

Planning and Zoning Board
City of Fort Lauderdale
Wednesday, November 15, 2006 – 6:30 P.M.
City Hall City Commission Chambers – 1st Floor
100 North Andrews Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Cumulative
June 2006 – May 2007

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Pamela Adams	P	5	1
Edward Curtis, Vice Chair	P	5	1
Maria Freeman, Chair	P	5	1
Mary Fertig	P	6	0
Steve Glassman	P	6	0
Rochelle Golub	P	6	0
Mary Graham	P	6	0
Judith Hunt	A	2	4
Catherine Maus	P	5	1
Tom Welch	P	1	0

Staff

Sharon Miller, Assistant City Attorney
Greg Brewton, Planning and Zoning Services Manager
Yvonne Redding, Planner II
Anthony Fajardo, Planner II
James Cromar, Planner III
Michael Ciesielski, Planner II
Tim Welch, Land Development Manager
Don Morris, Acting Zoning Administrator
Jim Koeth, Principal Planner
Jenni Morejon, Planner III
Wayne Jessup, Architect
Mina Samadi, Engineering Department
Sandra Goldberg, Recording Secretary

Guests

Jerry Gerardi	Allen Davis
Roseana Cordova	Bob Leonard
Michael Madfis	Jose Rodriguez

Jim Kahn	Mike McNerny
Mike Smith	Sadler James
Donald Hall	Alan Tinter
Frank Snedaker	David Eichholtz
Heidi Davis	Joe Holland
Geri Udell	Chris Barton
Rogério Basso	Bill Spencer
Kirk Lofgrin	Robert Dugan
Sylvia Coltrane	Diane Smart
State Senator Many Dawson	Lucy Wayne
Gregory White	Scott Strawbridge
Luis Rivuelta	Sidney Callaway
Steve Tilbrook	Victor Teladano
Alan Davis	Ralph Andrea
Richard Betaine	John Paul Schroeders

Index

	<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.	24-R-06	Lauderdale Investment/South Andrews Office Building	3
2.	4-Z-05	Broward County / Palmdale	4
3.	88-R-05	Broward County / Palmdale	5
4.	110-R-06	City of Fort Lauderdale/Fire Station #29	5
5.	133-R-05	Villaggio Di Las Olas Development, Inc./Storks Las Olas	6
6.	140-R-06	Grand Termar, LLC/Green-Atelier	6
7.	46-R-06	Transacta Prive Developers, Ltd./Orion Resort	7
8.	59-R-06	V&L Associates, LLC	11
		For the Good of the City	14

Call to Order

Chair Freeman called the meeting to order at 6:44 P.M., then proceeded to introduce the members of the Board and explain the procedures that would be followed during tonight's meeting. Assistant City Attorney Miller explained the procedures for quasi-judicial cases, the local planning board requirements, and the City's lobbying rules. Anyone wishing to testify on any matter was sworn in.

Ms. Redding informed Chair Freeman that the applicant for item 5 had requested a deferral due to improper signage.

Motion made by Ms. Fertig, seconded by Ms. Golub to defer item 5 to their December meeting. Board unanimously approved.

Approval of Minutes

Motion made by Mr. Glassman and seconded by Ms. Golub to approve the minutes of the October meeting. Board unanimously approved.

December meeting schedule

The Board discussed possible alternatives to their December 20, 2006 meeting date. Their January meeting would move to January 24, 2007 to accommodate the City Commission.

Motion made by Mr. Glassman, seconded by Ms. Golub to move their December 20, 2006 meeting to January 3, 2007. Motion passed 5 – 4 with Mr. Welch, Ms. Adams, Ms. Maus, and Mr. Curtis opposed.

Cases

1. Lauderdale Investment/South Andrews Office Building

Anthony Fajardo

[Index](#)
24-R-06

Request: ** Site Plan Level III / Parking Reduction / CB Zoning

Legal Description: Lots 12 through 15, Block 46 of Croissant Park according to the plat thereof recorded in P.B. 4, P. 28 of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida

Address: 1777 South Andrews Avenue

General Location: Southwest corner of South Andrews Avenue and Southwest 18 Street

Board members disclosed communications they had regarding this case.

