

**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD  
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE  
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS – 1<sup>ST</sup> FLOOR  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2011 – 6:30 P.M.**

**Cumulative**

<b>Board Members</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>June 2010-May 2011</b>	
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Patrick McTigue, Chair	P	9	1
Rochelle Golub, Vice Chair	P	9	1
Michael Ferber	P	2	0
Maria Freeman	P	8	2
Leo Hansen	P	9	0
Catherine Maus (6:32)	P	9	1
Michelle Tuggle	P	10	0
Tom Welch	P	9	1
Peter Witschen	P	9	1

**Staff**

Greg Brewton, Director of Planning and Zoning  
 Sharon Miller, Assistant City Attorney  
 Yvonne Redding, Planner II  
 Mike Ciesielski, Planner II  
 Thomas Lodge, Planner II  
 Carol Ingold, Parks and Recreation  
 Frank Snedaker, Public Works  
 Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communication to City Commission**

**Motion** made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Ms. Maus, for the City Commission to consider placing a moratorium on further rezoning cases for businesses not approved by the Master Plan, such as convenience stores. The moratorium would remain in place until the CRA Board has had sufficient time to codify its plan for the redevelopment of the Sistrunk Corridor. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**Index**

	<b><u>Case Number</u></b>	<b><u>Applicant</u></b>
1.	1-Z-11** *	Louis James
2.	8-P-10**	Narain S. Lalwani / Lalwani Plat
3.	46-R-10**	Spectrum 1500 Building Associates Ltd.

4. 27-R-11 \*\* \* City of Fort Lauderdale / Hortt Park
5. 2-Z-11\*\* \* City of Fort Lauderdale / Hortt Park
6. Communication to the City Commission
7. For the Good of the City

### **Special Notes:**

**Local Planning Agency (LPA) items (\*)** – In these cases, the Planning and Zoning Board will act as the Local Planning Agency (LPA). Recommendation of approval will include a finding of consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan and the criteria for rezoning (in the case of rezoning requests).

**Quasi-Judicial items (\*\*)** – Board members disclose any communication or site visit they have had pursuant to Section 47-1.13 of the ULDR. All persons speaking on quasi-judicial matters will be sworn in and will be subject to cross-examination.

Chair McTigue called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. He introduced the Board members and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. Planning and Zoning Director Greg Brewton introduced the City Staff members present.

Chair McTigue noted that the Board's April meeting, originally scheduled for April 20, must be moved due to the rescheduling of the City Commission meeting. The members discussed the possibility of rescheduling to Tuesday, April 19. Vice Chair Golub and Ms. Tuggle advised they would not be able to attend on this date. Ms. Maus requested an email reminding the members of the change in date.

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Golub, seconded by Mr. Welch, to approve the minutes of the February 16, 2011 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Attorney Miller explained the quasi-judicial process used by the Board.

1. Louis James Yvonne Redding 1Z11

**Request: \*\* \*** **Rezone from RC-15 (Residential Single Family Cluster Dwellings/Medium Density District) to CB (Community Business)**

Legal Description: Lots 47 & 48, Block 4, of Lincoln Park Corrected Plat, According to the Plat thereof, as recorded in P.B. 5, P. 2, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida

Address: 1447 NW 6 Street

General Location: North of NW 6 Street and East of NW 14 Way

District: 3

**DEFERRED FROM THE JANUARY 18, 2011 MEETING.**

Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on this Item were sworn in.

Don Arpin, representing the Applicant, explained that the request is to capture two residential lots on Sistrunk Boulevard to rezone for convenience store parking. The tenant is converting the property from a restaurant to a convenience store, which would require an increase in parking.

Yvonne Redding, Planner, stated that the Applicant wants to rezone the two parcels to the north of their existing parcel from RC-15 to CB in order to align with the rest of the parcel that fronts Sistrunk Boulevard. The site plan has been through the Development Review Committee (DRC); however, Ms. Redding said there are still several issues with the site that must be addressed, including a variance to address other issues. The Application has gone before the Board of Adjustment and will continue there after the rezoning process is complete.

She added that the underlying land use for the parcels is Northwest Regional Activity Center, which is consistent with both residential and commercial uses.

