

**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS – 1ST FLOOR
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 2011 – 6:30 P.M.**

Cumulative

Board Members	Attendance	June 2011-May 2012	
		Present	Absent
Patrick McTigue, Chair	P	2	0
Leo Hansen, Vice Chair	P	2	0
Stephanie Desir-Jean	A	1	1
Michael Ferber	P	2	0
Catherine Maus	A	1	1
James McCulla	P	2	0
Michelle Tuggle	P	2	0
Tom Welch	P	2	0
Peter Witschen	P	2	0

Staff

Greg Brewton, Director of Planning and Zoning
 Sharon Miller, Assistant City Attorney
 Michael Ciesielski, Planner II
 Anthony Fajardo, Planner III
 Yvonne Redding, Planner II
 Deborah Rutkowski, Planning Assistant
 Dennis Girisgen, Engineering
 Mohammed Malik, Chief Zoning Examiner
 Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

Index

	<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1.	3-Z-11** *	First Ebenezer Missionary Christian Church, Inc.
2.	4-T-11*	City of Fort Lauderdale / SRAC-SA Zoning Districts
3.	3-T-11*	City of Fort Lauderdale / ILA Comprehensive Plan Amendments
4.	1-P-11**	New Boston Atlantech Limited Partnership
5.	26-R-11**	Costa Dorada Associates, Inc.
6.	31-R-11**	Salim Khoury / Khoury Real Estate, LLC
7.	Communication to the City Commission	

8. 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 6:30 p.m. and all stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. The Chair introduced the Board members and Director Brewton introduced the Staff members present. Attorney Miller explained the quasi-judicial process used by the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Welch, seconded by Mr. McCulla, to approve the minutes of the June 15, 2011 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Motion made by Vice Chair Hansen, seconded by Ms. Tuggle, to defer Item 3 until the August 17, 2011 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Welch, seconded by Mr. McCulla, to defer Item 5 until the September 2011 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Chair McTigue noted that the City Commission will move their December 2011 from Tuesday, December 20, to Wednesday, December 21, which would be the Board's regular meeting date. He suggested that the Board meet on Tuesday, December 20. The Board agreed to this by unanimous consensus.

1. **First Ebenezer Missionary Christian Church, Inc.** Deborah Rutkowski 3Z11

Request: ** * Rezone from RMM-25 (Residential Mid Rise Multifamily/Medium High Density) to CF-HS (Community Facilities-House of Worship)

Legal Description: Lots 3-12, Lots 39-48, Block 322, PROGRESSO, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 2, Page 18, of the Public Records of Dade County, Florida

Address: 312 North West 7 Street

General Location: North of Sistrunk Boulevard, on the Southeast corner of Northwest 4 Avenue and Northwest 7 Street

District: 2

DEFERRED FROM THE JUNE 15, 2011 MEETING

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

Dan Fee, representing the Applicant, recalled that at last month's meeting the Applicant was advised to contact the CRA and homeowners' association of the neighborhood in which the property is located. He stated that the CRA offered no objection and no comments via an email, which is included as Exhibit 1 in the Staff Report.

He continued that the Applicant spent time discussing the proposed rezoning with the homeowners' association, which requested that the Applicant provide development plans. Mr. Fee said the Applicant had been unable to do this due to the expense, but informed the association that the requested rezoning allows fewer uses than the existing zoning. Many residential uses, including special residential and lodging facilities, would no longer be allowed under the proposed rezoning.

The reason for rezoning is that the total square footage of the building, which is over 10,000 sq. ft., would not be allowed within the existing RMM-25 zoning district. The church would be roughly 11,500 sq. ft. and would feature a new sanctuary on an adjacent parcel, which is currently vacant. Mr. Fee added that the homeowners' association also asked to see the site plan, elevations, and traffic study to show how the proposed development would affect the neighborhood. He said the Applicant is presently "not to that level yet" regarding the proposal and will not know what can be developed until they have learned whether or not the rezoning will be allowed.

