

**MINUTES OF CITY COMMISSION WORKSHOP
DOWNTOWN MASTER PLAN
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2003 – 12:00 NOON
CITY COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM
8TH FLOOR, CITY HALL
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**

Meeting was called to order at 12:13 p.m. by Mayor Naugle on the above date, City Commission Meeting Room.

Present:

Mayor Jim Naugle
Vice-Mayor Carlton B. Moore
Commissioner Christine Teel
Commissioner Dean J. Trantalis
Commissioner Cindi Hutchinson

Staff:

Alan Silva, City Manager
Harry Stewart, City Attorney
Lucy Kisela, City Clerk
Greg Kisela, Assistant City Manager
Bud Bentley, Assistant City Manager
Cecelia Hollar, Director Construction Services
Bruce Chatterton, Planning & Zoning Services Manager
Christine Fisher, Planner
Cathy Connor, Parks and Recreation
Sergeant At Arms, Sergeant M. DiMaggio

Consultants:

Marc C. LaFerrier, Keith & Schnars, P.A.
Neil Kittredge, Beyer Blinder Belle (BBB)

Guests

Doug Eagon	Donald Singer	Michael Ferber
Jim Brady	Jon Krupnick	Tim Hernandez
Gus Carbonell	Peter Feldman	Jack Loos
Dr. Peter Magyar	Richard Mancuso	Louis Mencado
David Barth	Jason Robertson	Steven Glassman
Mary O'Donnell	Norman L. Howard	Joel S. Fox
Lutz Hofbauer	Walter Morgan	Ed Smoker
Bria Lambrix	Jim Murley	Helena Mirigliano
Anne Abrams	Fred Fazio	

Recording Secretary: Margaret A. D'Alessio

Mayor Jim Naugle called the meeting to order at approximately 12:13 p.m.

Bruce Chatterton, Planning and Zoning Services Manager, stated they were going to summarize what had been done during the past year regarding the Downtown Master Plan. A general update would be provided which would include the character areas, population density, work force housing, and capital projects. He advised that the Urban Design Guidelines would be new information. Mr. Chatterton explained that there would be discussion involving how streets would be treated, along with how buildings should be related to streets and to each other. He advised that they were also going to discuss the dwelling unit allocation, which consisted of proposals, which had been presented to the City Commission previously, along with alternatives for implementing the guidelines through the dwelling unit allocation process.

Mr. Chatterton stated they were also going to ask for the City Commission's authorization to proceed with the recertification of the 2,960 flex units on the Broward County Planning Council's Agenda for November 20, 2003, and in order to be placed on such agenda a letter was needed by October 28, 2003.

Mr. Chatterton proceeded to introduce Neil Kittredge of Beyer, Blinder and Belle who would be making today's presentation; Marc LaFerrier of Keith and Schnars, P.A. who would be handling discussion regarding the downtown density and development potential issues; and Cecelia Hollar, Director Construction Services, who would be discussing the implementation of the regulatory issues.

Mr. Chatterton explained that during the past year a number of workshops had been held, presentations made to the City Commission, and workshops with the stakeholders and the public. He stated that today an update of the plan would be provided, and then they would be requesting input regarding possible changes to the plan, differences in direction to be taken, and public input. He announced that the final draft would be presented to the Commission on November 4, 2003.

Mr. Chatterton further stated that the Downtown Master Plan was being coordinated with other planning projects that were being conducted in the City. One of the public initiatives they were dealing with was the Regional Activity Center Mobility Study. He further explained that they had stated early on that they were not going to include consulting services for transportation in the Master Plan in order to avoid overlapping or repeating what was being done by the mobility study. He advised that the consultant teams were continually discussing ways in which that could be the transportation element of the Downtown Master Plan. Other initiatives they were dealing with were the Flagler Precinct Plan, CRA initiatives, Broward County Downtown Campus, Riverwalk Trust, Broward Greenways Plan, Strategic Parks Master Plan, and the SABA Corridor Master Plan.

Mr. Chatterton stated that the Downtown Master Plan was to be approved or approved in principle by the City Commission as:

1. A vision and set of principles, which defined a vision and would be achieved through a public consensus building project.

2. A variety of Planned Actions, which would implement the vision, but could change and evolve over time. He reiterated that the important thing was to keep the core principles and the vision as their goal.
3. A framework or “road map” or “bones” of the Downtown. He explained they would then look towards a precinct planning process in order to put “flesh on the bones.”
4. A design-oriented planning approach that would not deal with individual buildings in a vacuum, but create streets and places.
5. A guide for updating policies and regulations.

Mr. Chatterton stated that Neil Kittridge was going to go through the program.

Neil Kittridge stated that he wanted to reiterate the elements of the Master Plan which were as follows:

1. The Vision for the Downtown, which had been developed over time through the consensus building process, including the public, stakeholders, and the City.
2. The Framework Plan which illustrated the “bones” of the City that included the structure and organizing plan of the Downtown RAC.
3. Urban Design Guidelines, which was the new information that would be discussed at today’s meeting. He explained that today’s data would be more specific as to how the different areas of the framework might be organized in terms of the structure and composition of streets and buildings, and the relationship of buildings and the elements.
4. Precinct Planning Process. He explained this was the concept of taking a particular area of Downtown including several blocks, or perhaps an entire zone of the Downtown. He advised there was currently a precinct plan taking place in the Flagler Heights area, which would take the principles, the framework, and the guidelines and be more specific to the particular characteristics of the area and perhaps be a model for precinct planning to occur in other parts of the City.

