

**Planning and Zoning Board
City of Fort Lauderdale
August 15, 2007 – 6:30 P.M.
City Hall Commission Chambers – 1st Floor
100 North Andrews Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida**

Board Members	Attendance	Cumulative Attendance June 2007 – May 2008	
Pamela Adams	P	3	0
Edward Curtis, Chair	P	3	0
Mary Fertig (arrived 6:37 p.m.)	P	2	1
Maria Freeman	P	2	1
Steve Glassman	A	2	1
Rochelle Golub	P	3	0
Mary Graham	P	2	1
Catherine Maus, Vice Chair	A	2	1
Tom Welch	P	2	1

Staff

Sharon Miller, Assistant City Attorney
James Koeth, Principal Planner
Michael Ciesielski, Planner II
Jenni Morejon, Planner III
Wayne Jessup, Principal Planner
Alexandra Grant, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Index

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. 104-R-06	Terra Nova Homes	2
2. 3-T-07	City of Fort Lauderdale	4
3. 3-ZPUD-06	Mt. Olive Development Corp. (MODCO)	5
4. 64-R-07	City of Fort Lauderdale	9
For the Good of the City		10

Call to Order

Chair Curtis called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. All present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Approval of July 18, 2007 meeting minutes.

Motion made by Ms. Golub, seconded by Ms. Adams, to approve the minutes of the July 18, 2007 meeting. Board unanimously approved.

Those present who wished to testify on any matter were sworn in.

<u>Cases:</u>		<u>Index</u>
1. <u>Terra Nova Homes</u>	Mike Ciesielski	104-R-06
Request: **	Site Plan Level III / 3 Unit Cluster Development / RD-15 / Medium Land Use	
Legal Description:	Lots 36 through 38, Block 184 of "Progresso" according to the plat thereof as recorded in P.B. 2 at P. 18 of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida; said lands situate, lying and being in Broward County, Florida.	
Address:	1022 NE 2 Avenue	
General Location:	Approximately 263 feet North of Sunrise Boulevard on the East side of NE 2 Avenue	

Board members discussed communications they had regarding this case.

Chair Curtis opened the public hearing.

Maritza Alegria and Hugo Torres, owners and developers, gave a presentation concerning this project. The project is located at 1022 NE 2 Avenue, facing the Northside Elementary School. Features of this development include:

- Two-story homes with 2-car garage.
- 3-bedroom/1.5 bathroom units with den, dining, living, laundry and storage.
- A barbecue area with a covered patio.

Ms. Alegria stated the Mediterranean style design included small second story balconies, recessed entries and arched openings. Landscaping will be included with a 25-foot setback and a driveway entrance from 2nd Avenue. She added that the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) reviewed this application and found no adverse impact of the project on the school. Additionally, the project was presented to the Neighborhood Association whose members are in favor of it.

Mr. Ciesielski explained that this proposal was reviewed by staff and found to meet the ULDR requirements for cluster developments.

Ms. Golub asked if the Board was given a copy of the Neighborhood Association's letter. Mr. Ciesielski indicated he would check to see if this is on file. Ms. Golub commented on the HPB's input and on the scope of their review. Mr. Ciesielski advised that it is within the realm of the HPB to review and comment on this proposal. He added that the HPB did not find any negative impact of this building.

Ms. Golub observed that the roof line of the cluster homes is as tall as the school's towers. In response, Mr. Ciesielski stated he is unsure of the exact height of the school. Mr. Ciesielski then checked the elevation drawings provided by the applicant and noted that the roofline of the cluster development was the same height as the school's steeples.

Jenni Morejon, Planner III, provided a copy of the Neighborhood Association's letter for the Board's review.

Ms. Golub asked why the developer chose to build cluster homes on a lot this narrow. In response, Ms. Alegria stated the lot is permitted for 3.5 units per Code.

Ms. Golub pointed out that per Code, the portion of the building facing 2nd Avenue should look like a home; however it resembled the side of a large building. In response, Ms. Alegria explained that balconies, moldings and arches are on the side of the building facing the street, which should present a residential look on 2nd Avenue.

