DRAFT

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
700 NW 19 AVENUE, FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33311
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 2026 – 6:00 P.M.

Board Members	Attendance	Present	Absent
Patrick McTigue, Chair	P	11	0
Brian Donaldson, Vice Chair	P	10	1
Kevin Buckley	P	10	1
Hector DelaTorres	P	7	1
Whitney Dutton	A	8	3
Steve Ganon	A	10	1
Monty Lalwani	P	3	1
Jacquelyn Scott	P	9	2
Alexander Spence	P	8	0

Staff
D'Wayne Spence, Deputy City Attorney
Scott Stone, Assistant City Attorney
Jim Hetzel, Urban Design and Planning Manager
Trisha Logan, Principal Urban Planner
Jonathan D'Angelo, Urban Planner I
Tyler Laforme, Urban Planner III
Benjamin Restrepo, Senior Project Manager
N. Day, Recording Clerk, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to City Commission

None.

~~I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE~~

~~The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Chair McTigue introduced the Board members and Urban Design and Planning Manager Jim Hetzel introduced City Staff.~~

~~II. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM / APPROVAL OF MINUTES~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Buckley, seconded by Mr. Donaldson, to approve the minutes of the last meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.~~

~~IIII. PUBLIC SIGN-IN / SWEARING-IN~~

~~Any individuals wishing to speak on Agenda Items were sworn in at this time.~~

IV. AGENDA ITEMS

Index

Case Number	Applicant
1. UDP-SR25001** *	Four Ten Properties LLC
2. UDP-Z26002*	Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA)
3. UDP-T26002*	City of Fort Lauderdale
4. UDP-T26004*	City of Fort Lauderdale

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.

The following Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

~~**2. CASE:** UDP-Z26002~~
~~**REQUEST: *** Rezoning from Residential Multifamily Mid-Rise/Medium-High Density (RMM-25) District to Northwest Regional Activity Center-Mixed Use West (NWRAC-MUw) District~~
~~**APPLICANT:** Fort Lauderdale Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA)~~
~~**AGENT:** Greg Brewton, Greg Brewton Associates~~
~~**ADDRESS:** 538 NW 8 Avenue and 537 NW 7 Terrace~~
~~**ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** North Lauderdale 1-48 D, Lot 45-48 Tog with W 1/2 Of Pt Vac'd Alley Lying E of & Adj to Lots 45-48 As Per Or 15316/195, Blk 15 and North Lauderdale 1-48 D, Lot 6,7,8 Tog with E 1/2 Of Pt Vac'd Alley Lying W of & Adj to Lots 6-8 As Per Or 15316/195, Blk 15~~
~~**ZONING DISTRICT:** Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/ Medium High Density (RMM-25) District~~
~~**LAND USE:** Northwest Regional Activity Center~~
~~**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** 3 – Pamela Beasley-Pittman~~
~~**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:** Historic Dorsey-Riverbend Civic Association~~
~~**CASE PLANNER:** Jonathan D'Angelo~~

~~Disclosures were made at this time.~~

~~Hope Calhoun, representing the Applicant, stated that the Item is a rezoning request in anticipation of a project known as Sistrunk View. This property was awarded to the developer by Fort Lauderdale's Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) and the developer has worked closely with that organization, as well as with the surrounding neighborhood.~~

~~During the Development Review Committee (DRC) process, the Applicant and City Staff determined that the property should have a single consistent zoning district. At present, half of the property is zoned Mid-Rise/Medium-High Density (RMM-25) and half zoned Northwest Regional Activity Center-Mixed Use West (NWRAC-MUw). The Applicant requests rezoning of the RMM-25 portion of the property to NWRAC-MUw.~~

~~Ms. Calhoun continued that Staff has reviewed the Application and found the project to be consistent with the NWRAC-MUw rezoning criteria. Supporting information is provided in the Applicant's backup materials as well as the Staff Report.~~

~~At this time Chair McTigue opened the public hearing. As there were no individuals wishing to speak on the Item, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.~~