Mr. McCulla asked how the Applicant would know the proposed buildings exceed the existing zoning restrictions without having a site plan. Mr. Fee said the proposed building and sanctuary are estimated at 11,500 sq. ft., which is considered an appropriate size for the Applicant's needs. He noted that the estimate is based upon the overall size of the property, which is 1.5 acres, including parking, setback, and landscape requirements. A site plan is not specifically required for a rezoning request.

Vice Chair Hansen asked Mr. Fee to explain the "general pattern" of the request, including how long the church has been located on the site. Mr. Fee replied that the church has been on the primary lot since 1992; as other lots have become available, the Applicant has purchased them and has now assembled "a block of lots" that approximately doubled the size of the existing site. The plan is to build a new sanctuary on an adjacent parcel and use the current building for other needs, including offices and a school. He noted that there is presently no school operating on the premises, although a school was on the property in the past and would be allowed again under the requested zoning.

Mr. Witschen asked who approached the CRA. Mr. Fee said he had spoken to CRA Director Alfred Battle and had sent him an email and a copy of the Application and survey. Mr. Battle had responded via email. Mr. Witschen observed that the response declined to comment on the request. Deborah Rutkowski, Planner, advised that no member of City Staff had spoken to Mr. Battle regarding the Application.

Ms. Tuggle pointed out that the email response said the CRA had no comment, and advised the Applicant to ask a Planner to contact Mr. Battle directly for additional information. She noted that the Applicant's email asked the CRA to clarify how the Application "fit into the plan" for that area.

Ms. Rutkowski said she had not felt there was anything more to discuss with Mr. Battle regarding the Application, as he had offered no comment. Mr. Witschen commented that the CRA's response would substantially affect his ability to vote in favor of the Application; he did not feel that "no comment" was sufficient.

Ms. Rutkowski said the property's current zoning is for mid-rise, multi-family, medium to high density, and noted that the house of worship is presently located on the property. The rezoning request would allow for the renovation and expansion of the existing building in order to allow for the addition of a school facility. The property is 67,000 sq. ft. of land. The future land use designation is Northwest Regional Activity Center, and the character of the area is suitable for the uses permitted in the proposed district and is compatible with surrounding districts, which include both residential and commercial uses.

Ms. Tuggle noted there was no backup showing that the Applicant had discussed the proposed rezoning with the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Fee said the association did not provide the Applicant with any written documentation. He reiterated that the association had asked the Applicant to provide documentation that was unavailable at the current stage of the proposal.

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair McTigue opened the public hearing. He advised that representatives of the Applicant may address the Board for 15 minutes; representatives of associations or groups may speak for five minutes; and individuals may speak for three minutes.

Mathamise Pierre Francois is the wife of the pastor of First Ebenezer Missionary Christian Church. She explained that the church was founded in 1982, and said the area surrounding the property is populated primarily by Haitian residents. Ms. Francois described the church as "transitional," where new residents come to worship and to learn English; it serves as a community agency serving individuals in need. She concluded that there was "a lack of communication" with the neighborhood association because many members of the church are learning the legal and civil processes of the United States for the first time.

Doug Sterner is the president of the Progresso Village Civic Association. He confirmed that Mr. Fee had met with the Association after the Board directed the Applicant to do so; while he characterized the meeting as "cordial," he clarified that the Association did not ask to see a site plan, elevations, or renderings of the project. They were interested in knowing what the Applicant planned for the site, and had asked why the zoning change was requested and what would be added to the site as a result of the change. He stated that the Association was not satisfied, as they did not have "a better sense of what [the Applicant's] plans were." He concluded that he did not feel the Applicant addressed the concerns and questions raised by members of the Association.

Mr. Sterner showed the Board a map of the Association's boundaries and the subject property. He said the Association has concerns regarding traffic, and advised that without a solid plan, they could not evaluate the impact that rezoning of the property would have on the neighborhood. Mr. Sterner said the Association did not know whether or not the Applicant had the entire community's interests at heart with regard to the proposed rezoning, and stated that they "had not been engaged" with the Association.

Ms. Tuggle asked if the Association was supportive of the project, based upon the information currently available. Mr. Sterner said the Association could not support the request to rezone the property, and noted that no project has been proposed at this time.

Ron Lux is a member of the Progresso Village Civic Association. He agreed with Mr. Sterner's testimony, and added that he felt a church should work with its community if it wants to expand its facility. He stated that he would like to see greater community outreach from the church.

Mr. McCulla asked if Mr. Lux had a specific concern regarding the impact of the proposed rezoning on the community. Mr. Lux said he felt the residential part of the community should remain residential, and he did not favor the proposed expansion of the church.

Ron Centamore, private citizen, said he objected to the proposed rezoning without knowing what the Applicant plans to put on the property. He said the Applicant possibly intended to build a school and did not offer plans regarding what they wished to build. He noted that he is a member of the CRA Advisory Board, but had seen no outreach from the Applicant to that board. He felt the rezoning should not be changed before a plan for the property is proposed and the neighborhood can evaluate it.

Richard Barrett, private citizen, said there has been little interaction between the Applicant, church members, and the neighborhood in the 20 years the church has been on the property. He asserted that the neighborhood should know what is planned for the property.

Tom Wolf, private citizen, said he is aware that the neighborhood is "transitional" and he is involved with the Civic Association to improve the area. He stated that residential properties are encouraged in the neighborhood to try to improve the community. He felt the church members resided outside the community and did not have the interest in the neighborhood that a resident would have.

David Richerson, private citizen, said his issue with the proposed rezoning was the current lack of parking for the existing facility. He felt if the sanctuary was enlarged, there would be even less space for parking. He said there is presently parking on or "completely in" the streets if there are events at the church.

Kim Centamore, private citizen, stated she had attended the meeting between the Association and the Applicant, and described the information offered to the Association as "extremely vague." She said she had requested clarification of whether or not the proposed school would be a Sunday school, but this and other questions had not been clarified. She noted that the addition of a new facility on the Applicant's property would affect both 3 Avenue and 4 Avenue, and felt the impact on traffic would constitute a nuisance to homes in this immediate area.

Rene Lupine, private citizen, said he has built homes in Progresso Village. He characterized the neighborhood as "challenging," stating that continuity is important in turning a neighborhood around: if the neighborhood consists of "a

hodgepodge of different things” and uses, its residents would not feel safe in that environment. He concluded that the neighborhood “[doesn’t] have a clue” what the Applicant intends for the property.

Sylverist Francois is pastor of First Ebenezer Missionary Christian Church. He said the church had been in place since 1989, and asserted that they did not plan to build a large building on the site. He said the church provided greater security for the neighborhood and its homes.

Jean-Ed Tida, private citizen, said the church held services nearly every day of the week and had nearly 200 members. He said they provided education and many other services for the members, and had been part of the community for 28 years.

Rolande Jean, private citizen, is a resident of the neighborhood and a church member. She said there were no “bad people” associated with the church

Shamar Mercier, private citizen, has been a church member for 20 years. She said the church had taught its members to open its arms to the community, including transient individuals. She stated that someone is on the church property every day and the gates are not closed.

Kenel Hercule is a deacon of First Ebenezer Missionary Christian Church. He said the church helps all members of the community.

Violene Mercier, private citizen, has been a church member since 1982. She said members of the community who were not aware of the church’s activities should reach out to them. They hope to build a bigger facility to encourage more people to come to church, as the building does not currently have enough space for everyone.

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. Fee stated that while the Civic Association had not specifically asked to see site plan and elevation requirements, he had felt these were requested due to the concerns and questions that the Association raised. He added that the Association had asked for specific plans for the school, such as how many days of the week it would meet. He said this information would make no difference, as the current zoning already district permits a school. He said he felt “perplexed” at the questions, as many of the same uses are permitted under the current district. He concluded that asking the Applicant to provide the requested specifics “doesn’t make sense.”

Vice Chair Hansen said his objection to the Application was because it appeared to be “spot zoning,” as the proposed rezoning would not be contiguous with existing zoning in the area. He asked if lots 47 and 48, on which the existing building partially stands, could be kept as RMM-25 lots, as this would not create a “jog” in the continuity of the zoning. He also recommended the development of a rough master plan rather than a site plan, which would be less expensive and would allow for dialogue with the neighborhood. Vice Chair Hansen concluded that if a school was built on the property, the use would be more compatible with the commercial property on Sistrunk Boulevard and would not protrude into the neighborhood. He felt addressing these issues might bring the Applicant and the neighborhood closer to an agreement.

Mr. Witschen clarified that while the church has obviously contributed good work to the area, it does not affect the question of rezoning the property. He agreed that a site plan was not required for rezoning, and noted once rezoning has been done, it will exist into perpetuity regardless of the property owner. He asked if a “cluster of RMM-25” zoning would remain on the southwest corner of the property. Director Brewton confirmed this. Mr. Witschen felt it would be appropriate to discuss the proposal with a member of the CRA Board for further direction.

Ms. Tuggle asked if the reason for the rezoning request to CF-HS was due to the Applicant’s desire for a building greater than 10,000 sq. ft. Ms. Rutkowski confirmed this. Ms. Tuggle asked to know the approximate dimensions of the existing facility. Mr. Fee estimated the building is “about 4500 sq. ft. of floor coverage.”

Ms. Tuggle agreed that the church is of great value to the neighborhood, and pointed out that the issue seemed to be the lack of information presented on future plans rather than the church’s contribution to the area. She commented that the Item had been deferred in part to get input from the CRA, but this was not done.

Mr. Fee said he was “confused” regarding the role of the CRA. He stated that he had contacted them following the meeting, but noted that they are not “within the formal process” for rezoning. He reiterated that the CRA had offered no comment on the Application, and asked what action he might have taken. Mr. Witschen explained that the Applicant could have appeared before the CRA Board with the proposal to determine whether or not that board found the Application consistent with the CRA’s Master Plan for redevelopment.

Mr. McCulla observed that he was “torn” regarding the issue: while members of the neighborhood had described the church as not necessarily being a good neighbor, members of the church had stated they served the community, although not necessarily the immediate neighbors of the property. In addition, the

church had been part of the neighborhood for roughly 20 years, while the CRA Master Plan was developed less than 10 years ago. He expressed concern that the church might be asked to comply with a Master Plan that was put in place long after the facility was established, but also agreed with Vice Chair Hansen that “spot zoning” was not ideal for the situation. He concluded that there are “too many questions” regarding the Application.

Mr. Ferber confirmed that the existing facility was built in 1992, although the Applicant had been located on the property for a longer time. He asked Director Brewton if the land use for a church or school was consistent with the Northwest Regional Activity Center land use designation. Director Brewton said both a church and a school would be “a permissible use under the broad umbrella of the RAC land use designation.”

Mr. Ferber asked if any site plan offered at a later time would be required to meet every provision of the ULDR, such as parking, traffic, and setback requirements. Director Brewton confirmed this as well, and noted that the site plan would be subject to review by the Board.

Mr. Ferber asked if it was unusual for neighborhood residents to request submission of a site plan when the request is for rezoning. Director Brewton agreed there is no requirement for submission of a site plan as part of a rezoning request, and it is not unusual for a rezoning Application not to present this information to the Board. It is left to the Board’s discretion to determine whether or not they would be comfortable with a rezoning change at a particular location, depending upon the future anticipated use of that location.

Mr. Ferber recalled Mr. Fee’s assertion that the rezoning change would actually diminish the potential uses of the site. Director Brewton said the residential uses under the current zoning district “would not travel along with the new zoning classification” of CF-HS.

Ms. Tuggle asked if it is typical for there to be a request to see a site plan before rezoning in a residential environment. Director Brewton said it “could be” typical. Mr. Witschen pointed out that while an Applicant could show a proposed site plan prior to rezoning, it does not hold the Applicant to developing that plan.

Motion made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Vice Chair Hansen, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** failed 2-5 (Ms. Tuggle, Mr. Witschen, Mr. McCulla, Mr. Welch, and Vice Chair Hansen dissenting).

Vice Chair Hansen asked if the Applicant could change the request to “exclude certain properties” and re-apply in the future. Director Brewton said while the Applicant could not return with the same Application, Staff could determine if

future changes were sufficient to view a future Application as new. The Applicant could also appeal the Board's decision to the City Commission.

