



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

APPROVED MINUTES  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE  
CENTRAL CITY REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD  
MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 2025 – 6:00 PM  
700 NW 19 AVENUE  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33311

Cumulative Attendance  
September 2024-August 2025

Board Members	Present/Absent	Present	Absent
Kimber White, Chair	P	5	0
Antoinette Wright, Vice Chair	P	4	1
Edward Catalano	P	5	0
Linda Fleischman	P	5	0
Justin Greenbaum	P	4	1
Troy Liggett	P	5	0
Thomas Mabey	P	5	0
Jason Ross	P	3	1
Carlton Smith	A	1	4
Nikola Stan	P	5	0
Bobby Tinoco	P	5	0

Mr. Greenbaum arrived at 6:14 p.m.  
Ms. Fleischman arrived at 6:33 p.m.  
Mr. Jason Ross arrived at 6:46 p.m.

**Staff:**

Anthony Fajardo, Assistant City Manager  
Laura Reece, Acting Asst City Manager  
Ella Parker, Urban Design and Planning Manager  
Karlanne Devonish, Principal Planner II, Development Services  
Cija Omengabar, CRA Planner/Liaison  
Lorraine Tappen, Principal Urban Planner  
Clarence Woods, CRA Manager  
Tania Bailey-Watson, CRA Senior Administrative Assistant

**Others:**

Jason Crush, Crush Law  
Courtney Crush, Crush Law  
Members of the community that opted to speak\*:  
Julian Castro  
Jacob Resnick  
John Hayden  
Jacob Schickler  
Arthur Marcus  
Dr. Paul Rikeit  
Lorraine Saunders  
Olga Zamora

Tomislav Lukic  
Susanna Coleman  
Dr. Jeff Musgrove  
Ali Vazquez  
Ross Parker  
Clint Allen  
Robert Mazzola  
Brian Smith  
Mel Lenet

K. Cruitt, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

\*A full list of community members that were present is part of the public record

**Communication to the City Commission:**

None.

**I. Pledge of Allegiance**

Board members recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

**II. Call to Order & Determination of Quorum**

The meeting was called to order at 6:08 p.m. Roll was called, and it was noted that a quorum was present.

**III. Approval of Minutes – December 4, 2024 Regular Meeting**

**Motion** by Mr. Stan, seconded by Mr. Catalano, to approve December 4, 2024 Regular Meeting minutes as amended. In a roll vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**IV. Chair Opening Remarks**

Chair White thanked the community members present for taking the time to attend the meeting. He noted that members of the Board and City Staff had put in a lot of hard work to develop the proposed rezoning. The intent of the meeting was to hear from the community, commercial property owners and Staff, with a goal of coming to a consensus on a way to make Central City a place where everyone would enjoy ‘Work, Live, Play,’ and a quality of life that takes care of everyone.

**V. Rezoning Project Phase II:**

**1) December 4<sup>th</sup> Effort Recap**

Karlanne Devonish, Principal Urban Planner, gave a presentation to update those present on the rezoning options, a copy of which is part of the public record. Her presentation included slides with high-level pros and cons of each option.

At the March 6, 2024 CCRAB meeting, Staff proposed Option A as one zoning district with height restrictions to a maximum of 105 feet by right, 125 feet with affordable housing, and 150 feet with Planning and Zoning Board approval. Option A faced opposition and resulted in Option B.

Option B would split Central City into three zoning districts with maximum allowed height by location: Corridor-Mixed Use (CC-CMU) - Sunrise Boulevard / 105-250 feet as outlined in Option A; General Mixed Use (CC-GMU) - NE 4 Avenue / 80 feet; and Neighborhood Mixed Use (CC-

NMU) - NE 13 Street / 55 feet. Ms. Devonish highlighted that two revised maps for Option B were developed for review and discussion by the Board. She explained that two revised maps were developed after a question regarding zoning boundaries for the district fronting Sunrise Boulevard was brought forward at the December 4 meeting and she needed clarification after reviewing the March 6 meeting minutes; both were presented because she needed clarification. The revised maps were labeled Option B-Option 1 and Option B-Option 2. The former was drawn up to 11 Street and NE 5 Terrace on the West. The latter would extend all the way to the FEC tracks.

Option C was noted to have been applied in the Uptown area. This option establishes zoning districts based on location, land use patterns, design characteristics, redevelopment potential and mobility needs; Staff would be able to alleviate the time and cost burden when the property owner is ready to develop.