Ms. Maus asked what variances are being sought for the property. Ms. Redding said the width of either a drive aisle or a landscaping island would need to be narrower than what is required by Code.

Vice Chair Golub asked why the request was not to rezone the lots for parking rather than commercial use. Ms. Redding said a buffer zone, landscaping, and possibly a dumpster would also be located on the lot, which meant its use would not be limited to parking only.

Vice Chair Golub asked if the proposed use fits with the vision for the Sistrunk Corridor. Ms. Redding said the Sistrunk Corridor Plan does not currently include convenience store uses in this area.

Vice Chair Golub requested clarification that if the Board approved the request for rezoning, this would not mean they are approving a convenience store use. Ms. Redding said the site plan is not tied to the rezoning, as there is no flex use to tie them together. Other regulatory bodies would determine whether or not the use is appropriate for the Sistrunk Corridor.

Ms. Tuggle asked if the Board's approval of the rezoning from RC-15 to CB would permit the use for the store. Ms. Redding clarified that the store itself is located on an existing CB lot; the parking, and the required landscaping necessary for the store, would be located on the lots for which rezoning is requested.

Ms. Tuggle asked if the use fits into the Sistrunk Corridor Plan. Director Brewton said he had discussed this issue with the CRA Director for this area, and advised that a plan exists to implement zoning classifications that would address some of the areas to be rezoned within the district, as well as parking requirements for certain uses. This plan is presently still being developed.

Ms. Tuggle noted that there are at least three similar stores located near the vicinity of the site. Director Brewton said many members of the community have expressed concern with some of the uses currently permitted within the existing zoning districts, and added that the CRA Director had been particularly concerned that the Corridor's redevelopment should be consistent with the plan adopted by the City Commission for the Sistrunk Corridor.

Ms. Tuggle asked if the Applicant has met with members of the CRA or the neighborhood. Mr. Arpin said the tenant had met with CRA Director Alfred Battle. Tarek Bahlawan, tenant on the property, said he had had several discussions with Mr. Battle, Director Brewton, and "a lot of people from the City," including members of the surrounding community. He said they had given him support for his business, and that he wants to be part of the Sistrunk Corridor renovation.

Ms. Tuggle asked if there was any documentation of community outreach. Mr. Bahlawan provided copies of some of the email correspondence with neighborhood residents.

Ms. Tuggle recalled that there had been discussion of placing parking at the rear of the site rather than to the side. Director Brewton said several schemes are currently being discussed, including parking on the street and in the rear. There have also been discussions related to future development along Sistrunk Boulevard, which will hopefully be consistent with the Plan.

Mr. Arpin said the CRA had reviewed the Application, and as a result parking along the street was not allowed. He said all the parking spaces included in the Application are “to the back of the property” and to the east of the building.

Director Brewton advised there was a discrepancy in Mr. Arpin’s statement, as Mr. Battle had advised him there was no “true support” of the plan. He stated he would try to contact Mr. Battle for clarification of this issue, as they had spoken earlier in the day and Mr. Battle had expressed a desire to ensure that future development along the Sistrunk Corridor was consistent with the Plan. Director Brewton said Mr. Battle had not told him the CRA had endorsed the Application.

Mr. Arpin said a member of the CRA had looked at the plan “at one of their meetings,” and reiterated that this member had denied the Application any parking spaces along Sistrunk Boulevard. Mr. Bahlawan said following this meeting, which had included Director Brewton and members of the Engineering Department, he had scheduled a meeting with Mr. Battle, who had “given” him two designated parking spaces on Sistrunk Boulevard.

Ms. Freeman said she was a former member of the CRA Board and a current property owner on Sistrunk Boulevard, and advised that there has been a great deal of concern regarding the number of convenience stores already located on the Boulevard. She estimated there were eight or nine convenience stores in the area and on 15 Street. She added that “probably 90%” of these stores have been problems for the Sistrunk Corridor, which she felt was because the stores’ operators perceived Sistrunk Boulevard as an area in which the community would not vocally oppose them. She said it was a problem for business owners in the Corridor and was not part of the redevelopment that is underway for this area, or part of the overall vision for Sistrunk Boulevard. She asked to know the proposed hours of operation for the store.