~~Mr. Spence noted that the rezoning narrative for the Application indicated plans to develop 100 rental units alongside commercial space, as well as a garage that would accommodate up to 114 cars. He requested clarification of the proposed garage location. Ms. Calhoun replied that there will be structured parking within the proposed building. She confirmed that the Applicant's traffic statement was presented to the City and showed that the project would result in a negligible amount of traffic.~~

~~**Motion** made by Vice Chair Donaldson, seconded by Mr. Buckley, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP-Z26002 based on the following findings of fact, the facts in the City Staff Report, and/or based on the testimony heard tonight, that the Board hereby finds that the Application meets the applicable criteria of the ULDR cited in the Staff Report ,and any conditions that may be attached to this is [sic] also added to the motion. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.~~

1. **CASE:** UDP-SR25001
   REQUEST: ** * Site Plan Level IV Review: Waterway Use with Landscape Yard Modification, Rezoning from Residential Multifamily Low Rise/Medium Density (RM-15) District to Community Business (CB) District with Allocation of 0.14 Acres of Commercial Flex for 20,337 Square Feet of Retail Use and 11,816 Square Feet of Office Use with an Associated Parking Reduction
   APPLICANT: Four Ten Properties LLC.
   AGENT: Stephanie Toothaker, Esq., P.A.
   PROJECT NAME: Weston Jewelers
   ADDRESS: 1117 E. Las Olas Boulevard
   ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Beverly Heights 1-30 B Lot 16 & S1/2 of Alley Lying Between Lots 1 & 16 Blk 21 and Beverly Heights 1-30 B Lot 1 & N1/2 of Alley Lying Between Lot 1 & 16 Blk 21
   ZONING DISTRICT: Boulevard Business (B-1) and Residential Low Rise Multifamily/Medium Density (RM-15)
   LAND USE: Commercial and Medium
   COMMISSION DISTRICT: 4 – Ben Sorensen
   NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: Colee Hammock Homeowners Association
   CASE PLANNER: Trisha Logan, AICP

Disclosures were made at this time.

Stephanie Toothaker, representing the Applicant, explained that this Application represents an opportunity to increase the presence of luxury-branded retail in Fort Lauderdale, and reviewed several of the brands that would be carried by the Applicant's store. She emphasized the importance of Las Olas Boulevard as a key potential location for luxury brands, including Rolex, and their prospective buyers, among other attractions.

Ms. Toothaker referred to the 2025 Las Olas Boulevard Mobility Plan, which defines Las Olas Boulevard as having three districts: a Downtown district on the western end, a shopping district in the center, and the Collee Hammock district to the east. The proposed project, Weston Jewelers, would be located in the shopping district.

The existing uses on the subject site include Commercial on the southern parcel with five multi-family residential units located on the northern parcel. It is located on the Himmarshee Canal. Ms. Toothaker advised that the project has reduced its originally proposed height in response to concerns from neighbors. Additional properties in the surrounding area are three to 12 stories in height.

The Future Land Use of the front half of the property is Commercial while the back half has a Future Land Use of Medium Residential, which requires the allocation of flex units. No Land Use Plan Amendment is necessary for flex allocation. With regard to the zoning, the existing B-1 zoning on the southern half allows a height of 150 feet, while the northern half is zoned RM-15. The Applicant requests rezoning of the back half to Community Business (CB).

The proposed height is 74 feet to the top of the roof. The building will include 20,337 square feet of retail on levels one, two, three, and five in addition to 11,816 square feet of office space on levels four and five.

Ms. Toothaker continued that when the project first began the DRC process, several neighbors from the surrounding districts shared feedback, most of which was negative with regard to the original plan. That plan required more parking, included two restaurants, and was taller. The Applicant chose to remove the restaurants from the plan and has offered the voluntary condition that they will not allow restaurants to be returned to the plan. The Applicant understood the restaurant use to have been the primary reason for concerns among neighbors to the property.

The proposed project meets all rezoning requirements with the exception of a request to place the building closer to the water, as there will be a platform and new dock along the waterway. The Applicant also plans to raise the property's seawall. Ms. Toothaker noted that Code requires 20 feet of landscaping, but asserted that this does not make sense for a property located on the subject canal.

Code requires that retail use of the proposed size must have 129 parking spaces, which Ms. Toothaker pointed out is not consistent with the needs of a jewelry store. A shared parking analysis suggests that 116 total parking spaces would be needed during weekday

peak hours and 114 spaces during weekend peak hours. The Applicant requests to provide no on-site parking.

The Applicant has made two off-site parking agreements for the business, one for six spaces and the other for 34 spaces for a total of 40 in the direct vicinity. She referred to the Applicant's traffic report, which shows that Las Olas Boulevard provides a pedestrian shopping/walking destination for a multitude of uses. Many potential customers are expected to use ride-sharing services to access the location and then visit multiple stores and/or restaurants on the street rather than visiting one location only.

The Applicant's traffic report shows that there are 207 public parking spaces within 700 feet of the subject site and 213 public parking spaces within an expanded quarter-mile area. The Applicant's traffic engineer consulted with the City's traffic engineer on this information. While a 209-space parking garage is planned for Las Olas Boulevard, the Applicant does not rely on any spaces that facility may provide in the future.

Ms. Toothaker reviewed the study areas included in the Applicant's traffic report, stating that an hour-by-hour comparison shows 116 parking spaces available during the heaviest-trafficked time of the week, which was noted at 2 p.m. each weekday. This includes all parking by other uses in the area. On weekends, the heaviest-trafficked time was noon, at which time there were 203 parking spaces available.

Ms. Toothaker showed a rendering of the proposed off-site parking for the Applicant's business. The Applicant has entered into a 25-year parking agreement for six spaces at a nearby office location for the family office. It was also stated that the Applicant has a Letter of Intent (LOI) for 34 additional spaces for staff as well as customers. This lease would be signed upon approval. The Applicant has offered the voluntary condition that they will not seek a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) unless they can provide this parking.

Ms. Toothaker reviewed several applications in the Las Olas Boulevard area which have recently come before the Board for parking reductions, concluding that while the Applicant proposes a 100% parking reduction on-site, they still plan to provide 40 parking spaces for their customers. She reiterated that the requested yard modification on the Himmarshee canal would allow the Applicant to provide pedestrian access to the waterway. The back of the building was designed for consistency with the front of the building.

Ms. Toothaker reviewed the proposed building, which will have an entrance onto Las Olas Boulevard and includes several individual luxury-brand spaces within the store. The second floor includes additional retail as well as dedicated spaces for shopping experiences. The third floor will also include retail, with some pre-owned jewelry and watches. The back half of the facility will include an authorized Rolex repair area that will not be accessible to the public.

The fourth floor will include family office space, which Ms. Toothaker described as a very low-intensity use which will not be open to the public. The Applicant has offered the voluntary condition that this space will never be rented to outside entities. The fifth floor will include a small retail space and an office lounge for employees.

Ms. Toothaker again emphasized the voluntary conditions offered by the Applicant, which are as follows:

- No addition of restaurant use back into the Site Plan
- Use of office space for family office only
- Employees will never be permitted to use any of the public parking spaces available through the Applicant's parking agreements

The Applicant made an in-person presentation to the Beverly Heights Association as well as a public participation meeting using communications technology for residents of Collee Hammock. The Application must ultimately be approved by the City Commission after two readings.

Clarification was requested for the number of full-time employees who may work at the proposed business. Ms. Toothaker replied that she would have this answer later in the meeting.

Ms. Scott observed that this calculation may be difficult to estimate, as the Applicant will provide space to other jewelers inside the Weston Jewelers business. Ms. Toothaker clarified that the entire building is owned by Weston Jewelers, which is an authorized dealer for several brands. The brands have designed their own interior spaces, but the spaces will be operated by Weston Jewelers employees. There will be no outside tenants, as the family office space belongs to the family which owns Weston Jewelers.

Ms. Scott pointed out that this means the Board will need to know how many employees are expected on the site. Ms. Toothaker further clarified that employees will work the entire floor of the business rather than remaining in dedicated brand areas at all times.

At this time Chair McTigue opened the public hearing.

Dan McNulty, resident, stated that the proposed building appears to be out of place with the surrounding area, particularly with regard to the back side of the structure. He was not in favor of the project due to the building's size, and felt it would be consistent with the surrounding area in a different district of Las Olas Boulevard. He concluded that a smaller building would be more appropriate.

Anthony Battista, president of the Bellaggio de Las Olas Condominium Association, noted that no property east of the Himmarshee Canal has been rezoned by Fort Lauderdale for commercial use only, and cautioned that the size of the proposed building would destroy the character of the neighborhood, concluding that the building should be designed to fit its existing zoning.

Harold Mers, resident, stated that he felt the Rolex brand would be a good fit for the area, would bring business to the area, and would be a good fit over the long term.

Percy Johnson, resident, felt the proposed project and its affiliation with the Rolex brand would be good for Fort Lauderdale as an international destination. He emphasized the importance of luxury shopping and culture to the City, and encouraged the Board to

consider the future of Las Olas Boulevard, including what may need to change in order to maintain the City's economic engines.

Lesley Jones, secretary of the Beverly Heights Association and president of the Himmarshee Hammock Homeowners Association, recalled that at a previous meeting with the Applicant and their team, concessions were made to neighbors, including the exclusion of the two restaurants originally proposed for the building's top floor.

Ms. Jones continued that despite these concessions, concerns remain, including the proposed zoning change, which could establish an unwanted precedent that could allow other developers to disturb the character of nearby residential neighborhoods. She cited a number of new construction projects in and near the Beverly Heights community, stating that residentially zoned lots have been purchased by commercial entities which hope to bring forward zoning changes at a later time.

Kristin LaFleur, president of the Beverly Heights Association, emphasized that the zoning change would have a significant impact on nearby small residential neighborhoods that border commercial areas. She echoed Ms. Jones' concern that developers may want to build oversized structures in the area. She also pointed out that many similar properties on Las Olas Boulevard which have requested parking reductions were replacing previously existing buildings with similar uses. She concluded that some of the parking spaces counted by the Applicant's parking study are located within residential areas.

Jim Brady, resident, stated that if the Applicant's expectation of success at the subject property is correct, it is likely to create a greater need for parking in that area, and the development should bear its own parking burden rather than placing that burden on surrounding property owners. He pointed out that if parking is not provided, people will park in adjacent residential neighborhoods. He requested that the Board protect the surrounding community as it changes.

Jennifer Leong, resident, advised that she is a member of the Board of Directors of the Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce as well as chair of the Chamber's real estate and construction board. She emphasized that the City is not well-known internationally and must strive to keep up with other international locations in the area.

Mr. DelaTorres requested additional information on the real estate market in which Ms. Leong works, asking how important a high-end retailer such as the proposed Weston Jewelers is to international customers who may be considering purchasing properties in Fort Lauderdale. Ms. Leong strongly emphasized the necessity of luxury storefronts to her clients in order to keep up with other international municipalities.

Bobby Henry, resident of Plantation and owner/publisher of the *Westside Gazette*, stated that he supported the proposed project, which he felt would strengthen the business, culture, and community of Las Olas Boulevard. He characterized the Application as a plan that would activate the street and increase daytime economic activity. He noted that Las Olas Boulevard already operates on pedestrian flow and shared parking, concluding that the proposal represents responsible growth.

Mr. Henry added that his intent in attending tonight's meeting had been to address Item 2, but he had not had that opportunity, as that Item had been heard out of order. He asserted that he disagreed with the project proposed by Item 2, expressing concern that it would overshadow his longstanding business.

Vicente Thrower, resident, stated that different individuals perceive growth differently, and noted that the Board must consider future visions of the City. He described the Rolex brand in particular as a great opportunity for the community, and concluded that he supported the Application.