Mr. Kittredge stated further that the character areas were the concept of breaking the Downtown RAC into a number of different areas which had a different feeling or different urban characteristic that built on the unique quality of each area, including the feeling of the streets, the relationship of buildings to the streets, and to each other in order to provide a diverse setting for urban building types, streetscapes and different neighborhoods. He added that they were also to provide for a variety of housing and business opportunities. He further stated the character areas were also to provide a wide range of feasible and sustainable uses and long-term redevelopment strategies. They were also created in order to avoid a “monolith” of urban development or random redevelopment patterns. They were also to build on the principles of past planning efforts and other successful downtowns.

Mr. Kittredge stated that there had been a number of plans over time starting in 1977, which looked at the RAC area and conceived the idea of zones of different characters within the Downtown starting from a compact core area to a more residential neighborhood fabric. He further explained that a sense of transition between those two elements was created.

Mr. Kittredge proceeded to show a diagram as to how the zoning districts had been changed and transformed over time beginning with the original City Center area, which was located South of Broward and down to the River. He explained it had expanded in 1992 to take in south of the River, north to 4th Street, and south to 9th Street. Another expansion was done in 1997 that went further to the north to 6th Street. He explained there had been a pattern of zoning for the City Center District to accommodate the potential development of the City in order to allow for continued growth, but at the same time the planning efforts historically had looked to create a compact core, and an intense center to transition into more neighborhood areas on the edges. He stated this was not necessarily an irreconcilable situation. He stated that by presenting the Urban Design Guidelines they wanted to show how a set of principles for the relationship of the buildings and their relationships to streets, and the arrangement of streets could be overlaid over the zoning so they could have both the benefits of the zoning which was currently in place, along with the benefits of a strong urban design form for the City Center. He stated they saw the guidelines not as a zoning issue, but designed to be consistent with the City zoning in all aspects. He stated they were to be an overlay of a sense of urban design thinking and a set of urban design principles that complimented the zoning.

Mr. Kittredge proceeded to show a map of the character areas, which were entitled as follows:

Downtown Core (red, orange and yellow areas) that consisted of mixed-use "center", more commercial/civic use, and high-density housing.

Near Downtown, which was also a downtown core area, that was the shoulder district, which started to transition from a highly commercial center to a more institutional, retain and residential area.

Urban Neighborhood which was more predominantly residential and started to feel like more of a livable urban neighborhood.

Mr. Kittredge stated that at the October 2, 2003 Steering Committee meeting, a vote had been taken to transform the character areas which were to enlarge the Downtown Core to the north and south, and replace the Urban Neighborhood with Near Downtown. He explained that the character areas would then match the zoning districts, and eliminate the Urban Neighborhood.

Mr. Kittredge stated he hoped the Urban Design Guidelines would illustrate that the vision could be seen as completely consistent with zoning and be complimentary and not create the impact of down zoning the Downtown or affecting the zoning, but overlaying it in a complimentary way. He explained that within the different zoning districts, they imagined there could be different areas of character, but still being consistent with zoning.

Marc LaFerrier stated they wanted to provide some more detailed and technical information, as requested, through the planning process. One of those was to determine what the population density of the Downtown could be under this planning regime. He explained that they recognized that the Downtown changed and evolved over a long period of time, and a successful downtown would continue to do so. He explained further that they felt the numbers they were going to show today were good planning numbers,

and ones which could be used for subsequent planning efforts, such as utility, parks, and roadway planning. He further stated that they also recognized that the Downtown was dynamic making it necessary to revisit the plan over time. He explained they had done these calculations so they could have a better understanding of what implications would be needed for the future growth in the Downtown.

Mr. LaFerrier explained that one of the things they did in attempting to determine what the future Downtown density population would be was to look at the existing and proposed developments in the Downtown. He added they had also researched other similar downtowns to determine what their densities were, along with growth projections, which had been provided for the State and the area. He advised they had also looked at the urban development objectives from past planning efforts and those involved in this planning study. He advised further that they wanted to provide a relevant density and guidelines which the City could follow in its planning efforts which would be expressed in a dwelling unit per acre, a net acre calculation, overall. He stated they had then gone back and reviewed the population projections with other trends in various cities.

Mr. LaFerrier stated they had developed a map after doing their research regarding what the new developments were consisting of, along with the conditions of existing sites, and then were able to determine "hard" and "soft" sites. He explained that the multi-colors shown on the map were sites they believed would redevelop over the course of the next 15-25 years, and were located in the outskirts of the Urban Core area. He explained the "hard" sites were shown in beige on the map and they believed those areas were significantly developed as of this time, in good condition, and would not redevelop over a period of time. He stated they believed there were about 330 acres that could be developed over a period of time. He explained they applied the net density calculation to the number and arrived at their figures. He explained in considering that the City had already approved and had under construction about 5500 dwelling units, it meant the population in the near term for the Downtown would be in the neighborhood of 11,000 residents. In looking to the future, they recognized that the net change could be in a range between another 16,000 to 25,000 residents moving into the Downtown which would result in a total population of about 27,000 to 37,000 additional residents, along with all economic activity and associated uses that were needed to support an exciting and vibrant downtown.