Option D is the ULDR Prior Zoning Regulations Provision through the use of provisions of the zoning regulations in effect at the time the development application was submitted; Section 47-26A.1 could apply with a request for the application of prior zoning regulations and would require higher-level approvals.

Ms. Devonish also reviewed the details of proposed changes to existing CC-MU regulations and dimensional requirements. Existing policies related to density, and the Live Local Act were presented.

## **2) Presentation**

Courtney Crush, Attorney, Crush Law presented proposed rezoning revisions on behalf of their clients, the 13<sup>th</sup> Street Commercial Property Owners Group, a copy of which is part of the public record. Ms. Crush stated that her understanding is there is a strong desire by both the neighborhoods and property owners along 13 Street to introduce mixed use to create more pedestrian-friendly active retail, and additional neighbors to support the commercial corridor. Ms. Crush stated that her clients had hired an architect who reviewed the proposals that had just been presented. She then presented their proposed changes to the regulations and dimensional requirements and indicated they had been developed with a collaborative approach in mind. The details of their proposed changes were summarized in two slides using a grid format for easy comparison to the existing and proposed CC-MU rezoning. Proposed regulation changes included form-based density, lower height, parking, and incentives; dimensional changes were proposed for setbacks, tower stepback and building tower floor plate size.

## **3) Public Comments**

Following is a summary of comments made by members of the community.

- Julian Castro, 530 NE 13 Court. Mr. Castro purchased his property in 2001 in anticipation of what was to come on 13 Street; he looks forward to seeing it developed and populated. His house backs up to the property shown in the slide by Ms. Crush. He stated that 55 feet is more acceptable than 105 feet. While he understands the commercial owners do not feel that it is viable, he is concerned that the sun would be completely blocked with the exception of May through July, and that height would not fit the character of the

neighborhood. He stated the developers could find a way to make the numbers work if they wanted to.

- Jacob Resnick, 1405 N Dixie Highway. Mr. Resnick agreed with the previous speaker, and stated that large 105-foot high buildings would strain the utilities such as the stormwater systems. He acknowledged that some development is great but did not feel that Option A works for the residents.
- John Hayden, 539 NE 13 Court. Mr. Hayden stated that he had watched Wilton Manors flounder with zoning and failed growth, that this community needs to build. He added that comparing 13<sup>th</sup> and the stretch of 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Sunrise & Broward was incorrect. He acknowledged that they need more foot traffic, not motor traffic, especially between 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m.; he added that ingress and egress need to be considered as it will be extremely limited.
- Jacob Schickler, 713 NE 17 Court. Mr. Schickler had just recently moved to the area and suggested that adding high rises would feel like downtown and completely change the walkability of the area. He cited concerns with cast shadows; increased traffic when the current flow is already very heavy; impact on the sewer system; flooding, and classroom sizes in schools. He stated he is for development, but it needs to be intentional and sustainable, taking into account the local business that are there. He also stated that he is “definitely opposed.”
- Arthur Marcus, 1800 North Andrews. Mr. Marcus stated that zoning was never meant to be a one size that fits all philosophy, and in this case, it does not fit. He stated that he thought Option B provides different solutions for the neighborhoods, and inquired whether the Board had voted on the options presented yet.

Chair White clarified that the Board voted on the proposal in March, but there appeared to be a misunderstanding that the commercial business owners had agreed with the proposal; the Board is reconsidering that vote and other proposals as well.

Mr. Liggett stated that the Board had adopted Option B in a 5/2 vote in March; there were many public meetings since 2018, and business owners had every opportunity to participate.

Vice Chair Wright invited those present to review the history of past meetings which they can find in the public record. She affirmed that at the meeting in March, the Chair at that time indicated that the business owners signed letters conveying agreement with the rezoning, but some notice requirements were not followed. She stated that the Board made a decision based on the information available at that time, and highlighted the intent was to have a fair and equitable discussion. Additionally, Ms. Wright explained that the reason for the meeting was the Board had to wait for the commercial

business owners to respond because their position had been misrepresented; this meeting was the first time that they had come forward in almost a year.

Chair White reiterated that the goal was for the Board to discuss, and make decisions, so they can move forward with a proposal.