Mr. Michael Madfis, architect for the project, explained that the building was originally designed for medical offices for the adjacent hospital district, but the hospital had difficulty finding doctors to occupy the building. The owner wanted to rent the spaces to professional offices. He wanted to install a yoga/fitness center on the ground floor and needed to eliminate six parking spaces on the south side of the building to do this. They had hired a consultant who determined that there was sufficient on-street parking and there were 24 vacant spaces on a regular basis, which was the maximum that would be required for the office use.

Mr. Madfis explained that the change of use as the units changed tenants would result in a change of the parking requirements, and each new lease would require a permit that was processed through Zoning, which would verify the parking requirements. Ms. Miller stated they can attach conditions to parking reductions, including use.

Mr. Madfis was not sure when the existing medical leases would expire, but he felt it would be in the next few years.

Ms. Golub said she had driven the area and found that street parking *could* exist in certain places, but did not actually currently exist. She had not seen much available street parking on her visits, and found the lot at 1770 “pretty full.” Mr. Madfis said it was true that Lauderdale BMW used a lot of the area to store cars on which they were working, but felt there were 36 spaces within 700 feet, as well as another 140 in the area, according to their Master Plan. Ms. Golub wanted to know if they had reduced parking for other development in this area.

Mr. Anthony Fajardo, Planner, explained that the study had indicated a surplus of spaces within 700 feet of the building, and it met the ULDR requirements.

Mr. Jose Rodriguez, engineer at Keith and Schnars, said this was the first request for a reduction in this area. Mr. Tim Welch, Land Development Manager, said he was unaware of any parking reduction requests in this area for the past several years.

Ms. Graham felt that if they located the yoga center on the second floor, there would be no need to eliminate parking spaces. Mr. Madfis agreed that the site could be developed differently, but they were trying to work with the existing infrastructure.

Chair Freeman reminded Mr. Brewton that the Board had requested information on other reductions in the area when considering parking reduction cases. Mr. Brewton said, “Many of the parking agreements in previous days were not kept up,” and he feared giving the Board inaccurate information. Due to past practices, Mr. Brewton said he could never guarantee that information was 100% accurate.

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

Motion made by Ms. Maus, seconded by Ms. Adams, to approve the parking reduction request with the condition that future tenants be limited to non-medical office uses with a parking requirement of 1 space per 250 or more. Motion failed 4 – 5 with Ms. Fertig, Ms. Graham, Ms. Golub, Mr. Glassman and Mr. Curtis opposed.

Ms. Golub stated that 13,000 square feet with no medical tenants would require 53 spaces. The applicant claimed they would have 44 after they removed the ground floor spaces, for a 9-space deficit. Mr. Fajardo agreed with this calculation and explained that the consultant had calculated with the medical use, resulting in a larger deficit.

Mr. Glassman said he was not comfortable limiting the medical use of the units.

The following two items were heard together.

Request: ** * Rezoning from B-3 to Utility

Legal Description: Parcel "A", 1-B Palmdale Plat, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in P.B. 112 P. 9, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida

Address: 301 N.W. 66 Street

General Location: South of McNab Road and east of the CSX Railroad Tracks

Board members disclosed communications they had regarding this case.

Ms. Roseana Cordova, Broward County representative, stated that the application did not include site development or improvement; it was a rezoning and public purpose request and was the final step for the land use plan amendment to bring the site into conformance since it was taken over from the county. Ms. Cordova said they had re-noticed the property and met with the mobile home park owner.

Ms. Jenni Morejon, Planning and Zoning, listed the code items from which the applicant was requesting exemption: the 30-foot setback to adjacent residential property; tree requirements; architectural requirements; the landscape strip adjacent to residential strip and the 5' high buffer wall. Ms. Morejon said this project was approved to go to the Planning and Zoning Board. She confirmed that proper notice and signage requirements had been fulfilled.