Mr. Bahlawan said he would continue to close at midnight through the week and 1 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights. He asserted that he cares for his business and for the community, and has called the police himself many times if issues arose. He said he has operated a store in the area for six years, although not in the proposed location.

Ms. Freeman asked how Mr. Bahlawan’s business is currently operating. Mr. Bahlawan said the business is both a convenience store and a restaurant. He characterized the business as “a nice...’7-11’ type of store” and said he wanted to be part of the renovation of Sistrunk Boulevard.

Ms. Freeman stated that she has heard no positive responses to the addition of another convenience store on Sistrunk Boulevard. Mr. Bahlawan said again that he operated his business differently from others.

Mr. Witschen asked if the hours of operation would be defined by the operator according to City Code if the Board approved the Application. Ms. Redding said the request was for rezoning only and did not address the uses on the property. Mr. Witschen asked if the zoning “goes with the land, not the operator.” Ms. Redding confirmed this.

Mr. Witschen referred to an aerial view of the property, asking if a partially landscaped piece of property is currently vacant. Ms. Redding said it was. Mr. Witschen noted there is a residence to the west of the property, bordering the requested parking lot extension. Ms. Redding said a neighborhood compatibility landscape buffer of 10 ft. is required from the property line to the nearest parking space. Residential property also abuts the property to the north. Mr. Witschen observed that other than the Community Facility use located one block to the east, the Application seemed to be “one of the more intrusive developments into the neighborhood...as a commercial use.”

Ms. Maus asked if the variances sought for the property apply to either an isle located along the west, bordering the home, or the north, bordering the residential property. Ms. Redding said the variance was requested for the east border toward 14 Way.

Ms. Maus asked if Director Brewton could describe the future approvals that would be necessary in order for the business to open, such as whether or not the CRA would need to take official action regarding the property. Director Brewton said official action was not required. Ms. Maus asked if the approval for the site plan would go through the DRC. Director Brewton confirmed that the DRC would be the reviewing body.

Ms. Maus asked if the “6 Street Corridor vision” was similar to a Master Plan, which would mean it was a non-binding suggestion. Director Brewton said it was not binding until the desired zoning ordinances were approved in order to implement the Plan. He noted that the Plan has been reviewed and endorsed by the City Commission, and the CRA is working on the zoning ordinances at present, although he did not have a time frame for their completion. The CRA is considering hiring an outside consultant to formalize the zoning classifications and tailor these new zoning districts to fit the Plan’s vision.

Vice Chair Golub requested that Staff or the Applicant compare Sheets 1A and 1B and the site map submitted with the summary. Ms. Redding explained that the Applicant’s request is to rezone Lots 47 and 48, which front northwest 14 Way. She noted the location of the store as well, although she clarified that this lot would not be rezoned and the Applicant planned to use the existing building.

Ms. Tuggle noted that the information provided by the Applicant in the members' information packet included "signatures with a note" from June 28, 2010. She advised that the sections quoted in this document were not the same as the sections included on the Application. She said she was not certain whether the signatures referred to an earlier document or the current Application, as the two requests appeared to be different. Mr. Bahlawan said the sections were changed after meeting with the Zoning Department.

Ms. Tuggle asked if Mr. Bahlawan is currently operating his business at the location in question. Mr. Bahlawan said he was. Mr. Arpin said the tenant is currently under Code Enforcement restrictions and reports to a magistrate "concerning his rezoning and getting the project done."

He added that the Board of Adjustment had tabled their action on the Applicant's request, which was to reduce the drive aisle east of the building by 1 ft. Their original application had been for a 4 ft. landscape buffer in lieu of a 5 ft. buffer, but this request had been denied. The Board of Adjustment had tabled this issue "to find out what the Commission was doing" with regard to the project.

Mr. Hansen noted that the parking count referred to 18 spaces required and provided, but only 15 were shown. Ms. Redding said she was not certain if the parking count was an accurate plan at this time. She explained that the plans submitted were not required as part of the Application, but were submitted by the Applicant as a courtesy; the plans are preliminary and must be revised due to the continued renovation and expansion of the Sistrunk Corridor as well. She concluded that there will eventually need to be 18 parking spaces for the store.

Ms. Maus asked if the minutes of tonight's meeting would go to the Board of Adjustment. Director Brewton said they could. Ms. Maus asked if this could be made a request, and Director Brewton agreed it could.