- Dr. Paul Rikeit, 713 NE 17 Court. Dr. Rikeit stated that he moved to Middle River Terrace last Summer and was shocked to hear about Option A as it does not align with what was discussed at his neighborhood association meetings. He set up a petition to stop Option A and ensure that their desire for neighborhood-friendly rezoning solutions could be heard, a copy is part of the public record. He added that during the previous 3 weeks, just under 200 votes had been collected; 181 were digital votes. He and his partner decided to move into the area because of the tranquility and walkability of the neighborhood; he loves his jogging route and being able to see downtown Fort Lauderdale close by; he is concerned about traffic and asked that the Board listed to the residents, look at transition zones and how many are speaking in favor of Option A since they have nearly 200 speaking against it.
- Lorraine Saunders, 1735 NW 7 Avenue. Ms. Saunders stated that she had been living in South Middle River since 1993, and it had been a dream to make 13 Street as walkable as Las Olas is for locals, but it never happened. She added that it feels hopeless because of all of the constraints that did not allow variances. While she is opposed to Option A, she wants to see something happen, and likes several things in the other plans. She stated that nothing has changed in so long, and wants to see people come together to make something happen.
- Olga Zamora, 1115 NW 3 Avenue. Ms. Zamora stated that she is in support of the recommendation by City Staff. She observed that CRAs in Pompano Beach, Delray Beach, Miami, and Northwest Progresso Village are trying to move away from slum and blight, and would like to see those changes in her neighborhood, respectful of transitional zoning, homesteaded property owners and businesses. She asked that the rezoning be done so that it creates excitement on 'NE 13<sup>th</sup>' as well as on her side of the side of South Middle River because she did not wish to feel 'forgotten'.
- Tomislav Lukic, 1109 NE 3 Avenue. Mr. Lukic stated that under the proposed changes, the plot across the street from him would be entirely rebuilt. He estimated that a 150-foot building with the sun at a 40 degree angle could cast a 170-foot long on 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue; at 80-feet, that shadow would be 95-feet long and 'condemn' him to live in the dark in the mornings because he lives in a townhouse and a street that is not that wide. He shared that construction of a house by his neighbor over a period of 6 months caused his house to shake and it would be exacerbated with an 80-foot building so he requested that the Board consider a limit of 50 feet under Plan B for 13<sup>th</sup>.
- Susanna Coleman, 1313 NE 5 Terrace. Ms. Coleman stated that she lives behind the location of the proposed building. She purchase a small 1929 Key West-style bungalow

in 2003 and saw the neighborhood come a long way. She is excited and open to development but Option A is not desired for reasons others had previously stated. Msl Coleman also pressed concerns with traffic as it is already very difficult to access her property from 13 Street, and with increased flooding. She stated that she and her neighbors are open to Option B as the best fit for them.

- Dr. Jeff Musgrove, 534 NE 13 Court. Mr. Musgrove also lives behind the proposed building; he encouraged the Board to think about the transition, not only from a commercial perspective, but also from a community and psychological perspective because it would change their lives in many ways. He had already had to deal with noise pollution and had installed buffers in his windows, so he felt residents need to be protected. Mr. Musgrove felt that development is important, that psychological welfare and health are also important, so he is not in favor of Option A.
- Ali Vazquez, 1622 NE 8 Avenue. Ms. Vasquez referenced the statement made earlier by Chair White that the current Board was willing to reconsider a decision made on March 6, 2024. She stated that it had been discussed by the community since 2018, opinions were taken in public charrets, and people explained that they did not want to be 'boxed in' by the shadow of high rises. She felt that the shadow cast by building would be detrimental to her neighborhood. Ms. Vasquez understood the desire to have a business area on 13 Street, but stated that it did not require 15 floors of mixed use and affordable housing. She asked that the Board honor the decisions made, and go with Option B as Option A would repeal the rights of property owners to speak out against projects that could adversely affect their properties.
- Ross Parker, 920 NE 13 Street. Mr. Parker introduced himself as the founder of Call of Africa's Native Visions Galleries. He invested in his building in 1997, took on drug dealers and pimps with other owners to greatly improve the street, and invested a lot of money in it. He stated that he is looking to invest about \$1.5 million in his building to put in a gallery, and can put it elsewhere. He also cited the investment that other businesses made on the street and inquired how much residents are investing. Mr. Parker asked for consideration of the effort invested to turn the street around, and stated that they need the density for the businesses to succeed.
- Clint Allen, 1617 N Dixie Highway. Mr. Allen owns a single family home and is also concerned about the increase in density; he understood that some is needed to sustain the businesses but did not think there was enough consideration of the capacity for the resulting increased traffic. He said he agreed with what Ms. Crush said about medium height buildings, but that her proposal of 1.2 cars per unit will generate parking on residential streets. He also did not think that \$10,000 per unit to 'get out' of affordable housing would stop people from developing large buildings. He asked that the practical reality be considered because the residents have to live there.
- Robert Mazzola, 1525 NE 5 Avenue. Mr. Mazzola stated that they bought his home when it was a transitional neighborhood in 2016; that they invest, are tax payers and voters.