Ms. Golub advised that when she drove through the neighborhood, she observed that this building is more than double the average height and massing compared to others in the area. In response, Ms. Alegria commented that homes in the area are small with little historical or architectural value. She added that several new developments of similar size and scale size are being approved in the same area.

Ms. Graham voiced concern about the need for more landscaping to obstruct the sheer face of the west elevation. She stated she did not like palm trees and suggested that other trees be considered. Ms. Alegria agreed to look into other types of trees.

Ms. Alegria presented photographs of other projects including cluster homes being developed in the area.

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

Motion by Ms. Graham, seconded by Ms. Freeman, to approve subject to the applicant working with staff to better improve the streetscape. In a roll call vote, the Board approved 6-1.

2. City of Fort Lauderdale

Don Morris

3-T-07

Request: **

Amending Section 47-13.20, Downtown RAC Review Process and Special Regulations to Provide for the Allocation of 3,000 Dwelling Units Added to the Dwelling Units Available for Residential Development in the Downtown RAC as adopted by the City Commission in 2006

Legal Description

N/A

Address:

N/A

General Location:

RAC

Mr. Morris, of the Planning Department, presented this application.

Ms. Golub stated she is confused about the term "Design Guidelines" as there is no definition or reference for this term.

Wayne Jessup, of the Planning Department, explained that "Design Guidelines" refers to a section of the master plan that implements the intent of the master plan. Ms. Golub commented that it might be better to specify "Design Guidelines" with reference to the relevant chapter.

Ms. Freeman asked how many units remained. In response, Mr. Jessup said about 100 units remained in the pool; most are allocated and some projects are currently making adjustments. Ms. Freeman asked if units will be set aside for workforce housing. Mr. Jessup stated the Commission will make this determination.

Ms. Fertig asked what factors were considered in the study to determine whether the City could sustain additional units. In response, Mr. Jessup advised the City had the supporting infrastructure in place to sustain these units. He added that the additional units provided value in terms of critical mass to help support additional retail, transit and the pedestrian lifestyle of the downtown area.

Chair Curtis asked if there is any limit to how many units could be added downtown. In response, Mr. Jessup advised the master plan anticipated more growth. Chair Curtis commented that it is the Commission's discretion to make the final decision.

Jim Koeth, of the Planning Department, said staff will need to bring this application back to the Board if additional units are allocated.

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

Motion by Ms. Freeman, seconded by Ms. Adams, to approve subject to units being set aside for workforce housing.

Ms. Golub requested to add the following to the motion: that clarification on the term "Design Guidelines" be better defined in the final guidelines.

The Board agreed to this addition to the motion.

In a roll call vote, the Board approved 4-3.

3. Mount Olive Development Corp. Jenni Morejon 3-Z-PUD-06

Request: ** Site Plan Level IV / Rezoning from CB and RS-8 to Planned Unit Development (PUD) / 17 existing multi-family Residential Units and 1,781 SF of existing Office with 4 new Multi-Family Residential Units and 1,560 SF of new Office / NWRAC Land Use.

Legal Description LESS THE NORTH 10' OF LOT 3, 4, 5 AND LOTS 6 & 7 BLOCK 2, of "DORSEY PARK FIRST ADD." According t the Plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 21 a Page 30 of the Public Records of BROWARD County, Florida.

Address: 551 NW 15 Terrace

General Location: Southwest corner of NW 6 Street (Sistrunk Boulevard) and NW 15 Terrace

Board members disclosed communications they had regarding this case.

Isaiah Roland, on behalf of the applicant, presented this proposal and said this is a mixed use project supported by the CRA development plan. He stated that this development will accomplish the following goals:

- Bring infill development and maximum land use along Sistrunk Blvd.
- Provide additional affordable housing to the area.
- Provide landscape and sidewalk improvements.
- Serve as a catalyst for future developments along the Sistrunk Corridor.