Motion made by Ms. Maus and seconded by Ms. Graham to approve the zoning change. Motion passed 9 – 0.

3. Broward County / Palmdale

Jenni Morejon

[Index](#)
88-R-05

Request: ** * Public Purpose Use Approval

Legal Description: Parcel "A", 1-B Palmdale Plat, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in P.B. 112 P. 9, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida

Address: 301 N.W. 66 Street

General Location: South of McNab Road and east of the CSX Railroad Tracks

Motion made by Ms. Maus and seconded by Ms. Graham to approve the public purpose use. Motion passed 9 – 0.

4. City of Fort Lauderdale/Fire Station #29

Jim Koeth

[Index](#)
110-R-06

Request: ** * Public Purpose Use / Replace Existing with New 14,534 SF Building / CF

Legal Description: Office of the Fire Marshal – Fire Station No. 5 – A portion of the S.W. ¼ of the N.W. ¼ of Section 36, Township 49 South, Range 42 East, City of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida

Address: 2002 N.E. 16 Street

General Location: One block west of the 1600 block of Federal Highway to the east of Lake Melva including approximately a 40-foot wide strip of land that extends east from the south east side of the property to Federal Highway (US-1)

Board members disclosed communications they had regarding this case.

Ms. Mina Samadi, Engineering Department, explained that they wanted to demolish the existing station and construct a new one to meet the Fire Department's needs. They were requesting relief from certain code items.

Mr. Jim Kahn, Keith and Schnars, explained the code sections from which they requested exemption: reduction of side setback from 25 feet to 8.5 feet on the east side abutting a commercial property wall; wall requirements abutting residential property for the northwest corner, where they intended to leave existing trees in place to serve as the buffer; parking requirements for the Fire Administration building on site.

Mr. Curtis opened the public hearing. There being no members of the public wishing to speak on the item, Mr. Curtis closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Ms. Maus, seconded by Ms. Graham to approve the request. Motion passed 9 – 0.

[Index](#)

5. Villaggio Di Las Olas Development, Inc./Storks Las Olas Yvonne Redding 133-R-05

Request: ** Site Plan Review/3 Passenger Charter Boat Use/B-1

Legal Description: Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 13 and 14, together with that portion of that certain 10 foot abandoned alley, lying between said Lots 3 and 14, and between said Lots 4 and 13, Block 21, "Beverly Heights", according to the plat thereof, as recorded in P.B. 1, P. 30, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida

Address: 1109 East Las Olas Boulevard

General Location: North of Las Olas Boulevard and west of SE 12 Avenue

This item was deferred to the Board's December meeting.

[Index](#)

6. Grand Termar, LLC/Green-Atelier Yvonne Redding 140-R-06

Request: ** Site Plan Review /Nine Townhomes/NBRA

Legal Description: Lots 1 and 2, Block 6, of Birch Ocean Front Subdivision, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in P.B. 19, P. 26, of the Public

Records of Broward County, Florida

Address: 551-567 Antioch Avenue

General Location: Southwest corner of Terramar Street and Antioch Avenue

Board members disclosed communications they had regarding this case.

Mr. David Eichholtz, representative of the applicant, said his client desired to downsize the already-approved project. They had shortened the building height, reduced the units' size and added one unit. Mr. Eichholtz stated they had met with and received approval from the Central Beach Alliance and City Staff.

Ms. Redding confirmed the project reduction, and confirmed the project's support from the Central Beach Alliance.

Mr. Curtis opened the public hearing.

Mr. Sadler James, Central Beach Alliance, said they even more pleased with the project now that it was reduced.

There being no more members of he public wishing to speak on the item, Mr. Curtis closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Ms. Redding confirmed for Ms. Golub that the applicant would make a contribution to the beach improvement fund and the School Board had been notified of the increase in the number of units.

Motion made by Ms. Maus, seconded by Ms. Graham, to approve the request. Motion passed 9 – 0.