He added that his business failed on 13 Street because of code limitations. While the Board and Zoning have been talking about it for years, they still want Option B.

- Brian Smith, 1013 NE 13 St. Mr. Smith stated that he represents multiple commercial property owners on 13 Street. He referenced the comments regarding shadow cast, and stormwater challenges, then reminded everyone that current zoning is 150 ft by right and it was that way when they purchased their properties. He felt that a reduction to 90 feet as a middle ground is a gift. Regarding storm water concerns, he stated that new buildings would not create more rain or have an impact on stormwater. He added that the area has been starved of redevelopment. Additionally, he assured the Board that they have four to five separate folios and six addresses and stated that those property owners never received notice about the proposed zoning change.
- Mel Lenet, 920 NE 13 Street. Mr. Lenet stated that he works with Ross Parker, and had heard a lot of perspective from each side and affirmed that the current zoning is 150 feet. He has worked on that street since 2009 in a small business, and referenced the comment about small businesses that have come and gone; he highlighted that without foot traffic, those amenities would not survive so more density is needed. Mr. Lenet felt that the middle ground is the way to go and the 90 feet proposal is the most viable solution to allow the amenities that everyone wants.

Additional feedback from the public was submitted electronically and may be found in the public record.

#### **4) Board Discussion and Recommendation**

Chair White advised Mr. Liggett that the City Attorney had informed him, through City Staff, that there is a possibility that Mr. Liggett would be in violation of the Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct if he chose to participate in discussions because of some proposals that had been made. Mr. White clarified that it was his duty to inform Mr. Liggett, and was not making an accusation. Ms. Laura Reece, Acting City Manager, reminded Mr. Liggett of a previous conversation, and stated that information on his involvement outside of the Board meeting had been brought to the attention of the City Attorney. She indicated that, as was shared one-on-one with him prior to the meeting, that her office was directed to advise Mr. Liggett that he could be in violation of the Code of Ethics if he participated. Ms. Reece cited this section of the Code of Conduct: "... the Members should refrain from participating in any proceeding in which their impartiality could be reasonably questioned."

Ms. Reece clarified for Mr. Catalano that Staff is not in a position to weigh in on different scenarios concerning the Code of Ethics.

Mr. Liggett explained to those present that he is the president of the Middle River Terrace Neighborhood Association (MRTNA) as well as a member of this Board; he understood that members filed a complaint with the City indicating that he was not impartial. Mr. Liggett advised that he handed out a neighborhood flyer by going door-to-door to

encourage attendance at this meeting so neighbors could express their opinion; he did not believe he violated the Code of Conduct. He stated that his Commissioner encouraged him to continue trying to find a consensus, and referenced the six amendments that he distributed at the last meeting. Mr. Liggett also stated that he would participate in the meeting, and continue to move forward with rezoning.

Mr. Greenbaum stated that he was surprised that Mr. Liggett did not think his actions could be in violation of the Code; Mr. Liggett stated that the Board of Directors had signed off on it, and he was one of the persons handing it out.

Chair White disclosed that the office of the Vice Mayor also expressed concern to him, and recommended that the Board select Option B. He stated that it is his job to ensure that Members are unbiased and he would not compromise the integrity of this Board. Chair White added that he too had an issue with the actions that Mr. Liggett had taken and his discussion with the Vice Mayor was different than what had been represented; he hoped they could move forward in a positive manner.

Vice Chair Wright acknowledged that Mr. Liggett is the President of MRTNA. She noted that while several CCRAB members also serve on the South Middle River Terrace Board, they did not send a letter or expose their position on the rezoning, so she agreed with Mr. Greenbaum; in that it goes against what they should be doing and it is their duty to be fair and would make their decisions accordingly.

Mr. Catalano stated that he also serves as President of SMRCA and sent out an announcement about this meeting to encourage residents to come out and have their voices heard so they could be considered in the decisions that would be made.

Mr. Stan did not see anything wrong with the letter or the involvement by Mr. Liggett in distributing it; he said it engaged the community and was responsible for the turnout. In his opinion, it is the duty of the Board to inform, engage and come up with a consensus.

Mr. Liggett felt there was an objection to the substance of the flyer. He indicated that this Board voted for Option B in March, and it is the responsibility of Boards to support what was voted for. He stated that his petition supported the current position of this Board, explained what happened, what the Board adopted, and asked people to come and defend that.