Mr. LaFerrier proceeded to show a chart which quantified trends both from the perspective within the last 10 years and towards the future. He stated that in the '80's and '90's there had been a decline in residential development. He felt the trends from 1990 to 2000 were misleading for the purposes of comparing future trends in the Downtown because of the success of residential development, along with new development, and the atmosphere presently in the Downtown which provided a better opportunity for greater population densities for the future. He stated what was relevant was the relationship between the total growth expected in the County over the next 20 years which could be a capture into the Downtown. He explained that about 700,000 people were expected to move into Broward County over the course of the next 20 years, and they figured that about 3.7% of that amount could come into this City.

Mr. LaFerrier continued stating that another important aspect of downtown housing was the ability to provide housing for a wide variety of incomes and lifestyles, and for the overall population. He further stated that an important aspect of any downtown planning effort was workforce housing. They felt with the success in downtown housing, which

was occurring, there should be an embracing of workforce housing to go along with the demands and trends taking place in the Downtown area. He reiterated that the character areas and Urban Design Guidelines would provide a greater opportunity for housing types of all incomes and all types of families. He felt there were a number of tools that could occur, such as integrating the units throughout the Downtown area and matching them with market-rate housing so as not to isolate the units in certain areas or certain buildings. He further stated that a couple of the tools should be inclusionary or incentive-based zoning so as units were allocated, they could be used for workforce housing or density bonuses could occur to provide such housing.

Mayor Naugle asked what the consultant's definition was for workforce housing, including a price range. Mr. LaFerrier stated he was not sure of a price range at this time, but the term workforce housing was a new and evolving term. The most recent study from ULI indicated that workforce housing was in a range of about 60% to 110% of the average income of the area. He explained it was not quite affordable housing, but broadened the range of housing types and the individuals they were providing housing to. He further explained that in an area like the Downtown where land and construction prices were high, it was sometimes difficult to obtain workforce housing.

Mr. LaFerrier stated that tools within the CRA involved partnerships with private organizations, trusts, and grants, which could assist in integrating the workforce units into the Downtown.

Mr. LaFerrier stated they also wanted to discuss examples of capital projects. He continued stating that this Master Plan would result in public investment, and this City had a long history of recognizing that public and private investment went together. He stated that private investment was at a greater and more significant magnitude than public investment, and it was crucial to choose the correct public investments to create motivation and stimulus for private development. Some examples were:

- Roundabout at US-1 and Sunrise. Mr. LaFerrier stated they felt this could create a grand entrance into the Downtown, provide a new civic space, anchor the north end of the Downtown, create a signature landmark, improve traffic flow, and increase surrounding land values and create an urban redevelopment opportunities. He proceeded to state that the cost for such a project would be about \$3 Million to \$6 Million, and would not include land costs.
- Parks (Community, Neighborhood and Pocket). Mr. LaFerrier stated they had estimated that there would be about 10.5 to 12 acres of parks that would be needed to supply open space for the new residents of the Downtown. He further stated they would provide connectivity through a system of parks, provide civic space, create additional green space, and increase surrounding land values and create urban redevelopment opportunities. He stated the total cost for such projects would be about \$8.5 Million to \$14 Million.
- Bridges and River Crossings. Mr. LaFerrier further stated that another signature landmark, which had been discussed during some of the previous presentations, had been a pedestrian bridge possibly located over Federal Highway. He added they understood the complications which could arise due to boat traffic, but they felt it was an important idea that should be reviewed further. He continued stating that they could

provide bridge, tramway and ferry crossings, pivotal north and south river connectivity, promote pedestrian activity, create a signature landmark, and exhibit quality public investment. The cost for such projects would be in a range from \$5 Million to \$8 Million. He added these projects would cost the same as a standard DOT pedestrian bridge.

Mayor Naugle asked if an estimate had been done regarding the ferries. Mr. LaFerrier replied they were not able to arrive at a good estimate because it involved primarily labor costs. He stated one of the things they had looked into and were still discussing was the idea of a ferry instead of a bridge. He stated they were going to do more research regarding such an idea, and believed the operating costs would be more significant than the capital costs.

- Streetscapes were another important component of public improvements in the Downtown. Mr. LaFerrier stated they would provide a sense of place and street character, shade and buffers, promote pedestrian activity, create safe and walkable streets, promote quality redevelopment, and provide parking and landscaping. He added that the cost range broken into a per block price would be about \$325,000 to \$375,000.

Neil Kittredge began to speak about the Urban Design Guidelines. He stated they were intended to be more specific regarding character areas. He further stated the particulars were not yet fully resolved, and would be worked on further by the City and the stakeholders. He felt they had an overall common sense of principles for streets and buildings.

Mr. Kittredge stated that the Urban Design Guidelines were not intended to conflict or change the zoning, but to compliment the zoning. Another point was that they would never get so specific that a set of rules could be created to cover every conceivable situation. He explained some cities had done that, but they did not feel that was the right approach. He stated they wanted to create a guide that could be used by intelligent people working collaboratively over a period of time towards the future, and have a set of principles that individuals had agreed on regarding a common vision for the City. He added that those principles could be used to review projects, designing projects, and a guide for understanding the vision of the Downtown. He explained they were not too specific as to preclude variations. Mr. Kittredge stated further that they felt the combination of the City zoning and the Urban Design Guidelines as a set of principles were a permissive environment, development, and regulatory regime for the Downtown. He reiterated that they did not feel doing things in a quantitative sense would be an appropriate solution for Fort Lauderdale, and felt they should focus on qualitative aspects of urban form, streets and buildings. He emphasized it was about how things were designed and how they related to each other to create the whole environment.