Mr. Hansen noted that one issue raised in the documentation was the expansion of the commercial corridor to allow additional parking. He asked if the expansion of parking would "go into the neighborhood" in order to allow for the proper redevelopment of the Corridor. Director Brewton said in some cases this would happen, but Mr. Battle had advised him that certain uses would also be addressed when these parking requirements went into effect.

He said there is an opportunity to reduce the required parking for some types of businesses within the Sistrunk Corridor if the proposed ordinances go into effect, or to prohibit other types of uses through the ordinance.

Mr. Arpin said if the Board of Adjustment does not allow the 1 ft. variance for the drive aisle, the Applicant would have to cut 1 ft. off the building. The tenant has committed to do this if necessary.

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair McTigue opened the public hearing.

Sheryl Dickey stated she represented the Midtown Business Association as well as herself. She is a business owner and major investor on the Sistrunk Corridor. She has been part of the planning process for the revitalization of the Corridor, and advised that the Master Plan says the community would not like to see approval of any additional convenience stores.

Ms. Dickey said the Midtown Business Association opposes the rezoning of the property specifically because it would perpetuate the use of additional convenience stores on Sistrunk Boulevard. She said the Application contradicts what the CRA Board told investors on the Corridor: they had made it clear that more convenience stores would not be acceptable. Ms. Dickey said the issue is not whether convenience store operators try to give back to the community, but that there are too many such uses to revitalize the Corridor. The Master Plan calls for a different mix of businesses in order to bring people to the Corridor as a destination.

Ms. Dickey said because the CRA has not quickly codified their vision for the area, it does not allow for the prevention of additional unwanted uses and allows the perpetuation of convenience stores in the area.

Lillian Small is a resident of the Dorsey Riverbend neighborhood, and is also opposed to the Application. She said it is adverse to what the residents expect as the larger vision for the Sistrunk Corridor. She felt the proposed business was not what the community expected to be part of revitalizing the area.

Addie Sanders-Owens said she opposed the project because the proposed changes to the Sistrunk Corridor did not include multiple convenience stores. She felt one to two such stores would be sufficient for the neighborhood; three or more would be overkill. She requested that the Application be denied.

Eddie Campbell asked that the Application be denied, as there are already many convenience stores in the area and they contributed to the activity that troubled her.

Mickey Hinton, President of the Durrs Homeowners Association, advised that the proposed store may be much better than the other convenience stores in the area, and concluded that he was in favor of changing the zoning for the proposed business.



As there were no other members of the public wishing to speak on this Item, Chair McTigue closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Witschen said his concern was that the site plan was not consistent with the residential character of the neighborhood, and that a sufficient barrier was not created between the business and the neighborhood. He suggested that the Board consider making a communication to the City Commission that a moratorium be imposed on further development until the CRA Board puts forth a plan providing clear direction.

**Motion** made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Ms. Freeman, to deny the zoning request.

Attorney Miller clarified that current case law in quasi-judicial matters now allows motions to be made to deny as well as to accept.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**2. Narain S. Lalwani/Lalwani Plat Michael Ciesielski 8P10**

<b>Request: **</b>	<b>Plat Approval</b>
Legal Description:	The East 30', front and rear measurements, of that part of Government Lot 1, Section 6, Township 50 South, Range 43 East, Broward County, Florida
Address:	3132 NE 9 Street
General Location:	South side of SE 9 Street west of State Road A1A
District:	2

Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on this Item were sworn in.

Scott McLaughlin, representing the Applicant, said the request is for the platting of a 0.7 acre parcel of land on Sunrise Lane. The Applicant proposes to build a four-storey mixed-use building, with the first floor intended for commercial use and the upper three floors for residential use.

Vice Chair Golub asked if signs were posted at the property. Mr. McLaughlin said they were posted for "at least two weeks." Vice Chair Golub stated she would like the record to reflect that she did not see signs on the property.

Mike Ciesielski, Planner, provided the Board members with a copy of the affidavit for the posting of signs at the property. Attorney Miller advised that signs must remain on the property until the final disposition of the Application, as required by Code; if they wished, the Board could defer the Item until the signs were re-posted. It is not the City's responsibility to ensure that the signage remains on the property.