Vice Chair Wright stated that the Board can update a recommendation to the CRA; she clarified that the Board is not the CRA, and they can change a recommendation if and when new information becomes available. Ms. Wright also stated that they had been notified by threat of a lawsuit that there was misrepresentation of information by someone on the Board; this caused them to question and go back to validate the information on

which that decision was made. She indicated that this was an opportunity to hear from both the commercial owners and residents.

Chair White reminded those present that this is an advisory board to the CRA, and everything would then go to Planning and Zoning and before the City Commission; they are here to work together. He added that if the Board does nothing tonight, property owners could move forward with Live Local, and no one could do anything about that. Chair White reiterated that they want a “Live, Work, Play” community and to agree on how to move forward. He added that the CRA missed three booms, so they need to move forward in a positive way; if not with A or B, it could be a combination.

Mr. Catalano asked what mid-rise would be in terms of feet.

Ms. Crush clarified that a mid-rise would be between 75-feet and 80-feet under the Florida Building Code. She explained that they modeled eight stories with an active roof, but it could be slightly higher from a Zoning perspective because they use newly-established grade for site plan height purposes. Mr. Fajardo, Assistant City Manager, believed that Ms. Crush was correct.

Vice Chair Wright requested clarification on the height variance of 10-feet based on the answer to the prior question, as opposed to the 90-feet mentioned in the Crush proposal. Ms. Crush explained that the Florida Building code measures the top floor of a building whereas the City measures height to the main roof slab; this accounted for the additional 10-feet. Further, if you activate an un-enclosed roof space, you need a perimeter wall or glass railing and must at minimum calculate the additional 42 inches from the main roof slab.

Ms. Devonish clarified that Ms. Crush is asking for the same as the 80 feet that is required for mid-rise on NE 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Mr. Stan referenced a slide in the presentation made by Ms. Crush that outlined the NE 13 Street commercial property owners; he said it suggested they represent nearly half of those businesses on the Northeast side east of NE 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and inquired whether they had reached out to the other business owners to solicit their opinions before developing the proposal. Ms. Crush stated that Mr. Jason Crush had done so and had a sign-in sheet for meetings that were held. She noted that those businesses did not reach out afterwards to state their position, so she was being careful not to speak for them as it was not solidified. Mr. Stan stated that he was trying to avoid another group of business owners coming back with a different opinion. Ms. Crush clarified that all of the business owners they represent had approved of the proposal presented.

Ms. Fleishman was under the impression that developers would take responsibility for improving the infrastructure. Ms. Crush stated that for any new proposed site plans, City of

Fort Lauderdale and Broward County regulations require a capacity analysis for water and sewer to determine whether an upgrade is needed prior to approval being given for Certificate of Occupancy. Ms. Crush also explained that both the City and County requires that 100% of stormwater be retained within the boundaries of a property, and clarified that regulations determine infrastructure improvement by anticipated capacity, not height.

Ms. Devonish clarified that while the criteria for approval to go from 125-feet to 150-feet in Option B had not yet been fully developed by the Planning and Zoning Board, components would include a neighborhood compatibility test. Mr. Fajardo added that under the current zoning, there are developments that have to go to the Planning and Zoning Board, typically for conditional use approvals as applicable or mixed use; there are also permitted by right uses that can go up to 150-feet with Staff-level approval. Mr. Fajardo also clarified that Live Local is a State Statute that requires administrative approval, so it would not go before Planning and Zoning. He noted that other than density or height, zoning regulations would still apply for items such as parking.

Chair White explained affordable housing and highlighted that it would create density without any type of business or quality of life. He added that there are a lot of caveats and the Board is trying to ensure the entire neighborhood is protected, and coming together as a group.

Vice Chair Wright asked what City Staff would recommend considering the Crush proposal of 90-feet and concerns of the community on parking and encroachment. Ms. Devonish stated something similar to what is allowed in other zoning districts with similar density and intensity; the first 2,500 exemption and 60% of the parking standard was applicable for commercial use. For residential, she believed it was the same standard or similar in Northwest RAC. Mr. Fajardo clarified that for mixed use areas, what was proposed is the parking standard; if the CCRAB wanted to use the parking standard for residential as opposed to a mixed use, they could look at the Central Beach Activity Center; he outlined how Code is typically applied by type of use because they do not want parking bleeding into residential areas.

Mr. Greenbaum inquired whether a Live Local Act project would have to comply with a reduced parking requirement because he did not want to risk reducing it just to see one not have to conform. Mr. Fajardo reiterated that the zoning ordinance for parking would typically apply, but it may be possible to craft it in a way that it would not; he needed to verify that with the City Attorney and would advise.