2. **City of Fort Lauderdale / SRAC-SA** Anthony Greg 4T11
Zoning Districts Fajardo

Request: * **Recommend approval of ULDR amendment to revise notice requirements for Site Plan Level II review in the SRAC-SA zoning districts and to correct errors and omissions made in the approved SRAC-SA zoning district use tables.**

General SRAC-SA Zoning Districts
Location:

District 4

DEFERRED FROM THE JUNE 15, 2011 MEETING

Anthony Fajardo, Planner, explained that the request would amend the ULDR to clarify the review and approval process for development within the SRAC-SA zoning districts, and would revise notice requirements for these districts. It would also revise Use Tables to address uses that were unintentionally omitted when these tables were consolidated with the existing downtown RAC zoning districts.

He advised that on January 4, 2011, the City Commission approved the creation of the South Regional Activity Center-South Andrews zoning districts. Their use tables are from five existing Downtown Regional Activity Centers (RACs). This Application would address uses left out during consolidation and would clarify the applicability of these uses. Mr. Fajardo noted that there may be further clarification between tonight's meeting and approval of the revisions by the City Commission; the intent is not to change any of the uses or applicability as originally adopted in the SRAC zoning districts, and "whatever was adopted originally is still permitted."

He cited an example on p.3 of the backup materials, in which the public purpose facility of bus terminal/railroad station is listed as a permitted use in SRAC-SAW; however, at the end of the public purpose facility subsection on p.4, these uses are listed once again. The intent is to eliminate duplicates such as this.

Mr. Fajardo continued that the City Commission had directed Staff to include a provision that all Site Plan Level II development must be subject to a sign-posting notice before DRC meetings. Staff has determined that the 15-day requirement does not work with the current schedule of Development Review Committee (DRC) meetings, which occur twice monthly, and have proposed that the notice requirement be lowered to 10 days.

The Ordinance also establishes a streamlined review and approval process consisting of Site Plan Level II, with City Commission request for review, for all proposed developments up to 110 ft. in height; it also establishes Site Plan Level II with City Commission approval for all development exceeding this height, up to the 150 ft. maximum. The intent, however, was not to do away with the existing thresholds for smaller developments, which would still be subject to Site Plan Level I review.

Vice Chair Hansen requested clarification that the Site Plan Level I requirement was unintentionally omitted. Mr. Fajardo said it was not omitted, but Staff wished to clarify that this requirement was not changed. He explained that the language made it appear that all Applicants had to go through Site Plan Level II, regardless of the size of the development.

Mr. Witschen asked if Staff planned to re-evaluate permitted uses based on the hope that the SRAC will “transition into...a college and university,” which is not presently permitted in the area. Mr. Fajardo said the SRAC only includes the corridor from 1st Avenue to the FEC corridor and Tarpon River to SR-84; the remaining RAC is still being considered. He agreed that the uses to which Mr. Witschen referred could be considered, but noted that property owners and City officials do not wish the uses currently permitted to change at this point.

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. McCulla, seconded by Mr. Witschen, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

4. New Boston Atlantech Limited Michael Ciesielski 1P11 Partnership

Request: **	Plat Approval/ Atlantech Plat
Legal Description:	A portion of the NE one-quarter (NE ¼) of Section 12, Township 49 South, Range 42 East, Broward County
General Location:	6451 North Federal Highway (West side of North Federal Highway immediately south of NE 65 Street)
District	1

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

Leigh Kerr, representing the Applicant, explained the request is for approval of the Atlantech Plaza plat. The existing office building at the site would be retained and commercial and residential uses, including 500 residential units, would be added. The first 260 residential and commercial units are presently under Site Plan review by the DRC, and will ultimately come before the Board, as it is a residential use. The Applicant has met with the Imperial Point Homeowners' Association, which supports the Application.

Michael Ciesielski, Planner, stated the request is for development of a 9.8 acre parcel with a mix of residential and commercial uses. There are 389,946 sq. ft. of existing office use; the proposed plat note requests 6000 sq. ft. of commercial use, 2400 sq. ft. of bank use, and 500 mid-rise residential units in addition to the existing office use. The Application meets all adequacy and subdivision regulations and is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

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 Vice Chair Hansen, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

6. Salim Khoury / Khoury Real Estate, LLC. Yvonne Redding 31R11

Request: **	Parking Reduction
Legal Description:	Lot 2, Block D-1, Croissant Park Dixie Cut-off Section 6-5 B. Broward
General Location:	3233 South Andrews Avenue
District	4

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

Alex Khoury, Applicant, stated the request is for a parking reduction for an addition to an existing building, which complies with the ULDR. The size of the property physically prohibits the requirement for four on-street parking spaces. A detailed parking study has been approved by Engineering, and the project has received the requisite approvals by the DRC.

Yvonne Redding, Planner, advised that the request is for three on-street parking spaces. The parking study shows there is adequate parking throughout the day for the expansion. The parcel allows for one on-site parking space, which will be the required handicap-accessible space; the remaining three spaces would be on-street parking.

Mr. McCulla asked how the building is used. Ms. Redding replied it is currently a contractor's office. The building is currently 2000 sq. ft., and the expansion would add another 1000 sq. ft. upstairs. The parking requirement is for one space per 800 sq. ft. for this use.

Mr. McCulla asked if the parking reduction is tied to the use as a contractor's office. Ms. Redding said if the use is changed to one that requires more parking, such as "generic office use," another parking reduction would need to be requested.

Mr. Ferber said he found the request "perplexing," as there was no clear means of getting "storage or materials onto the second floor." Mr. Khoury explained that the existing building has a concrete slab roof, which would serve as the floor of the second storey; there is no way to change this slab, so the addition would be "a box to enclose" the second floor, and the new storey would be accessed from the back. An alley behind the building would accommodate delivery vehicles.

Mr. Ferber asked if storage is included as part of the current use. Mr. Khoury said the current ground floor serves as both a contractor's office and yard. Mr. Ferber observed that office space has a larger parking requirement than is shown. Mr. Khoury said the property owner maintains an office on the first floor and the second floor would be used as storage space.

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.

Mr. Witschen requested information on the parking analysis. Dennis Girisgen, City Engineer, said he had personally visited the site and reviewed the report, and was comfortable with the analysis.

Mr. McCulla asked if the second floor would be used exclusively for storage. Attorney Miller added that the parking reduction order would be written to specify this use. Mr. Khoury said while it would be used for storage only, the parking study was done including both the new and existing spaces.

Mr. McCulla asked if the Applicant would be willing to accept an approval that included the restriction that the second floor would be used for storage only. Mr.

Khoury said he would, and clarified that the Application was before the Board because he could not physically include the required parking spaces on his own property due to the width.

Motion made by Mr. McCulla to approve with that restriction. The **motion** died for lack of second.

Vice Chair Hansen said when he had viewed the site, he was uncomfortable granting the addition of space to a building that had “no parking whatsoever” aside from the handicap-accessible space. He also felt the space did not look like a contractor’s storage space. He stated if the reduction was approved, he would also like to ensure that the second floor not be used as office space.

Mr. Welch asked if a parking reduction, once granted, is tracked in a database. He explained that as an area redevelops, this would allow the number of parking variances in a given area to be monitored. Director Brewton confirmed that this is done.

Mr. McCulla asked if the parking reduction is granted as written, with no restriction specifying the use of the second floor as storage space, the Applicant could also use that floor as a contractor’s office. Ms. Redding confirmed this, and clarified that the Applicant will provide one handicap-accessible space on-site, while the three remaining spaces will be provided on-street. Without the reduction, the Applicant would be required to provide four on-site spaces.

Motion made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Ms. Tuggle, to approve as presented.

Ms. Redding noted that the two following Staff conditions are attached to the Application:

1. The parking reduction must be recorded through the proper process.
2. The Site Plan must be final.

Attorney Miller clarified that these specifications are already required and did not need to be added as conditions.

Mr. McCulla noted that the restriction he had proposed in his original **motion** did not apply to the current **motion**.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 5-2 (Vice Chair Hansen and Mr. Ferber dissenting).

7. Communication to the City Commission

None.

8. For the Good of the City

None.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Chair

Prototype

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