Mr. Kittredge stated that in regard to streets it was important to maintain a fine-grained street grid, and not vacate City streets or alleys except for strategic public planning purposes. He proceeded to show examples of streets falling under such principles. He further stated that streets should utilize traffic calming rather than blocking streets, and encourage on-street parking in as many areas as possible, except on major arterials such as Federal Highway and Broward Boulevard. Other principles of street design were to provide adequate bike lanes in a planned network, require street trees on all

Downtown streets, primary row of street trees located between sidewalk and street, reduce maximum regular spacing for street trees, reduce horizontal clearances for trees, use shade trees along streets, palm trees to mark intersections, eliminate County "Corner Chord" requirement which was not compatible with urban areas, reduce curb radius at corners to maximum 15', eliminate curb cuts on "primary" streets, and have fixed rights-of-way and setbacks for all Downtown streets (to eliminate uncoordinated City setback and County easement requirements).

Mayor Naugle remarked that he wanted to refer to the example regarding shade trees when discussing the JPI project during tonight's Commission meeting so mistakes were not repeated.

Mr. Kittredge added that they felt the standard design speeds that engineers worked towards in designing downtown streets should not be as high as they were, and they would provide some recommendations later on. He reiterated that was a safety issue and would allow the lanes to be smaller.

Mr. Kittredge proceeded to discuss the principles of building design. He stated the first concept was to frame the street with a "street wall" that would meet the setback line. Examples were shown of each principle as discussed. He stated that open space requirements could be used in small pocket parks, which would be usable and accessible to the neighborhood. Still in regard to framing the street, he began discussing the "shoulder" of a building with minimum and maximum building "street wall" lengths and heights. He stated that once one moved above the shoulder of the building, one entered the "tower zone" and a common sense principle should be established to limit the floor plate of a tower. He added that towers should face "primary" streets and not be located on streets less than 60' wide, but it would depend on the site. He continued stating that another principle of building design was surface parking, which should not face the primary street, but be accessed from the back. He also stated that concept would apply to garages having minimal visual exposure to the street. He also stated that other principles were to have main pedestrian entrances facing the street, active uses and "extroverted" ground floors with retail in strategic locations, encourage balconies and bay windows to animate facades, and buildings with ground-floor residential to have individual entrances to the units. Mr. Kittredge further stated that other principles of building design were to have high-rises meet the ground with active tower-floor uses and pedestrian-oriented design.

Mr. Kittredge proceeded to show illustrations how the character area guidelines could apply to the Downtown Core, the Near Downtown, and the Urban Neighborhood. He stated that there were no shoulder requirements for the Downtown Core in order to create the sense of verticality, but there would be a requirement for the floor plate. In all cases the height requirements would be consistent with the zoning heights, but in the City Center there would be no height limitations. He explained that in the Near Downtown area there was a shoulder which created a streetwall that framed the street, but once above the shoulder similar guidelines as used for towers would apply. He explained the towers would always be above the step back at the shoulder point giving a more horizontal feeling on the street. He stated that in the Urban Neighborhood area there would be a shoulder requirement that would be lower on the small local streets, but higher on the major streets. Townhouses would be encouraged for the area especially on alley blocks or medium scaled buildings such as the JPI project. He stated that above the shoulder height elevation with a slight step back, there could be a tower which would

be consistent with the height limits in zoning, but different as to how and where it was oriented.

Mr. Kittredge proceeded to show some street section examples of how all the above principles could apply, such as on Broward Boulevard, Federal Highway, and 3rd Avenue. He stated that in the diagrams they were showing roads being built-out according to the current code, and then showing how they could be built-out in accordance with the above-described principles. He announced they had not yet completed their work in regard to Andrews Avenue. He stated there were problems on Andrews due to the fact that they had more buildings which were tighter to the street than other streets.

Mr. Kittredge proceeded to show some local and residential streets, which had been built-out in accordance with the present code, and then showed the streets built-out in accordance with the proposed principles. He added that they wanted to see more activity along the Riverwalk, including more nightlife, restaurants, cafes, bars, shops and galleries. He stated the park could be expanded and a paved area could be created to permit service and emergency vehicles through, but otherwise be closed to traffic.

Cecelia Hollar, Construction Services Director, stated that the dwelling unit allocation was the 2960 units that were on hold. She stated that everyone recognized that 2960 additional dwelling units could be the beginning of the next stage of residential development in the Downtown, but would not be the completion. She reiterated there were 2960 dwelling units which were on hold and were part of a future Land Use Plan Amendment. She explained that item would be scheduled before the Planning Council, if the Commission directed staff to do so. The next hearing was scheduled for November 20, 2003, and they had to send a letter by October 28, 2003, from the City Manager's Office or the Mayor asking to be placed on the Planning Council's agenda. She stated that would then allow the Planning Council to examine the amendment and re-certify the plan, if they chose to do so.