[Index](#)

7. Transacta Prive Developers, Ltd./Orion Resort

Don Morris

46-R-06

Request: ** Site Plan Review/196 Room Expansion to Existing Hotel with 8,100 sf Restaurant/Bar with 3,100 sf Retail Use/ABA

Legal Description: All of Block G, Birch Ocean Front Subdivision No. 2, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in P.B. 21, P. 22, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida

Address: 700 North Atlantic Boulevard

General Location: Bounded by State Road A1A, Belmar Street, Breakers Avenue and Vistamar Street

Board members disclosed communications they had regarding this case.

Mr. Mike McNerny, Bonnet House Board member, requested that Bonnet House be permitted response time equal to that given the developer; Bonnet House intended to present expert witnesses. The Board agreed.

Mr. Donald Hall, representative for the applicant, noted that information was being distributed to Board members from Heidi Davis; this was admitted in as Exhibit 1. Mr. Hall informed the Board that this parcel was a full city block and was the largest parcel proposed for development on Fort Lauderdale Beach, but was also a smaller project than its neighbors. Mr. Hall stated the project complied with both the ULDR and the Beach Revitalization Plan. Mr. Hall presented a rendering of the project with surrounding buildings that was accepted as Exhibit 2.

Mr. Hall stated that the pedestal was 35 feet tall and the tower was 200 feet tall; this reduced the mass and enhanced the pedestrian experience at street level. Mr. Hall explained that the FAR in this district allowed the applicant to apply for bonus points. After a July meeting, Staff had informed Mr. Hall that he had made a good argument for being awarded 9.2 bonus points, 9 of which were required to construct the building. Mr. Hall explained that the project also met the requirements for beach development permitting in 47-12.6 by complying with the goals of the Beach Revitalization Plan.

Ms. Heidi Davis, representative of the owner, stated that the Orion would be a “five or five plus star resort.” Regarding the DEP issue, Ms. Davis said the Staff report was incorrect in stating the DEP could make a determination about the parking garage resulting in a reduction of the FAR bonus points; DEP only regulated habitable coastal areas. Ms. Davis said they had met with DEP representatives to discuss the site plan, and she provided minutes of this meeting to the Board. In the worst case, Ms. Davis explained, the DEP would require the kitchen to be elevated; this would not affect the underground parking structure, and would not alter the bonus points.

Ms. Davis explained that the designers had accepted input from the Central Beach Alliance, and City Staff and Boards. The project also met the City’s adequacy and neighborhood compatibility requirements. Ms. Davis displayed renderings of the project and stated that their narrative explained how they satisfied the criteria to qualify for the FAR bonus points.

Ms. Davis stated that architecture of this project was different from nearby buildings and the colors helped it to blend in with the sky and water. Ms. Davis compared the Orion project to the nearby Atlantic, Trump and Q Club and remarked it was smaller in mass and height and had the biggest lot coverage. She felt that having entrances to the town house units at street level enhanced the pedestrian experience.

Ms. Davis said they had been meeting with Bonnet House representatives since April and had “made every attempt to work with them and would like to continue to work with them in the future.” Dr. Lucy Wayne had prepared a historical evaluation describing potential impact to the Bonnet House that was submitted to the Board. Ms. Davis said Dr. Wayne had concluded

that the project would have no adverse impact on the Bonnet House. Ms. Davis presented renderings and photos describing the impact the project would have on Bonnet House views and said it would affect only 9% of the view. The applicant had also commissioned a lighting study that found only “very negligible” light effects from the project.

Ms. Miller and Mr. Ciesielski marked all 19 of Ms. Davis’s exhibits for the record.

Mr. Don Morris, Planning and Zoning, said three items warranted the site plan level 4 review: the 20% FAR increase; increase in the building length from 200’ to 394’4”, and the hotel use. Mr. Morris said the applicant had provided a narrative regarding neighborhood compatibility and adequacy, and a parking and circulation study that had been approved. The project was consistent with the comprehensive plan, and the Planning and Zoning Board could recommend the project with or without conditions. Staff requested that if the Board voted to approve, that it include the condition that a valet parking agreement be required prior to final DRC signoff.

