and the public who had attended tonight’s Board meeting.

VIII. Old/New Business

Chair Lee recalled that at the Board’s March 2009 meeting, members had expressed concern regarding “pornographic” comments on t-shirts featured in Beach area shops. Staff has learned that there is no legal recourse to the matter.

Mr. Yaari noted that he has spoken “as a friendly neighbor” to the proprietors of one such shop, asking them to please consider the Beach’s image.

Chair Lee stated she wished to ensure that Staff continues to monitor the timing of the South Beach lot renovation so it does not interfere with the upcoming 2010 Super Bowl. Mr. Morris agreed he was aware of this concern.

Mr. Morris reminded the Board that the next meeting would be a "Beach Walk," and suggested that members dress appropriately. Ms. Jarjura recommended that the time of the Beach Walk be earlier in the day than the usual meeting time out of consideration for the climate. Mr. Morris agreed to look into changing this time.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

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