He advised that the Dorsey Riverbend Homeowners Association supported this project.

Jenni Morejon, Planner III, explained that the applicant is requesting a zoning into a PUD for 5 parcels located on Sistrunk Blvd. She stated the new project will consist of 21 multi-family units and 3,341 s.f. of office space. The building is currently used by a faith-based organization that provided services to low income communities.

Ms. Morejon reported that the DRC reviewed this project on August 22, 2006. She indicated there is a letter of support from the Dorsey Riverbend Homeowner's Association. Ms. Morejon advised that the Broward County School Board had recently sent a letter indicating no mitigation is required, and that the Interlocal Agreement no longer applies, since this development will not generate students.

With regard to parking, Ms. Morejon said that per Code, the site plan requires 53 spaces; however the applicant is proposing 23 spaces with 18 on site and 5 along the street. She explained that this parking reduction, while significant, could be approved contingent on the following criteria; as recommended by the City's Traffic Engineering Consultant:

1. There shall be a minimum of one space per unit.
2. The curb spaces should be designated for residents.
3. If there is future land use change within this property, the current parking requirements should be met.

Ms. Adams asked if curbside parking will be limited to residents. In response, Ms. Morejon stated the City's Parking Services will either approve the spaces or coordinate with the applicant regarding designation of the five curbside spaces.

Ms. Adams asked whether the redevelopment of Sistrunk Blvd extended this far and whether the City would get additional sidewalk. In response, Joan Oliva, Planning Manager for the CRA, said there would be an additional 5-8 feet provided in front of the building.

Chair Curtis opened the public hearing.

Samuel Williams, on behalf of the applicant, stated this development served special clients who do not all own vehicles; therefore, there is leeway to propose fewer parking spaces. He added that staff working on this project will park elsewhere and be bussed to the site. Mr. Williams spoke of a parking reduction study that indicated parking is not exhausted in the area.

Ms. Graham voiced concern that this project will set a precedent for others going forward with regard to parking reduction.

Mr. Williams stated he understands the clients' economic level and is comfortable setting this precedent. He felt the practical value added by this development will offset any parking precedent that may be set.

Ms. Freeman requested to hear from the Parking Survey Engineer hired for this project. John McMann, of McMann Associates, Traffic Engineers, explained that his firm had studied the site as it currently exists. He said the applicant is currently providing 17 spaces but there is really only demand for 13; the parking is therefore adjusted according to the unique population being served.

Ms. Freeman stressed the need to move the streetscape design along to further support redevelopment in the area.

Ms. Golub asked if the applicants had read the City's traffic analysis done by Keith and Schnars. Mr. Williams said he is unfamiliar with this. Ms. Golub questioned how the project will achieve minimum parking requirements set by the City. In addition, she said that on different occasions driving past the site, she observed that all available parking spaces were occupied. She added there is no guarantee the developer will get exclusive use of the five curbside spots.

Mr. Williams said the church would be willing to provide excess parking for staff. He commented that if this project is deemed problematic, he did not see how other development along the Sistrunk Corridor could occur. He stated that based on the parking reduction study done by the consultant, only 76% of parking is used during peak hours.

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

Ms. Adams asked about the availability of nearby public transportation. In response, Mr. Roland stated there is a bus stop and trolley stop right outside the property.

Ms. Fertig asked if the applicant would agree to have parking requirements reviewed by the City's Parking Services. Mr. Williams responded affirmatively.

Mr. Welch asked whether the applicant is aware of the City's new parking permit process. Mr. Williams stated he is not aware of this. Mr. Welch asked if the applicant could prove that few clients owned cars. Mr. Williams advised that per the consultant's survey, only 8 of the existing 18 residents owned vehicles.

Mr. Welch stated he is not a strong advocate of PUDs in the City. He asked if the applicant is willing to self impose a restriction to keep this project the same size. Assistant City Attorney Miller explained that a PUD designation actually limits the zoning to the specific use indicated on the site plan. She also clarified that staff is not prepared to say the church would allow overflow parking.