Mr. Glassman asked Mr. Morris about the conflict between the Staff report and the applicant’s statements regarding the DEP and FAR requirements. Mr. Morris said the City had asked for DEP’s opinion regarding the low first floor elevation. The City had not yet received a letter from the DEP certifying that the project could be built as designed. The City’s concern had been that if the building must be elevated, so would the underground garage, which would bring it into the FAR requirement. The applicant had stated that the project could be constructed as designed.

Mr. Glassman wondered if they should be considering the case until this final determination from the DEP was received by the City. Mr. Morris said the Board could make this a condition of their approval.

Ms. Graham wanted a definition from the Florida Building Code of “habitable space.” She agreed that a parking garage was not habitable, but questioned some of the definitions the applicant referred to in August 4 and November 1 memos from Coastal Systems International. Mr. Glassman noted that cities could have a stricter standard for habitable space in the coastal zone, and asked what Fort Lauderdale’s position was. Mr. Brewton replied that the building code would address this.

Mr. Hall presented the Board with a worksheet he said explained the Staff’s opinion on the bonus points; this was admitted as Exhibit 21.

Mr. Curtis opened the public hearing.

Mr. Mike McNerny, representative of Bonnet House, stated they did not know how big the project was; it could be eleven stories or twenty stories. He explained that the FAR, which could be affected by the DEP decision, determined the height of the building. He felt the Board must table the application as incomplete.

Mr. McNerny noted the difficulty he had in gaining access to documents provided to the Board, and in providing additional documents to the Board himself. He did not believe the Board had received copies of the Historic Preservation Board minutes, which contained that Board's unanimous recommendation to deny the project, with every member speaking against it. The City's consultant had also submitted a report that Mr. McNerny was unsure the Board had ever received, which came to a "drastically different conclusion as to the impact on the Bonnet House of this building."

Mr. McNerny said this project would have "severe" impact on the Bonnet House. He noted that the City recognized the historical significance of the Bonnet House, and it was mentioned 19 times in the City's comprehensive plan.

Regarding neighborhood compatibility requirements, Mr. McNerny informed the Board that Section 47-25.3 specifically addressed the importance of preserving Bonnet House's view corridors.

Mr. McNerny reported that the Bonnet House property was owned by the Florida Trust for Historic Preservation, which had written in opposition to the Orion project. He presented copies of letters and reports from the Florida Trust and the National Trust for Historic Preservation Mr. McNerny believed the Board had never received.

Mr. Robert Dugan, EDSA Planners and Landscape Architects, presented a PowerPoint demonstration of the impact of the Orion project on Bonnet House view corridors.

Ms. Fertig confirmed with Ms. Davis that the project as presented this evening was 20 stories. Ms. Davis presented a shadow study conducted on the project at 20 stories and stated it had no affect on the Bonnet House or its grounds, as it was 200 feet south of the property line. They had also performed a traffic study that concluded the project would "not increase over 1,000 trips" and there would be no increase in traffic at the beach.

Ms. Fertig asked Ms. Davis why they requested such a drastic increase in the allowed length of the building. Ms. Davis said this met the goals of the ABA district and the residents, and provided the parking for the structure.

Mr. Luis Rivuelta, architect, said he thought that since the pedestal was only 35 feet tall, they were allowed the additional 200 feet. Mr. Morris said they could request the increase, but the City must apply neighborhood compatibility criteria to the request.

Motion made by Chair Freeman, seconded by Ms. Fertig to defer the case to January 24, 2007, until the Board had additional information. Motion was approved 9 – 0.

Mr. Glassman felt the City, the Bonnet House and the applicant should continue to meet and try to come to agreement on the project. He felt that there were too many unanswered questions.

Ms. Golub remarked on the large volumes of information submitted by the applicant continuing until the very day of this meeting, and the pertinent information the Bonnet House representative felt the Board had not received. Ms. Golub thought the Board needed time to digest all of this information, and to receive the other information already discussed.