Michael Harrison, resident, that he is one of the principals of the proposed project, and described the background process for selecting the subject site. He thanked the community for their input and support.

Ms. Scott requested additional clarification on Rolex's involvement at the subject location. Mr. Harrison replied that when the Weston Jewelers location was approved by Rolex, they had rejected over 200 other dealers.

Jay Weaver, resident, stated that he spoke on behalf of Moss Construction, which would be the builder of the Weston Jewelers location. He emphasized the project's positive contribution to the community, stating that they are a respected local family business with a reputation for quality and would continue to elevate the Las Olas Boulevard area.

Ms. Scott observed that tonight's hearing was not related to the Applicant's business, but to physical aspects of the project.

Canica McCray**,** resident, stated that she fully supported the expansion of Las Olas Boulevard, as it will bring a more prestigious look to the community and attract more pedestrian traffic to local businesses.

Matt Sacco, resident, spoke favorably of the proposed business and felt the proposed project was consistent with the atmosphere of Las Olas Boulevard. He encouraged the Board to support the project.

J.K. McCrae, resident, stated that SE 12 Avenue is a major north/south thoroughfare for residents of the Las Olas area, and described traffic in the subject area as chaotic. She added that cars often drive through neighborhoods in search of parking.

Xaviea Bailey, resident, advised that adding height to Las Olas Boulevard will benefit the community by creating more jobs, helping families and small businesses, and making the community stronger.

Allison Rumzi, resident, stated that while she welcomed development within the community, she was concerned with the project's construction phase, which she felt could affect boating capability in the subject area, and requested information on this phase.

Ms. Toothaker offered to meet with Ms. Rumzi and the contractor privately to discuss construction. Ms. Rumzi indicated that she would prefer the issue be discussed publicly so all residents can be informed. She asked if construction would affect boats that have to pass the subject area. Jay Weaver, representing Moss Construction, clarified that the waterway would not be closed during the construction phase, even during construction of the new seawall at the subject property. The street will not be closed, and deliveries will be made on-site.

Mr. DelaTorres asked if the construction provider would appoint a liaison to keep the neighborhood informed during the construction period. Mr. Weaver confirmed that a project team will be on-site on a full-time basis; if any issues arise, that team can be contacted immediately. Either a head project manager or head superintendent will be on-site to serve as liaison. Residents will be informed of the construction schedule, including anticipated loud noises.

Mr. DelaTorres explained that his intent was for Moss Construction to be proactive in reaching out to the community on a regular basis rather than having residents contact them. Mr. Weaver again confirmed that representatives of Moss Construction will be available to address neighborhood concerns.

Chair McTigue asked if the new seawall will be built from shore or from the waterway. Mr. Weaver stated that the goal will be to construct the seawall from shore.

Ms. Rumzi advised that the waterway in the subject area is very narrow, so the presence of a construction barge would mean other boaters cannot access the waterway. Mr. Weaver reiterated that he did not anticipate any waterway or roadway closures for the entire project.

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

Deputy City Attorney D'Wayne Spence advised that the Application involves the rezoning of a parcel that is designated within a residential category in the City's Future Land Use Plan. This residential category means the allocation of commercial flex units is required. The Board is tasked with determining whether or not the Application meets rezoning criteria, as well as with considering the project's Site Plan. He concluded that this means the Board will review the rezoning criteria and Site Plan approval together rather than separately.

Vice Chair Donaldson asked if the Application will go before the City Commission. Attorney Spence advised that due to the rezoning aspect, the Application must go to the City Commission for two public hearings, as required for adoption of an Ordinance.

Urban Design and Planning Manager Jim Hetzel noted a correction to page 8 of the Staff Report related to a reference to the Flexibility Criteria in ULDR Section 27-28.3.D, which should be ULDR Section 47-28.3.E. He added that Staff has prepared physical copies of written public comments received only shortly before tonight's meeting, and distributed these to the Board at this time.