Ms. Graham asked about the age of the buildings and whether they had fire sprinklers. In response, Mr. Roland stated they were over 20 years old and had fire sprinklers. Ms. Graham asked how the developer got around the elevator requirement. In response, Mr. Roland said both the Building Department and the Fire Department had reviewed and signed off on this project.

Ms. Oliva reported that the City will be taking over jurisdiction for Sistrunk Blvd. and its future streetscape, and will provide additional parking spaces.

Chair Curtis asked about the timeframe for this process. In response, Ms. Oliva said ratification of the jurisdiction will occur later this month. Following this, the City will proceed with design drawings.

Ms. Golub voiced concern that if the five designated curbside spots are not approved, there will be insufficient parking as there are barely 18 spots for 21 units. She stated the parking reduction is a huge concession that might likely worsen the parking situation.

Ms. Fertig commented that part of the Board's work is to take each case individually. She pointed out this is a unique situation where the applicant knew its client population's needs, versus applicants who presented theoretical studies of what may happen when projects are built.

Chair Curtis expressed reservations about voting for a parking reduction and about whether the PUD rezoning is applicable here.

Motion by Ms. Freeman, seconded by Ms. Freeman, to approve subject to staff's conditions as follows:

1. The project will be limited to the specific use intended and any changes to the usage will be brought back to the Board.
2. The City's Parking Services Division will coordinate with the applicant regarding designation of the 5 curb spaces for residential use
3. The applicant will record a restrictive covenant in the public records of Broward County, outlining the approved parking reduction.

In a roll call vote, the Board approved 5-2.

4. City of Fort Lauderdale Mike Ciesielski 64-R-07

Request: ** Site Plan Level IV / Public Purpose Use / Change of Use / 3,394 SF Fire Station to Fire Station Museum / RML-25 / Medium High Land Use

Legal Description Lots 12, 14 and 16, Block 107, WAVERLY PLACE, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in P.B. 2, P. 19 of the Public Records of DADE County, Florida

Address: 1022 West Las Olas Boulevard

General Location: Southeast corner of West Las Olas Boulevard and SW 11 Avenue

Board members disclosed communications they had regarding this case.

John Aurelius, Vice President of the Fort Lauderdale Fire and Safety Museum, spoke of the fire station's history and summarized this request.

Mr. Aurelius voiced concern that a recent newspaper article erroneously reported that 70,000 people will visit the museum. He corrected this and explained that pending approval from the School Board, a Safety Center will be included for teaching children. If approved, 1-2 school buses will drop children off directly at the facility's door; also, the museum will maintain a chain link fence. Mr. Aurelius stated there would be no more than 40 children per week. Operating hours will be 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. on Saturdays.

Mr. Aurelius advised the museum's funding source consisted of over 200 members including retired firemen. He stated the members' goal is to save this historic 1927 building. Pictures of historic fire trucks on the site were presented.

Chair Curtis opened the public hearing.

John McDonald, 1008 West Las Olas Boulevard, voiced concern that rules and regulations will be followed. He commented that the museum did not clarify how long and how often it will be open for tours. He stated he is in favor of this project.

Dave Parker, president of the Sailboat Bend Civic Association, spoke in favor of this proposal.

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

Mr. Aurelius advised there were tentative arrangements with the neighboring church to provide additional parking.

Motion by Ms. Fertig, seconded by Ms. Adams, to approve. In a roll call vote, the Board approved 7-0.

5. For the Good of the City

Ms. Fertig commented on the admirable work the Board is doing. She expressed disappointment that there is no venue for the Planning Board to bring forward concerns to the City Commission.

Adjournment

Motion by Ms. Freeman, seconded by Mr. Welch, to adjourn. In a voice vote, the Board voted unanimously in favor.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

Chair:

Ed Curtis, Chair

Attest:

Fort Lauderdale Planning & Zoning Board
August 15, 2007
Page 11

Alexandra Grant, Recording Secretary