Ms. Adams wanted the applicant to respond to some of the questions that had already been asked. Ms. Freeman and Ms. Graham felt there were many areas about which they required additional information.

Mr. Hall wanted the Board to be specific about additional information they felt they needed. He stated that the DEP issue was “not an issue,” as this was a Building Department issue. He claimed that Curtis Craig, City Building Official, had already signed the DRC approval of the site plan, but this had not been good enough for the Planning Department.

Mr. Kirk Lofgrin, Coastal Systems International, said the DEP would never comment on building heights, and the only reason the building might need to be elevated was because the basement could not be dry flood-proofed, and Curtis Craig had stated that the building could be dry flood-proofed.

Senator Mandy Dawson felt the Bonnet House must be considered, and the Florida Trust should be included in the conversations.

Ms. Graham wanted to be sure that “whoever has the final say” would be invited to the meeting to make sure everyone was on the same page. Ms. Fertig wanted a clarification of the bonus point scoring from the City.

8. V&L Associates, LLC

Michael Ciesielski

[Index](#)
59-R-06

Request: ** Site Plan Level III/Parking Reduction/ CB

Legal Description: Lot 16, Block 8, Resubdivision of Lots 3 to 12 inclusive Block 8 and all of Block 16, Galt Ocean Mile, P.B. 38, P. 18

Address: 3465 Galt Ocean Drive

General Location: Southwest corner of Galt Ocean Drive and NE 35 Street

[This item was mistaken for another case and deferred at the start of the meeting]

Board members disclosed communications they had regarding this case.

Mr. Sidney Callaway, representative of the applicant, said the owner was requesting approval of a parking reduction from 30 spaces to 24.

Mr. Steve Tilbrook, representative of the owner, said they had significant community support for the request. He had explained that Dr. Taledano had stayed on the barrier island after the

Cleveland Clinic had moved west. He had purchased this property intending to use it for his medical office, but the property did not meet the City's newer parking requirements for medical offices.

Mr. Tilbrook described the nearby properties and noted that they relied upon public, metered parking, not on-site parking. Dr. Taledano's property had six on-site parking spaces because his property was located on a corner. Mr. Tilbrook presented photos of the property and nearby parking area, and stated that the nearby lot was underutilized due to the decline of the commercial corridor.

Mr. Tilbrook explained that the change of use required the facility to be brought up to code and pointed out that the property had not complied with parking requirements when it was built, but had relied on the nearby public parking. He said the code allowed them to account for available public parking within 700 feet of the site. They had conducted a parking study in February that determined there was sufficient parking available, even at full occupancy. Mr. Tilbrook added that City Staff and an outside consultant had approved the parking study. The applicant's consultant had also reviewed the safe pedestrian pathways and found them to be adequate.

Mr. Tilbrook said they had consulted with and received support from the Galt Ocean Mile Community Association. Most of the other business on the block, and the nearby temple had approved of the project as well. The temple had offered to allow parking for Dr. Taledano's office in their lot when there was no conflict with their services.

Mr. Ciesielski informed the Board that the applicant must meet adequacy requirements and the criteria for the parking reduction. Mr. Ciesielski had confirmed that the applicant met two of criteria. Mr. Ciesielski stated the following Staff conditions for approval: the parking reduction must be executed and recorded in Broward County public records at the applicant's expense; the reduction could not take effect until 30 days after the Board approved it, providing the City Commission did not move to review the application, and final DRC site plan approval must be obtained, subject to all applicable ULDR requirements.

Mr. Ciesielski said the applicant had not yet met all of the ULDR requirements for site plan approval based on the change of use. Mr. Ciesielski stated that the applicant would have to meet this condition that is subject to meeting all of the ULDR requirements for final DRC approval.

Mr. Glassman wondered why they were reviewing this if the applicant had not yet met all ULDR comments. Mr. Ciesielski said he had received all of the proper sign-offs for the parking reduction; the change of use would come up under the site plan level 2 and DRC review.