Vice Chair Wright recalled there had been many comments regarding shadows; she requested clarification on how the foliage and tree canopy would be protected. Mr. Fajardo indicated that they had just updated the landscaping ordinance to incentivize preservation, and they rely on landscape architects to determine what vegetation is appropriate; the Code does not include much language on vegetation or shadow.

Mr. Liggett observed that the slide with the blue and red bands above the building in the Crush presentation did not appear to be to scale. Mr. Crush acknowledged that while the height of the building was to scale at 90-feet, the bands were not.

Vice Chair Wright observed that the commercial business owners proposed a 16,000 maximum gross square footage for both residential and non-residential floor plate size, as opposed to 10,000 for residential and 16,000 for non-residential as currently proposed by the City. As a point of reference, Ms. Crush clarified that two towers are being proposed at 12,500 square feet with appropriate separation; she did not see the need to distinguish between commercial and residential use as a hotel looks similar to a residential building from the exterior. Mr. Fajardo stated that from a planning perspective, slender buildings are preferred as they allow more light and air to the ground, further separation, and other design benefits; he explained that Staff proposed different floor plate sizes to be consistent with the format used in the downtown area.

With regards to residential parking, Ms. Crush stated more evaluation should be done specifically with respect to studios to avoid spillover, so she withdrew the suggestion of 1.2 vehicles per unit.

Vice Chair Wright requested context from Staff regarding the potential impact of density on schools as it had been mentioned during the public comments; she understood that many schools are under populated. Mr. Fajardo stated that while he did not have a specific update from the School Board, an analysis would be done to determine adequacy requirements as a requirement of the ULDR.

Vice Chair Wright noted that the community had spoken loudly on traffic concerns and she too had a concern, so she asked whether Staff had recommendations to address traffic smoothing. Mr. Fajardo reminded the Board of their option to send a Communication to the Commission regarding overall traffic patterns; he stated that traffic is one of the many elements evaluated as part of their adequacy requirements to approve a development.

Mr. Stan acknowledged that the commercial property owners expressed concern about losing their rights so he was considering Option D as proposed by the City. It was clarified by Mr. Fajardo and Ms. Devonish that Section 47-26A.1 under Option D would not have to be "baked in"; those owners would be able to apply for approval by the City Commission. Mr. Fajardo added that it is not commonly used. Ms. Devonish clarified that owners would be limited to one regulation under Section 47-26A.1; multiple applications of prior regulations are not permitted.

Chair White acknowledged that residents are looking for lower height, and suggested that they consider coming to consensus on uniformity considering it will take the next three to five years to happen.

**Motion** by Vice Chair Wright, seconded by Mr. Catalano, to proceed by evaluating the most recent recommendations on a line-by-line basis using the Plan B, Option 2 map on page 6 of the Central City Updated Recommendations document as presented by Staff. The motion passed with 9 votes in favor; Ms. Fleischman had stepped away temporarily.

Mr. Liggett distributed three proposed changes to the boundaries of Option B for review by the Board and to City Staff for their reference in the ensuing discussion.

**Motion** by Mr. Liggett, seconded by Mr. Stan, to change the area between NE 7 Avenue, the railroad track and contiguous line of the current Commercial Business zone to CC-GMU at 80-feet instead of CC-NMU as marked in the map that he distributed. In a roll vote, the motion failed 6/4.

Vice Chair Wright stated that she felt this was a good discussion that should be revisited after the Board has gone through additional requirements.

**Motion** by Mr. Greenbaum, seconded by Mr. Ross, that the area designated as CC-NMU on the Option B revised map be reclassified as CC-CMU in the area denoted with a purple triangle border South of NE 13 Street on the proposal distributed by Mr. Liggett. In a roll vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

It was difficult for those that did not receive a copy of the handouts distributed to follow the discussion. As suggested by Mr. Fajardo, and agreed by the Board, Staff will present a revised comprehensive layout of what was being approved at the next meeting so that their understanding of zoning decisions being made can be clarified.

**Motion** by Mr. Liggett, seconded by Mr. Stan, to amend zoning at the intersection of NE 13<sup>th</sup> Street and NE 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Option B so that the two lots to the North of NE 13 Street are zoned CC-NMU to match the rest of Option B along NE 13 Street. In a roll vote, the motion failed 2/8.

Mr. Liggett referenced a ‘bump out’ on the West side of NE 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and North of NE 11<sup>th</sup> Street in the CC-GMU area on page 6 of the CCRAB deck, and moved to change the zoning to CC-NMU at 55 feet. Mr. Fajardo cautioned that could be considered “spot zoning; and recommended that Staff be allowed to come back with requirements to better address the transition to residential in that area as part of the regulations rather than creating a specific parcel that is zoned. Mr. Liggett agreed and withdrew his motion.

As a point of reference for the ensuing discussion on height, Vice Chair Wright referenced Option B heights and details on Page 3 of the CCRAB deck, and the map on Page 6 (Option B/Option 2), as the map on Page was incorrect as agreed earlier.

Discussion ensued on proposed height allowances in the CC-CMU zone. Vice Chair Wright, seconded by Mr. Mabey, moved to maintain the height restrictions as proposed by

the City for CC-CMU, however, Mr. Liggett challenged the need for a motion and Chair White felt it was important to establish that there is agreement. Ms. Wright and Mr. Mabey agreed to withdraw their motion.

There was discussion on heights in the proposed CC-GMU district; Ms. Devonish understood that the commercial property owners were comfortable with 80 feet along NE 4 Avenue, and wanted to amend the CC-NMU along NE 13 Street to a height of 90 feet. This was confirmed by Mr. Crush. Chair White and Ms. Devonish then affirmed that height on NE 4 Avenue would stay at 80 feet.

Discussion regarding amending heights in the CC-NMU on NE 13 Street to 90 feet as requested by the commercial property owners ensued; an associated motion by Vice Chair Wright, seconded by Mr. Ross, was later amended after the following points were debated.

Mr. Stan expressed concern due to the width of 13 Street; he stated the rules that apply to NE 4 Avenue should not apply to 13 Street because it is not as wide. Ms. Devonish added from a sidebar, that 80 feet would be amenable on NE 13 Street. Chair White asked Mr. Fajardo to weigh in on moving height from NMU to GMU at 80 feet due to concerns with height and density. Mr. Fajardo stated that typically, in constrained locations such as that area, the short depth especially on the north side, was not something to be too concerned about. Chair White deferred to Mr. Crush for input on behalf of his clients.

Jason Crush/Crush Law felt they would be able to make it work at 80 feet. He added that the consistency with NE 4 Avenue and NE 13 Street would give others desired predictability in the neighborhood. Mr. Crush explained that they had put in for 90 feet to allow flexibility for active roof tops, but they could lose that or pursue through P&Z instead.

Chair White stated that he agreed with Mr. Stan, and asked whether Mr. Crush had a concern with impact from 80 feet on NE 4 Avenue versus a condensed portion of that height with setback and restrictions on NE 13 Street. Mr. Crush referred to the rendering in their presentation, and stated that it represents the largest possible project on the largest strip of land, so there would be much smaller projects with roads in between because most of the properties are less than 250 feet long from street to street. He added that would be the maximum possible unless someone did Live Local, which would go "straight up" with no podium height restriction, step back, or building steps and he knew that people were looking at that. Mr. Crush stated that there would not be a wall of buildings as there is no ability to combine all those properties; most would have a 200-foot long podium with a 14,000 sq ft floor plate on top.

Mr. Stan inquired about the recommended tower step back towards NE 13 Street from 12 feet down to zero feet in the proposal. Mr. Crush stated that instead of putting less step back on the residential side, they wanted to move towards NE 13 Street which is 70 feet wide, as compared to 50 feet in Flagler Village. It would facilitate a consistent façade on

NE 13 Street instead of a tower step which would generate requests for deviation. He noted that they did not ask for a reduced step back on the residential side; there would be a 30 foot tower separation; and they do not have a building designed. Mr. Stan stated it would create a “box” effect and a reduction of heights is better. Vice Chair Wright asked if there was a lower height that was acceptable.

Mr. Mabey asked whether the rendering would be the tallest on the street. Mr. Crush explained the rendering was a model utilizing the largest stretch of land, with the maximum height and width allowed today, adding he does not foresee one of those being built.

Mr. Liggett stated that 80 feet by right was approved on NE 13 Street, the entire neighborhood would be against the plan; he offered a friendly amendment that they keep it at 55 feet but allow them to go to 80 feet under the same standards that they allow 105 feet to go to 150 feet because there are places on the North side of NE 13 Street that should have the opportunity to go to Planning and Zoning for conditional plans. He asked that Staff work on that concept. Vice Chair Wright acknowledged what Mr. Liggett was trying to do, however, she felt a more amenable solution would be more productive in the long term and reduce the risk of Live Local projects. Mr. Ross stated he agreed with Ms. Wright that a compromise was needed with the current property owners so they have the ability to develop, without “ham-stringing” them so they sell to developers that will build undesirable towers as tall as they can.