Ms. Hollar stated internally they needed to know what would happen if those units were to be released. She reiterated they needed direction from the Steering Committee, Commission, and various stakeholders. She explained that staff's recommendation was that they utilize the design guidelines shown today as a tool to assist in allocating the dwelling units within the Downtown, and would be applied as zoning in progress. She further explained that discussions had ensued as to whether that should pertain to any scale of development, and if there was a smaller scale project of 50 dwelling units or 50 dwelling units per acre, whichever was less, should they continue on a first-come/first-serve basis. She stated that not all of the guidelines would have to be applied, but they encouraged if there was a trigger for neighborhood compatibility that anything above would go to the Commission for approval. She stated there were differences of opinion throughout the community. She stated they had on the table an ordinance which basically stated there would be no allocation of dwelling units until such time the Commission chose to adopt an ordinance to do so.

Ms. Hollar reiterated that the second part of the conversation was what was the maximum plan. She explained it was clarification of the neighborhood compatibility guidelines that were in place. She stated excellent input had been received from the consultants and the steering committee. She explained further they wanted to utilize the Master Plan, if accepted by the City Commission, as zoning in progress for any new

residential development. She explained when precinct plans were done, or if someone came forward with a planned development project, or the Commission wanted in the future to apply these regulations across the board to all development, then that would be something that would have to be directed by the Commission. At this point, they wanted to use them as a guideline.

Ms. Hollar stated that she wanted to point out that the yellow flyer individuals had received had not been sent out by the City. She stated she did not know who made up or distributed such flyers. She felt everyone could see from today's presentation that nothing was being proposed that would change the zoning regulations, and she felt it enhanced what they had and gave everyone a better tool to achieve better end results.

Mayor Naugle stated this was a joint meeting between the City Commission, the DDA, the CRA Advisory Board, and the Urban Design Steering Committee. He further stated that he wanted to call on representatives from all three of those organizations to provide input on the Master Plan before Commission discussion took place.

Doug Eagon, Downtown Development Authority, stated that he agreed with the consultants in that the process had been one of consensus building for several months, and the Steering Committee and the DDA wanted to continue with such consensus building. He stated that upwards of 50% of what was seen today was brand new information, and therefore, additional meetings would be held. He felt they were at the point where the "meat" was being put on the bones, and it had impacts on property rights. As a reference point, he felt it was important that the consultant had given a brief history of the Downtown going back to the early days of the DDA, and stated that the City Center ran from Broward Boulevard to north of the River in 1977. He stated he was not sure where that information had been derived from, but he had the enabling legislation from the DDA as amended in 1969 that the boundaries ran generally south from 6th Street to generally north to northeast 4th Street. He did not think any dramatic changes had been made to those boundaries over the last 30 years. He stated the number of units which were available and the mythical 5100 units and how they came about, including the fact that today there were 3,000 + units approved of which many were now under construction, in reality that left about 2,000 units. He felt it was important from a reference point that when graphics were shown from the '90's, there had been 313 residents in Downtown Fort Lauderdale and they needed to reconcile that because if there were 2,000 units many of those were in the northern Flagler Heights area of which had a higher population count per unit than any of the new units being built. He stated further there might have been 7,000, 8,000 or more residents who already lived in the Downtown, and he felt that was important to note when they began talking about numbers in order of magnitude, and possibly, if they were lucky, there might be 25,000 people Downtown some day. He explained they could look at the virtual lack of impact of having several thousand residents already here.

Mr. Eagon felt the workforce housing issue was something they needed to discuss, and stated there had not been much discussion at the Steering Committee level as anticipated. He stated further that the consultant continued to talk about guidelines not replacing zoning, and he felt if they talked about it long enough they would eventually believe it. He stated that today it was difficult from a property owner's standpoint to see the great differentiation between the existing zoning, property rights in place, and what the consultant was proposing as an overlay. Rather than go on about that issue, he looked forward to the Steering Committee working towards reconciling the issues. He

cautioned them as a community to move very carefully as done in the past when addressing such issues, and walk down the path together which would not end up in litigation which would be expensive to the City.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 1:35 p.m. and returned at 1:36 p.m.

Mr. Eagon stated he agreed with some of the comments made by Neil Kittredge when reading through the graphic slides, such as eliminate and other language encouraged/discouraged. He stated he also agreed that on-street parking should be encouraged, and they should discourage curb cuts on primary streets, but it did not mean eliminate curb cuts on primary streets because from a practical standpoint they had to evaluate where and when that could be done. He stated that they needed to continue working on the floor plates, and felt they had to be careful not to bring their northern biases to some of the planning work being suggested. He emphasized they did not have the luxury as some northern cities did to bury their parking garages, and they had cars that traveled through the Downtown and garages were part of their life. From an idealistic world he, as a Planner and Designer, thought it would be great not to see them, but that was not reality. He reiterated that the Sun-Sentinel Building used as an example had parking enclosed and was very expensive, but from a marketing standpoint people did not like it and felt claustrophobic. He further stated that he agreed with Mr. Kittredge that they needed to minimize and screen the garages.

Mr. Eagon further stated that individual entrances to townhouses on streets were nice, but were very subjective. He stated while designers thought that should be done in some cases, in others it should not be done. He further stated that he did not know if it created more activity on the streets, especially in South Florida, because many of the streetfronts and townhouses used the areas for recreation areas. In many cases, he stated it took one to a garbage can and basements or homeless individuals sleeping on the sidewalks which did not cause for a safer environment, as opposed to going through a central entrance to get to a ground floor unit.