Ms. Graham wanted City Staff to report on how many parking reductions had been granted in the past in the area near this project; Mr. Ciesielski agreed to do this. Mr. Ciesielski explained

that the use change, plus the addition of the second floor, created the need for the parking reduction. Ms. Graham felt perhaps Dr. Taledano would decide not to add the second floor.

Ms. Golub felt they could specify that only the first floor would ever be used for medical office space; Mr. Tilbrook said the application was now that specific.

Mr. Welch asked if there were statistics available to show that there was more public parking available due to the decline in area businesses. Mr. Tilbrook said they had calculated the number of vacant retail and office space on the block, and their parking study demonstrated there was sufficient parking to accommodate full occupancy on the block and the change of use.

Mr. Curtis opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ralph Andrea, owner of a nearby realty office, spoke in favor of the request. He noted that he represented several nearby business owners and could not sell the properties because the parking did not exist. Mr. Andrea said, "there are times, even now with the four vacant stores, that there's no parking space." He said the City had put off-street parking on the next block and this should have been done on this block as well.

Mr. Richard Betaine, nearby business owner, felt that "all the businesses will be seriously impacted on the strip if additional parking is actually needed to accommodate Dr. Taledano's medical center." He explained that at the height of season, his clients must sometimes circle the block several times to locate parking spaces. He disagreed with the parking studies referred to by Mr. Tilbrook.

Mr. John Paul Schroeders, nearby business owner, said he had owned his store there almost 40 years. He wanted some redevelopment on the property because it was an eyesore, but felt they already had a "huge parking problem" in the area from December 1 through April 31.

Mr. Jack Friedman, president of the building they were discussing, said there was a "great deal of enthusiasm" in their building to have Dr. Taledano locate here because he specialized in geriatric medicine. Mr. Friedman felt the redevelopment would be a "tonic for the whole area." He felt some changes must be made to accommodate Dr. Taledano's move to the area.

Mr. Callaway offered to have Mr. Tinter address the Board regarding the adequacy of the parking study. Mr. Callaway noted that since Dr. Taledano specialized in geriatric medicine, many of his patients arrived by some means of transportation other than their own cars. He felt that Dr. Taledno was bringing a much-needed service to the community.

There being no other members of he public wishing to speak on the item, Mr. Curtis closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Ms. Maus, seconded by Mr. Glassman to approve. Motion passed 5 – 4 with Ms. Graham, Ms. Golub, Ms. Maus and Mr. Curtis opposed.

[Index](#)

For the Good of the City

Mr. Brewton reminded the Board of their request to change the code regarding the Board’s review of cluster development. He asked the Board for specific changes they desired.

Ms. Fertig felt they must discuss what qualified a development as “cluster.” She added that the density allowed for cluster homes and town homes was the same, but only cluster homes were currently reviewed. Ms. Maus said she hoped the Board would review all three, clusters, duplexes and town homes; Ms. Adams agreed. Mr. Curtis said there were obviously problems with the code, as “cluster homes get past certain ordinances by putting in a barbeque pit in there.” Mr. Brewton felt that the Board’s agenda could not handle every duplex that was reviewed.

Ms. Fertig noted that this discussion was spurred by Croissant Park residents’ fear that if the Board did not approve a cluster home, the developer would instead create a town home project that would not be subject to the Board’s review. Mr. Brewton said this could be addressed by stating that any project with more than four or five units would be reviewed. Mr. Brewton remarked that a developer could circumvent the process by “piece mealing” the permit applications for stages of a large project. He noted that developers were also getting very creative by designing “town home-style” duplexes.

Mr. Brewton clarified that the Board wanted a “very broad review of the code as it relates to duplexes, town homes and clusters, with the ideal that at some point in time there would be a review process...to control how those developments occur.” Ms. Maus felt that the code was “woefully inadequate” regarding all development between single-family and high-rise and should be completely redone.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:13 p.m.

Chair:

Attest:

Sandra Goldberg [for Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary]