BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING  
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE  
JULY 10, 2019 – 6:30 P.M.  
CITY HALL CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Members</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Cumulative Attendance 6/2019 through 5/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Reynolds, Chair</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Present 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Nelson, Vice Chair</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Present 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugenia Ellis</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Present 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaise McGinley</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Present 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McTigue</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Present 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Carey Villeneuve</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Present 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwick Maxey</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Present 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternates</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip Falkanger</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Present 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Eichner</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Present 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Bascombe</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Present 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff**  
D Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney  
Burt Ford, Zoning Chief  
Mohammed Malik, Zoning Administrator  
Chakila Crawford-Williams, Administrative Assistant  
Brigitte Chiappetta, Prototype, Inc.

**Communication to the City Commission**  
None

**Purpose: Section 47-33.1.**  
The Board of Adjustment shall receive and hear appeals in cases involving the ULDR, to hear applications for temporary nonconforming use permits, special exceptions and variances to the terms of the ULDR, and grant relief where authorized under the ULDR. The Board of Adjustment shall also hear, determine and decide appeals from reviewable interpretations, applications or determinations made by an administrative official in the enforcement of the ULDR, as provided herein.
Board members disclosed communications they had, and site visits made regarding items on the agenda.

All individuals wishing to speak on the matters listed on tonight's agenda were sworn in.

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum determined to be present.

II. Approval of Minutes – June 2019

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis to approve the Board’s June 2019 minutes. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

III. Public Sign-In / Swearing-In

Anyone planning to testify was sworn in.

IV. Agenda Items

1. INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Owner/Agent</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B19-018</td>
<td>Holman Automotive Inc./ Glen Welden</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication to the City Commission
For the Good of the City
Other Items and Board Discussion
REQUESTING: Sec. 47-22.4. A.1 - Maximum number of signs at one location and special requirements in zoning districts.

Whereas the ULDR states: Single business buildings. The total number of signs on any one (1) lot or plot shall not exceed four (4). A variance is requested to increase the total number signs on this development lot from four (4) to nineteen (19), per the submittal.

Sec. 47-22.3. E - Onsite directional signs.

Whereas the ULDR states: In business zoned districts directional signs shall not exceed eight (8) square feet in area nor four (4) feet in height. Such signs may be illuminated. All such signs shall be located on the property served, and the number shall not be greater than two (2) per curb cut or vehicular access point. A variance is requested to increase the maximum square feet from eight (8) to twenty-six point one two five (26.125) square feet, and, the maximum height of the sign from four (4) feet to five foot five inches (5’ 5”), per submittal.

Glen Welden, Director of Design at United Visual Branding, gave a Power Point presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes for the public record. He explained that their request related predominantly to vehicular and pedestrian wayfinding signs and to directional signs that exceeded the maximum square footage. Mr. Welden remarked that the signs were made of higher-end materials than most signs and were lit from behind.

Mr. Malik confirmed that the directional signs were not included in the count, but they contributing to the size and height issue. Directional signs not located at the curb cut, and were instead on a wall, were considered wall signs.

Mr. Malik read from the code describing the size, location and number of directional signs allowed. Mr. Spence clarified that they were seeking a variance to allow the directional signs that were not located at the curb cut but were wall signs. Mr. Welden stated a maximum of four [not directional] signs were allowed, and they were requesting nine. There were seven directional signs on the building, and 19 wall signs, where only four were allowed.

Mr. Spence informed the Board that a new law required that their findings be provided in writing to applicants, and this would be included in the Board’s orders in the future. Approvals should include the language that a request met all the criteria of the ULDR, but a denial should cite the specific section requirement the request did not meet.

The Board took a brief break.
The Board discussed ways to address the new requirements with discussion and motion language.

Mr. Malik clarified that the request was for seven wall wayfinding signs (because they were not located at the curb cut but, on the wall,) plus five extra wall signs. There was also a size issue.

Mr. Welden described the size and verbiage on each of the signs. Chair Reynolds noted that they desired to have separate signs for each brand of car at the dealership, which caused them to exceed the number of allowed signs. Mr. Nelson pointed out that brands could be incorporated into one sign, reducing the need for a variance. He noted that the Board was obligated to grant the minimum variance necessary to comply with the meaning of the code.

Ms. Eichner suggested removing the Rolls Royce (#2), the Holman Motorcar (#4) and the Bentley sign (#3) signs on the east and west sides of the building, because there were the same brand signs already visible from Sunrise Boulevard. This would leave them with a request for six signs where four were allowed. Mr. Welden indicated they would remove wall signs #1 and #2 (facing Sunrise Boulevard). Ms. Eichner asked if Mr. Welden would agree to remove the Rolls Royce sign that faced east and the Bentley sign that faced west, since they were also duplicative. Mr. Welden said they might consider removing only the Bentley Sign on the west side.

Mr. Nelson stated there were nine total advertising signs on the property; all other signs were directional signs, whether they were wall-mounted or freestanding. Ms. Eichner said they would still need a variance for five signs, if they agreed to remove the request for signs 1 and 2.

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

Mr. Nelson stated if they agreed to remove the request for signs 1 and 2, the variance request was for 3 additional directional signs and 3 additional advertising signs.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. McGinley:
Regarding the variance request for the number of signs, the Board finds the applicant’s final request for a variance to allow three (3) additional directional signs and three (3) advertising signs to meet all the criteria of the ULDR for the granting of a variance, in as much as the three brands allowed on that property would constitute one of each of the three signage requests, and it would be a matter of public safety to allow the directional sign variance. In a roll call vote, motion passed 6-1 with Ms. Eichner opposed.
Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. McGinley:
Regarding the variance request regarding the size of the directional signs, based upon
the size of the property and the location of the requested directional signs, the Board
finds that the variance requested does meet all of the requirements of the ULDR with
respect to the granting of a variance and it would be in the interest of public safety to
grant it. In a roll call vote, motion passed 6-1 with Mr. Maxey opposed.

Communication to the City Commission

Ms. Ellis asked if the City Commission had a response to the Board's communication.
Mr. Spence stated the Board had reviewed it and declined.

Report and for the Good of the City

None

Other Items and Board Discussion

None

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at
7:43 pm.

Chair:

Attest:

ProtoType Inc.

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