Jim Brady stated that Stan Brown was unable to attend today's meeting and he had been asked to present two motions to the Commission which had been adopted unanimously by the CRA Advisory Board. One motion had been passed on October 1, 2003, and the other on October 15, 2003. He stated that the Advisory Board appreciated the opportunity to participate in this process. He proceeded to read the motion which had been passed on October 1, 2003, as follows:

“To adopt the Flagler portion dealing with the Master Plan and the recommendation of the Downtown Master Plan Steering Committee with the following 3 elements: The Downtown Master Plan was strongly focused on open spaces, streetscape and pedestrian corridors and their linkages. The second element was to delineate the Downtown character area as co-terminus with the RAC type and CC boundaries with the remaining areas shown as Near Downtown character areas. The third element was the Master Plan would not affect the height or density provisions in any way as set forth in the ULDR.”

Mr. Brady stated that the October 15, 2003 motion read as follows:

“A motion to communicate the urgent concerns of the Northwest-Progresso-Flagler Heights Community Redevelopment Agency Advisory Board in support of the City Commission request for re-certification of the City of Fort Lauderdale’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan by the Broward County Planning Council at their November, 2003 meeting, and the immediate allocation and release of residential units to the CRA area north of Broward Boulevard.”

Mr. Brady stated that the sense of both motions was to “get off the dime” and move forward. He reiterated there were expectations in the community that needed to be served, and they needed to follow-up on such opportunities.

Donald Singer, Chairman of the Urban Design Steering Committee, stated the idea put forward more than 3 years ago by the Steering Committee was basically due to the climate and greatness of the community. He reiterated that the City would continue to grow, and their hope was to put order to that growth and create a walkable, usable, urban area, and after extensive research on the part of the consultants and well-attended public hearings, and after debate among the Steering Committee, they found some common ground, but there was still work to be done. He reiterated they had a good plan for the Commission’s consideration, and recommended approval.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that they had discussed the re-certification of the flex units that existed and that they wanted to use them north and south of Broward, and she asked if it was common for the Broward County Planning Council to ask for criteria and design guidelines of other cities or were they focusing on Fort Lauderdale. She asked if it was an easy process to have the flex units re-certified.

The City Attorney explained that it was neither uncommon nor unusual for them to ask for guidelines as to how the units were to be allocated, but historically, it was uncommon.

Commissioner Moore thanked everyone who had participated in this process, but stated that he was still concerned that the RAC was not being extended to 7th Avenue and Sunrise. He felt they were not taking advantage of an opportunity that should have been part of this study. He asked what timeline was being proposed for the groups to give their input on the new items presented today.

Doug Eagon stated they had been working in the time frame which had been dictated to them and would continue doing so. If the Commission were expecting to see this again in November, than they would work towards such a time line. He felt the bigger issue was whether they would come up with something that was going to truly build consensus in order to have everyone continue marching down the same path, and whether the community would have the opportunity to do so.

Commissioner Moore reiterated that the Commission wanted to discuss this on November 4, 2003. He then continued to ask what time frame was needed for input to be given on today’s presentation.

Mr. Eagon stated that he wanted to answer that more clearly, if in fact, they could anticipate that what they now had was what they were going to work with, but with due respect to the process, he stated this was the 6th meeting whereby they were given substantially more information than what had been presented previously. He reiterated

that they would make every effort to accommodate the November 4th time frame, but felt there were some fundamental things included that he had chosen not to discuss specifically in hopes that issues could be resolved.

Mr. Brady stated that he echoed Mr. Eagon's comments, and stated that things could be studied and nothing still got done. He further stated that the CRA wanted something done now, rather than in the future. He stated that the term elegant was used by the consultant, and he felt that was an ephemeral term to be used in land planning and development. He felt the word elegant in the land planning and development area was predictability, certainty, economically less burdened, and a level of getting in and through the system in a reasonable period of time. He felt this should be done within 3-4 weeks and the matter should be voted up or down, but the process should not be a de facto moratorium on the progress made or the progress to be made in the future.

Commissioner Moore asked if the CRA did not want to deal with the work in progress concept. Mr. Brady reiterated it was always work in progress, and stated it took 20 years to have the ULDR redone. He felt this could be the same time path but it should not be, and reiterated that something needed to be done.

Mr. Singer stated that with all due respect to his colleague Mr. Eagon, they had disagreed about a number of things involved in this process, and would probably continue to disagree. He felt the things referred to were details that were visual images shown in a presentation, and there had been and would be a consensus on the Steering Committee, and reiterated that it was important to move this process forward. He stated they recommended approval of this plan, but if the Commission felt they needed to discuss some matters further, then the Steering Committee would meet and present their findings in time for the November 4th meeting.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that he saw two forces running parallel. He stated there was the necessity to seize the moment and maintain the momentum of the market conditions, and that particular position had been pointed out to him time and again, and that they should not stifle the process through the planning process. He asked if the Commission moved forward and asked the Broward County Planning Council to release the units, would they be waiving their right to ask that the guidelines be adhered to as they were planning them in the process, or were they going to be required to wait until the guidelines were in place before allowing the units to be released. He asked once they were released would the developers have the right to insist on guidelines in place at the time of the application.

The City Attorney replied that it was truly up to the Commission because there was a proposed ordinance that would come before the Commission when they were asking for the units to be considered on November 4th. He stated this would be considered as zoning in progress, and would allow them to apply the new rules. If they did not want to use it as zoning in progress and wait until it was adopted, then prior to the adoption they could apply the old rules, and as soon as the new units were released any developer using them could follow the old rules or the new rules depending if they treated this as zoning in progress or not.