Mr. Greenbaum asked whether the motion was to change the zoning to GMU; Ms. Wright clarified that it was to adjust the height in NMU on NE 13 Street. Mr. Greenbaum stated he would like to see the limit of 80 feet. Vice Chair Wright amended her motion as follows:

**Motion** by Vice Chair Wright, seconded by Mr. Greenbaum, to update the height requirement for CC-NMU along NE 13 Street from 55-feet to 80-feet as discussed with the commercial business owners, with a limitation that it can go no higher. In a roll vote, the **motion** passed 8/2.

Prior to voting, Mr. Liggett stated that this proposal was not close to a compromise; it was going from a neighborhood-friendly plan to a 100% business developer plan and would cause problems at the Planning and Zoning step. Chair White reiterated that agreement on a compromise was needed. Mr. Stan reminded the advisory board of the public testimonies and the need for impartiality when voting. Ms. Wright disagreed with Mr. Liggett, stating that the current allowed height is 150-ft. so it was not a 100% business focus as they are losing nearly half of their height albeit with restrictions. She reiterated that a balance was needed.

Chair White stated that he agreed 100% with Vice Chair Wright and stated that this was not about taking rights away, but protecting the rights of everyone and finding a compromise.

Vice Chair Wright reviewed the proposed dimensional requirements from the presenter's deck and confirmed with other Members of the Board that there were no changes to lot sizes, lot width for FAR, building streetwall length, setbacks, podium minimum and maximum; she then opened discussion on tower stepback.

**Motion** by Vice Chair Wright, seconded by Mr. Ross, to maintain the tower stepback as proposed by Staff in Option B. In a roll vote, the **motion** passed 9/1.

With regards to maximum gross square footage of a building tower floor plate size, it was noted that while the commercial business owners requested no separation between residential and non-residential towers, no changes were made to the section of Option B in the proposal from Staff.

Chair White requested clarification on zoning in RMM-25; he was trying to protect that area as well. Ms. Devonish clarified that RMM-25 is located just East of NE 4 Avenue and NE 13 Street and is a multi-family zoning district with uses from single family to multi-family with a 25 unit per acre density cap. A mixed use development would be a conditional use in that area and require approval by the Planning and Zoning Board. She clarified that it would not be subject to development of a Live Local project.

Vice Chair Wright raised the issue of parking and stated that she did not think they should deviate from the Staff recommendation. Mr. Fajardo stated that Staff needed to evaluate that further so they can present a proposal for further consideration at the next meeting.

Mr. Liggett passed out a parking-related 'exhibit' which was from a meeting with a Central City Alliance group of businesses in October.

**Motion** by Mr. Liggett, seconded by Mr. Catalano, to eliminate the proposed parking reductions by Staff based on the testimony heard, and revert to the general parking ratios that apply to developments throughout the City. In a roll vote, motion failed 3/7.

During discussion, Mr. Fajardo clarified this motion would not preclude an individual from submitting for a parking reduction through a standard process; it would require Planning and Zoning approval. Chair White stated that while he understands the parking issues, it would be unfair not to take a recommendation from City Staff without further consideration of the information they offered to present at the next meeting.

## **VI. Communication to City Commission**

Mr. Liggett wished to communicate that this Board does not recommend that the City Commission consider the Corradino Group because of their lack of incorporating neighborhood concerns in the proposal. Chair asked for clarification from Staff before discussion moved forward as he did not think this Board had authority to make recommendations on procurement of services. Ms. Reece advised that the Board can recommend anything to the City Commission,

and Staff would have to look at the procurement rules and advise the City Commission of that at the time they consider the recommendation.

Mr. Liggett reiterated his intent by moving to request that the City consider other consultants for the land use proposal, other than the Corradino Group, due to their lack of incorporating neighborhood concerns and communicating with the neighborhood on their recommendation for rezoning. Mr. Fajardo advised it would happen by default through the RFP process, so respondents would be ranked according to the procurement process. Mr. Liggett asked why the wait to hire the Corradino Group. Mr. Fajardo stated Staff wanted that consultant to be considered because there are not a lot of options to choose from for a project of that scope.

Chair asked if there was a second. Mr. Catalano seconded the request.

Vice Chair Wright said she is a procurement professional; she stressed that government RFP are well regulated and documented, and have to follow the basis of law of fairness. She added she has no problem with a communication but wants to have further discussion and asked it can be moved to next month.

Mr. Liggett withdrew the motion and agreed to have further discussion next month. No action was taken.

## **VII. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:02 p.m.