Mr. DelaTorres observed that the Staff Report indicates the proposed rezoning would extend CB zoning approximately 120 feet north of the existing B-1 zoning district. The report also describes the proposed retail use as appropriate for the Las Olas corridor; however, it also notes that CB zoning would create a transitional area of less intense uses than the uses found along the commercial corridor. This would aid the transition to the adjacent residential neighborhood. Mr. DelaTorres requested additional information from Staff regarding this transition as well as the proposed lesser impact of CB zoning on adjacent residential development.

Trisha Logan, Principal Urban Planner, explained that the project's retail aspect is oriented toward East Las Olas Boulevard; there is more office use as the roadway moves closer to the nearby residential area. The proposed use is less intense than retail use.

Mr. DelaTorres also requested more information regarding the proposed building's height. Ms. Logan replied that properties zoned CB can be built to a height of 150 feet. The property described in tonight's Application is proposed at a height of 74 feet.

Mr. DelaTorres asked if the rezoning of the nearby property would establish a precedent within the subject area. Attorney Spence advised that no precedent would be set by rezoning, as the rezoning criteria in Code must be applied to the specific parcels in question. These criteria take the conditions of the surrounding area into consideration. The allocation of flex units is site-specific to the Application currently before the Board.

Mr. DelaTorres also addressed the proposed use, pointing out that maintaining a high standard in a commercial district surrounded by residential properties can help maintain the value of those residential properties.

Mr. DelaTorres noted that the property will have a single owner, and requested clarification of how this will relate to the business's floor plan, which reserves a significant amount of space for uses that will be less common than retail, such as the watch repair space and a bridal space. Mr. Hetzel advised that when determining parking requirements, Staff looks at the use and its proposed square footage, which varies from project to project.

Ms. Scott commented that while the proposed business would be a good addition to Las Olas Boulevard, several aspects of Las Olas Boulevard make it distinct from other parts of the City, including its connectivity to Broward Boulevard and the Downtown area. She emphasized that Las Olas Boulevard runs between neighborhoods.

Ms. Scott continued that the proposed rezoning could not be justified by the specific business that would be implemented on the parcel. She strongly emphasized the importance of preserving small residential neighborhoods and felt that the proposed rezoning could establish a precedent that would affect multiple residential communities in the area.

Ms. Scott continued that while she was in favor of the proposed business relocating to the subject parcel, her concern was for the size of the proposed building. She characterized the

project as overbuilt, stating that if the project was amended to be more consistent with the scale of the surrounding area, it would be a good addition to Las Olas Boulevard.

Mr. Buckley noted that the DRC Comment Report describes the project as "over-programmed" due to the size of the proposed building. He also pointed out that data for the Applicant's traffic study was collected in June 2025.

Ms. Scott addressed traffic and traffic patterns, pointing out that SE 4 Avenue is a residential street and the increased traffic and parking would be detrimental to its residents. She also expressed concern for condominium residents to the west of the proposed project who purchased their units facing east, and recommended that the Applicant reconsider their plan for the site.

Mr. Spence asked if, during the public participation meetings, the public had indicated any concerns regarding the size of the proposed building, or recommendations of a reduction since it would not include restaurant space. Ms. Toothaker replied that the building's height was reduced by 16 feet when the restaurants were removed from the plan. She added that the Applicant had only recently received the written public comments that were sent to the Board at tonight's meeting.

Ms. Toothaker also explained that the community had asked the Applicant to identify parking for store employees, which were secured on a nearby office parcel. Should that plan for the six spaces be deemed problematic, the Applicant will still have the LOI with a commercial building for 34 spaces. The maximum employee count for the business is estimated at 20.

Ms. Toothaker also noted that the dedicated luxury brand spaces to which Mr. DelaTorres had referred were very important to the proposed use and could not be easily given up, as they are important to the business's overall use. She estimated that the watch repair and bridal suite area would total 32,000 square feet, while the retail use will constitute 20,337 square feet and the family office space would be 11,860 square feet.