Commissioner Trantalis asked how legal was zoning in progress. The City Attorney replied it was very legal and it depended on how one applied the zoning in progress. If the zoning in progress was applied to all applications and they attempted to retroactively

apply it, then that would be inappropriate, but if applied to applications received subsequent to the time they were saying they were working on it, then that would be the new standard and could be applied from that time forward. Commissioner Trantalis clarified if they determined that these guidelines were zoning in progress, they could now henceforth apply them to development projects applied from this time forward. The City Attorney confirmed.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that when this process started as they grew up, they looked to build a better walkable city. She further stated that Third Avenue was the connector to Downtown and when one walked in certain areas of workforce housing, there would be retail on the bottom floor and a comfortable walk would be provided. She looked to these as guidelines as they related to the right-of-way issue and how buildings were placed on the street. She stated to allow for the canopies into the setback, they would not be putting a burden on the developer to go for the variance and the canopies made the project better. She stated that she did not agree with some of the things and for the record she was not into down zoning an individual's property and did not want any more phone calls. She stated that was not what this process was about. She explained this process was to build a better Downtown where everyone could live, walk and play together. She stated it would not end up down zoning people's property. She stated that was not where they were headed in this study, but were to provide guidelines to design better buildings and better pedestrian areas.

Commissioner Hutchinson agreed that bike lanes needed to be placed on appropriate streets, where they could connect a better grid and provide a better walkable area on the heavily traveled streets for pedestrians. She reiterated that she was attempting to accomplish the concept of the double-row of trees on SR 84, and admitted it had taken a long time but she had accomplished it. She stated there were a lot of concepts in the plan that she was in favor of, and she wanted everyone to build consensus as a community, as developers, as the CRA, as the Steering Committee, and as the Commission to proceed forward with something. She stated she was ready to get the units and stated there was a \$45 Million investment north of Broward, and another one south of Broward which was to be the Downtown Core. She stated that once she got the units, she was not sure where to go with them, and if the zoning in progress should be enacted or should developers have to adhere to principles that they had not yet received a consensus on. She hoped a consensus could be reached by November 4, 2003, because it would make it easier for everyone to play as a team.

Mayor Naugle stated that one of the reasons they were here today was to deal with some of the projects and prevent ones which had been previously approved from happening again. He felt there was a consensus in the community that mistakes had been made in the Downtown, and an example of that was the Riverside Parking Garage. In order to prevent that from reoccurring, they needed to have some sort of design guidelines for the future, but reiterated they did not want to prevent a building from being built. He stated that another project which was the "poster child" for bad design was The Waverly. He stated there was a strong consensus in the community that was a poor design. He felt this study was an attempt to prevent such things from happening in the future. He stated there was a feeling that the City wanted to take away an individual's property rights, but he questioned whether the property owner ever had the right to build the building in the first place. He felt if better definitions were needed in the ULDR to prevent such a thing from reoccurring, then that was what this plan was attempting to accomplish. He stated they needed to get out of their mind the concept of property rights

being affected because when an ugly building was built next to someone's property, it devalued that property. He stated that he supported some sort of attempt to regulate the design of future buildings for the Downtown for everyone's benefit. He stated maybe they needed to apply for the units, but they still needed to have some sort of control so applying for such units would not result in more mistakes like those made in the past.

Mayor Naugle announced that anything done today would not be a final decision because ordinances would have to be enacted, matters had to be presented to Planning and Zoning, and that sufficient time would be provided for public input. He stated that the City Commission meeting was scheduled to have started a half hour ago, and reiterated that the flyer sent out had resulted in input at today's meeting. He stated that 3 different points of view had been offered, but the Commission had to now make a decision regarding the units. He announced the Master Plan would come before this Commission again on November 4, 2003, but the Commission had to resolve today whether to send the letter to the Broward County Planning Council.

Commissioner Teel stated that she felt they needed to get moving on this and that they should get the units, but she wanted to also see a sense of trust being generated. She reiterated they were not trying to change people's property rights, and stated that the consultants and City staff had emphasized that point over and over again. She stated this was not about taking away property rights, but was about having a more walkable and enjoyable experience downtown. She stated that some of the examples shown today illustrated why she did not like to get out of her car, but what was being encouraged and proposed were streets that invited individuals to walk on them. She stated her biggest concern was to get the City codes, County ordinances, and FDOT to agree. She felt more work was needed, but did not want to go much past the November 4th deadline. She thanked everyone for their hard work on this plan. She added that she was also in agreement about the zoning in progress.

Commissioner Moore stated that they first needed to agree on getting the 2960 units. Mayor Naugle remarked that a resolution regarding that would be made at tonight's Commission meeting.

Motion made by Commissioner Moore that the Resolution to obtain the 2960 units be placed on the Commission agenda for October 21, 2003 at 6:00 p.m., and that the letter to the Broward County Planning Council be sent by October 28, 2003.

Mayor Naugle reiterated that a resolution would be presented for the Commission's vote at tonight's meeting.

Commissioner Moore stated that zoning in progress was a necessity for all the reasons which had been stated. He further stated if they went for the 2960 units and this concept was not in place, they would be defeating the purpose. He continued stating that the consultant's concepts were very beneficial, and did not see the zoning issue. He reiterated that he did not see any down zoning of property.