Ms. Tuggle noted there was no information in her packet regarding correspondence or meetings with the surrounding neighborhood, and asked if any documentation could be provided on this. Mr. McLaughlin said the Applicant had had several conversations with the adjacent business owners, and with another business owner through whose property the Applicant would need an access easement for parking.

Mr. Ciesielski said there was no documentation regarding community outreach included in the packets.

Mr. Witschen said because the Application is for a plat, the Applicant will also have a delegation request to the Board of County Commissioners, which is another public process that would take roughly 120 days; he asked to know the next public process required to develop the building. Director Brewton said once the area is platted, the next steps would be to meet the remaining ULDR requirements for development.

Vice Chair Golub asked if the adjacent properties were not platted. Mr. McLaughlin said none were platted after 1957, and explained that if any properties were platted before that date, they must be replatted if the property is to be developed.

The Board members agreed that they would hear the Item today rather than defer to a time certain.

Mr. Ciesielski explained that the Applicant's DRC plan was reviewed by Staff, who determined it would first need to go through the platting process. Because the development is within the Sunrise Lane Area and has a residential component, the site plan will require Site Plan Level 4 review, which means it must go through the DRC, the Planning and Zoning Board, and the City Commission. The Board will ultimately see and comment on the site plan as well.

He continued that the Applicant plans a four-storey building with commercial use on the first floor and single-family residences on the second, third, and fourth floors. The plat note restricts the development to 3500 sq. ft. of commercial use. The members' information packet includes a list of development permits and procedures to which the Applicant must adhere in order to be approved. The plat is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Vice Chair Golub noted that the lot is less than 3500 sq. ft. in size, and asked how this amount of commercial use would fit onto the lot. She also stated that she took issue with the development of a four-storey building in this location.

Director Brewton said the Board is only asked to review the plat itself at tonight's meeting to determine whether or not it meets the City's subdivision regulations. He explained that Applicants typically include the maximum amount of development that could occur on the site under the current Code, and pay the impact fees for this development; this is because if they decide to develop the site further at a later time, they will have already paid the appropriate fees and the plat will allow the development. This does not mean there is currently any activity that would require this approval: for instance, the development of a four-storey building will later be subject to further review.

Vice Chair Golub asked if this meant she should vote against the Application if she felt the Applicant was seeking a plat note that is too great for the site. Attorney Miller advised that tonight's Application gives no approval for development on the site, and the only part of the Application on which the Board is asked to vote is whether or not the plat meets the City's subdivision requirements. The additional information should not be considered at this time.

Director Brewton clarified that the Applicant would not be able to say at a later time that the Board had approved the use or development information included in the Application.

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair McTigue opened the public hearing. As there were no members of the public wishing to speak on this Item, Chair McTigue closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

**Motion** made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Ms. Maus, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

In a voice vote, the Board voted unanimously to hear Items 4 and 5 together.

**4. City of Fort Lauderdale / Hortt Park      Thomas Lodge      27R11**

**Request: \*\* \*      Public Purpose Use**

Legal Description: All of Hortt Elementary School site according to the map or plat thereof as recorded in P.B. 47, P. 31, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida

Address: 1700 SW 14 Court

General Location: South side of SW 14 Court between SW 18 Avenue and SW 16 Terrace

District: 4

**5. City of Fort Lauderdale / Hortt Park      Thomas Lodge      2Z11**

**Request: \*\* \*      Rezone from CF (Community Facilities) to P (Parks, Recreation and Open Space)**

Legal Description: All of Hortt Elementary School site according to the map or plat thereof as recorded in P.B. 47, P. 31, of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida

Address: 1700 SW 14 Court

General Location: South side of SW 14 Court between SW 18 Avenue and SW 16 Terrace

District: 4

Disclosures were made, and any members of the public wishing to speak on these items were sworn in.

Frank Snedaker, representing the City, said one request is to rezone Hortt Park, formerly Hortt Elementary School. The property is located in the Shady Banks neighborhood. He showed the Board a map of the Park's location. When the school was closed in the 1980s, the School Board converted its use to administrative offices, which the School Board presently occupies. The City acquired the property two years ago and the School Board has continued to lease the building under the agreement for purchase.