Ms. Toothaker continued that in addition to the 40 spaces cited earlier, the business will also provide valet parking and has identified a loading zone drop-off area. She added that other buildings in the area received similar setback waivers to what is requested by the Applicant.

Ms. Scott observed that multiple uses in the area cannot continue to count the same number of parking spaces toward their parking counts, stating once again that the proposed building is too big for the parcel. She also pointed out that the shops on Las Olas Boulevard are west of the subject site.

Mr. Spence asked if the parking study was conducted with consideration of the four restaurants planned but not yet constructed in the subject area. Suzanne Danielson, parking consultant for the Applicant, stated that the study considered two of these restaurants, one of which is forthcoming and one of which is expanding. She characterized the parking plan as including shared users as well as shared parking.

Chair McTigue asked if the shared parking can be expected to fill up. Benjamin Restrepo, Senior Project Manager, advised that none of the parking in the public right-of-way is allocated to specific uses. Whenever a parking study is conducted, it considers available parking during peak demand hours for a specific use. That use is allowed to count those spaces toward their parking requirement. Previously approved uses are accounted for in the parking study.

Mr. Lalwani requested additional clarification of how spaces are counted toward parking requirements for multiple uses in the same area. Mr. Restrepo replied that multiple uses in the same area will use the same parking availability, including spaces in the public right-of-way as well as spaces on City-owned property.

Attorney Spence explained that every project is required to provide a study once that project's application has been received. When an applicant surveys parking, available spaces can be counted toward the applicant's parking study. When a subsequent applicant submits an application, a new study must be conducted. If there are spaces available during the time of that study, the available spaces can also be counted toward that applicant's parking evaluation.

Mr. Restrepo added that when studies are conducted, a seasonal factor is applied to the study's counts which would either increase or decrease parking demand for a given use. Ms. Danielson advised that peak season is no longer considered to be October through December or December through February. The most recent FDOT counts show that the peak season began on February 18 and ended May 18.

Ms. Scott requested clarification of the number of spaces available within 700 feet of the proposed building. Ms. Danielson replied that there are 207 available spaces within that distance, and 420 spaces within 1,320 feet. The study was conducted using mounted cameras that collect video evidence at street level.

It was asked if Staff agreed with the Applicant's parking counts and study. Mr. Hetzel confirmed that Staff agreed with the methodology used by the Applicant's parking consultant. Staff does not recommend approval of parking reductions, but reviews the Applicant's technical analysis. At the end of the Staff Report, options are provided to the Board which include approval, approval with conditions, or denial, but Staff does not make their own recommendation.

Vice Chair Donaldson stated that his past experience in the jewelry business had shown him that those stores do not typically need the same number of spaces required of most retail establishments. He did not feel the parking requirement of 129 spaces for the proposed business was accurate. He also pointed out that parking spaces in the subject area should not be tied up by employee parking, and challenged the Applicant to identify a dedicated area that would be made available for customers of various existing businesses. He felt these were included at the former office building, and concluded that he found the parking plan to be legitimate in this case.

Vice Chair Donaldson also addressed the proposed rezoning of the back portion of the parcel, acknowledging concerns for the nearby neighborhood. He pointed out that the front portion of the parcel would currently be allowed to build to a height of 150 feet and noted that nearby 2 Court will soon include a 12-story building one block from the subject site.

Vice Chair Donaldson continued that he did not feel the City's parking Code is adequate to address every instance, and he did not believe the proposed building would ever need as many spaces as what would be required due to its use. He concluded that he was supportive of the proposed parking reduction.

Ms. Scott emphasized that the surrounding neighborhoods are invested in the success of Las Olas Boulevard. She reiterated her concern for the project's size on the subject parcel as well as the parking reduction.

Ms. Scott asked if the Applicant is willing to make additional changes to the project. Ms. Toothaker replied that if changes are made, the Applicant would lose the opportunity to carry the Rolex brand. She explained that the Applicant has made commitments to Rolex and to other luxury brands it plans to carry which are required of the business.