Commissioner Moore stated there were some things he found interesting, and one of those things was the de-emphasis of the workforce housing by the other 3 groups. He felt everyone was trying to "soft pedal" the issue, and wanted everyone to realize they needed to have workforce housing and would have it. He stated if there was no workforce housing, then they should not get the units. He felt they needed to arrive at a

percentage for that because the Downtown should not be developed while omitting people who were working towards this type of quality of life. He strongly urged all participants to address this issue because it was critical to the units and their allocation.

Mayor Naugle stated they needed to work towards that and see if they could shape something that could be agreed upon by everyone.

Commissioner Moore further stated that he also wanted to see artwork in the public spaces and felt that should be considered as a method of making the Urban Core interesting.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she wanted to find a way to move forward on the local street issues with the County, and felt it was vital. She stated she did not hear anyone disagreeing about those issues, and felt they needed to move to the next step with the County Commission. She felt the longer they waited, the longer the people would get their units allocated, the buildings built, and they would have "missed the boat" once again. She stated that everything she was hearing on the local streets as it related to the turning radius and on-street parking, they needed to ask and these would be the guidelines in how they should do it.

Mayor Naugle stated there could be another joint meeting. Commissioner Hutchinson agreed but stated it needed to be scheduled in the very near future. Commissioner Moore agreed and stated that there was a sense of urgency in this, and possibly the Planning Council could also address this. Commissioner Hutchinson reiterated that this was all part of the package. Commissioner Moore stated that if the County's Traffic Department dealt with the FDOT standards regarding trees, then they needed to be at the table to discuss the matter.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 2:07 p.m.

Ms. Hollar asked for some further clarification on two issues. One was that they would proceed with the letter by October 28, 2003 to the Broward County Planning Council, but asked if the Commission wanted them to propose that a certain number of units be continued on a first-come/first-serve basis or should all the units come to the Commission for approval. She stated there were two character area proposals on the table. One was from the Steering Committee, which was supported by the CRA Advisory Board, and also one from staff and the consultant. She explained the difference was that basically one character area followed the zoning line, and the other had a differentiation between the Core, the Near Downtown, and the Urban Village. Therefore, they needed some direction on that because one of those needed to be included in the final document of this plan.

Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting at approximately 2:08 p.m.

Mayor Naugle stated the first issue was the allocation of units and asked the Commission their preference.

Commissioner Moore stated that until they had the workforce housing included, he felt they needed to come before the Commission. After the ordinance was in place, he had no problem with the recommendation because it would allow the development community to understand the rules of the game and they could then play along. He

stated he did not want to slow down any development opportunities, especially with the flex units and wanted to mobilize the \$45 Million investment. He reiterated that he wanted the development community to believe that they were sincere in what they were proposing.

Mayor Naugle clarified that for the short term the units would come before the Commission, and hopefully, something would be adopted whereby they came before the Commission after a certain threshold. Mayor Naugle stated the next issue was the area north of 1st Street and south of 7th.

Ms. Hollar stated that the City wanted to follow the zoning line, and staff and the consultants had supported a more compact urban core.

Mr. Kittredge stated that the consultant team believed it was the result of the fact that they were not able to previously illustrate well enough the nature of what was meant by the distinction between the 3 character areas. He stated they were still showing the configuration because they had put more effort in trying to develop the meaning of those areas. He explained that in previous presentations they had used verbal techniques and photographs of other cities, which they realized was an inadequate means of communicating what the areas were about.

Commissioner Moore stated he understood things much better now and felt this segment of the discussion should still be part of the November 4th meeting. He felt the other 2 issues were immediate and needed to be done, but this was something that needed to be discussed and trust had to be built on. He added that would include the south portion also. He stated further that whatever was done, the document should be presented in color.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that the process was never to downzone or change the zoning, and that was the impression of the stakeholders. He agreed that such discussion should be postponed until the next meeting.

Mayor Naugle reiterated that the Commission would be prepared to make a decision at the November 4th meeting.

Jon Krupnick stated they did feel they were being down zoned between 7th and 9th. He explained they were on the south side of 7th, and historically they had been in the City Center, and they felt they were being moved out. He felt that was a property right which should not be imposed on them in this way.

Fred Fazio stated that he owned property south of the River and stated there were over 2 Million people in the County now, and there would be more in the future, and he did not feel that 13 blocks was too much for a Downtown Core.

Mayor Naugle further stated that now they had a parks impact fee and asked how it was presently assessed. Ms. Hollar explained that it was done on 3 acres per 1,000 population per unit. Mayor Naugle asked when was the last time the price had been adjusted.

Kathy Connor, Planner in Parks and Recreation, stated that a memo had been distributed to the Commission last week which detailed the next level of study that they

wanted to do with the area. She advised that the level of service for parks was 3 acres per 1,000 and was set in 1975. She further stated the dollar impact fee was \$140,000 per acre which was set in the '80's before concurrency. Mayor Naugle asked if they had the ability to adjust that figure. Ms. Connor confirmed and stated that could be done by doing the study they were requesting.

Mayor Naugle stated he felt that should be part of zoning in progress. Ms. Connor further explained that the memo, which had been distributed to the Commission was asking for the Commission's approval to put out an RFP to do the study which would establish a new level of service for the Downtown RAC. Once that permission was granted, they wanted to put out the RFP and would then bring it back to the Commission with the dollar amount. She stated they had also included an optional item regarding the northwest RAC, as well. She further stated they needed to define their level of service in regard to open space and how it would be addressed with the development.

The workshop was adjourned at 2:17 p.m.