At this point the City wants to tear down the existing buildings and expand the existing park, which occupies roughly one-third of the total property. The school buildings and most of the parking would be demolished in order to expand the park to nearly six acres. In conjunction with this plan, a smaller parking area, improved drainage, and a small community center would be added.

In addition to the rezoning request, the City is also requesting public purpose relief for two particular items: they would like to waive the buffer wall requirement. The property abuts single-family residences to the east, and there are segments of chain link fence that belong to the abutting property owners. The City would landscape against these with hedge material for greater privacy. They do not feel the wall is appropriate for a park.

Mr. Snedaker also noted that the proposed parking area will reuse part of the existing parking lot. The size of the parking area will be reduced; however, there are several mature trees throughout the site, and proper lighting for the parking area is required by Code. This would mean light poles would be located within the setback, which is a Code violation. The City requests permission to place low bollard lights within this area rather than light poles.

Vice Chair Golub requested more information on bollard lights. Mr. Snedaker referred her to Sheet E-1 of the information packet, where bollard lights are pictured. He explained that these lights are roughly 4 ft. high and direct light near the ground.

Vice Chair Golub said one issue is placing these lights in the 10 ft. line immediately adjacent to residential houses, where no wall will be located. Mr. Snedaker reiterated that a continuous hedge would be placed along this border, and pointed out that the lights would be shorter than the proposed landscaping.

Vice Chair Golub said her concern was the placement of light posts in places that residents had never expected them to be placed. She added that she was not aware of the sight line for the residences, particularly without a wall. Mr. Snedaker agreed there had been no light poles in this area before; however, the proposed type of lighting, and its configuration, would cast no light on the abutting property, as the bollard lights can be aimed in a way that would have "sharp cutoff" of their light.

Chair McTigue requested further explanation of the need to locate the bollard lights in the setback. Mr. Snedaker said it was to create ample lighting and meet the minimum Code requirements for parking lot lighting. He characterized it as a safety issue. In addition, part of the purchase agreement for the property was to preserve as much open space as possible in the park.

Mr. Witschen asked if the bollard lights in the setback area would be faced away from the residential properties. Mr. Snedaker confirmed this. Vice Chair Golub observed that the bollard lights are described in the information packet as being 41.5 in., which is closer to 3.5 ft. tall.

Thomas Lodge, Planner, said the Applicant plans to rezone the property to allow a new park with a community center on the site. The rezoning request is

consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan, and no substantial changes will be made to the neighborhood. The Applicant is also requesting relief from ULDR Section 47-25.3.D.4, which requires a 5 ft. wall between a park and contiguous residential property, and ULDR Section 47-19.2.R so light bollards could be placed in the setback in order to meet minimum lighting standards for the parking lot.

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair McTigue opened the public hearing.

Lois Udvardy, resident of the Shady Banks neighborhood, said she is in favor of the rezoning and site plan approval. She asserted that they would make the park even better.

Hadny Fayyaz, Board member of the Shady Banks Civic Association, said the organization is thrilled with the overall design and plan and has no opposition. She confirmed that the City has met with the Association several times to discuss the plans, and that the residents adjacent to the park who attended these meetings agreed with the landscaping proposal instead of the wall.

As there were no other members of the public wishing to speak on this Item, Chair McTigue closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

**Motion** made by Mr. Hansen, seconded by Ms. Tuggle, to approve 27-R-11. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**Motion** made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Mr. Welch, to approve 2-Z-11. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

## **6. Communication to City Commission**

Mr. Witschen stated he would like the City Commission to consider putting a moratorium in place to prevent further cases like Item 1 from coming before the Board for rezoning until the CRA's plan is put into place. He explained that this would prevent future Applicants from going through the expense of coming before the Board while the plan is still incomplete.

**Motion** made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Ms. Maus, to make this a communication to the City Commission. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

## **7. For the Good of the City**

Ms. Maus requested an update on the status of the Neighborhood Development Criteria Review (NDCR). Director Brewton said the Department has a working team that is partnering with the consultant to bring the changes to the plan together. He estimated that an “informal timetable” would bring the NDCR before the Board within the next 30 to 60 days, when the document is complete.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

---

Chair

---

Prototype

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