Ms. Scott asserted that the project could have been successful at a smaller size which would have been more likely to be accepted by the community. Ms. Toothaker advised that when the Applicant met with the neighborhoods, the only negative comments from the community were related to the restaurants; the current discussion has only occurred over the last several days. Ms. Scott pointed out that it would have been unlikely the project could have been approved with restaurants due to parking requirements.

It was asked if the Applicant would be willing to provide 35 foot setbacks at the front of the property. Attorney Spence advised that the Board's role in this case is quasi-judicial; asking whether an applicant would accept this change was not relevant to what is before them at tonight's meeting in their role as a fact-finding entity. He strongly emphasized that the Board is asked to examine the evidence presented to them at tonight's hearing and determine whether or not the Application meets the criteria for rezoning.

Ms. Scott concluded that she did not find the building to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood for reasons stated earlier, and she was opposed to its approval based on lack of parking, lack of neighborhood compatibility, and the proposed setback modifications.

Mr. Lalwani commented that if the building were smaller, it would still lack on-site parking and would need to identify parking within the surrounding area. Mr. DelaTorres observed that he found the proposed building to be compatible with other buildings in the surrounding neighborhood, whether they are residential or commercial.

Motion made by Mr. DelaTorres, seconded by Vice Chair Donaldson, to recommend approval for us to vote on Case Number UDP-SR25001 based on the following findings of fact, and the Board hereby states that the Application meets the applicable criteria of the ULDR cited in the Staff Report, and the Board's recommended approval of the Application,

subject to all the conditions included in the Staff Report, whether they are voluntary or obligatory. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 4-3 (Mr. Buckley, Ms. Scott, and Mr. Spence dissenting).

3. **CASE:** UDP-T26002
   REQUEST: * Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) Section 47-16, "Historic Preservation District", Amending the List of Historic Districts, Amending the List of Permitted Uses, Modifying the Dimensional Requirements for Increase in Height, Modifying the Sign Regulations; and ULDR Section 47-24.11, "Historic Designation of Landmarks, Landmark Site or Buildings and Certificate of Appropriateness," Amending the Effective Date and Establish an Approval Process for Administrative Certificate of Appropriateness when Visible from Public Right-of-Way
   APPLICANT: City of Fort Lauderdale
   COMMISSION DISTRICTS: 2 – Steven Glassman and 4 – Ben Sorensen
   CASE PLANNER: Trisha Logan, AICP

Principal Urban Planner Trisha Logan explained that this Item addresses the Historic Preservation (H-1) zoning district, which affects Fort Lauderdale's Himmarshee Village Historic District as well as the Stranahan House. The Himmarshee Village district is surrounded by RAC zoning. She provided an overview of the historic nature of the district, which was originally designated in 1975. The proposed updates would incorporate a new conditional table, update the use table, and update site requirements.

The amendments also propose incorporating a seven-day administrative review process for minor improvements to historic preservation projects that are visible from the right-of-way. Ms. Logan noted that the City already has a 15-day administrative approval process in place for the Sailboat Bend Historic District. Minor requests that are visible from the right-of-way can be processed at a faster pace rather than going to a full public hearing.

The permitted use table will remain the same for 15 uses while updating 36 uses for greater consistency with the language used throughout Code. Four new uses were added to this table as well, and seven uses were removed. There are additional uses not listed in the table which can be considered as special applications to the Historic Preservation Board (HPB).

Building standards are also updated by increasing the existing height allowance from 25 feet. The proposal would separate height for consideration in two different categories: SW 2 Street, which has greater intensity with commercial uses, and SW 2 Avenue and SW 3 Avenue, which are less intense in nature. Along SW 2 Street, heights of up to six stories with a required setback after three stories would be allowed, which will help maintain the pedestrian experience at ground level. Applicants may apply for up to nine stories if certain conditions and criteria are met in addition to standard review. Setbacks will be measured from the center line of the roadway in order to maintain consistency along the street frontage.

~~VI. FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE~~

~~There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.~~

~~Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.~~

Chair

Prototype

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