REQUEST: Site Plan Extension for Previously Approved Site Plan Level III Development; Case R15056

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>R15056E1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>1324 Bayview Drive LLC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Location</td>
<td>1324-1326 Bayview Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Size</td>
<td>14,797 square feet / 0.33 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/ Medium High Density (RMM-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>Four-story residential buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use Designation</td>
<td>Medium-High Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable ULDR Sections</td>
<td>47-24.1.M. Expiration of Site Plan and Conditional Use Approvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification Requirements</td>
<td>Sec. 47-27.6, Sign Notice 15 days prior to meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Required</td>
<td>Approve, Approve with Conditions, or Deny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Planner</td>
<td>Yvonne Redding, Urban Planner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The applicant, 1324 Bayview Drive, LLC, is requesting a site plan extension of the original development approval granted by the Planning and Zoning Board, for a 6-unit multifamily development located at 1324 Bayview Drive, along the Seminole Lake Waterway. The project consists of a four-story structure, which includes three residential floors constructed over the ground level to include a lobby, residential amenities and parking garage. The application, narrative, and a copy of the original site plan is included as Exhibit 1.

In accordance with the City’s Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) Section 47-24.1.M.1, Expiration of Site Plan and Conditional Use Approvals, the original site plan approval dates required the applicant to submit an application for a building permit by July 15, 2018, and to obtain the permit by January 15, 2019. The applicant submitted the extension request in a timely manner given the original dates of approval. However, a calculation error was identified on the original sign-off. The correct expiration dates should have reflected a date of January 15, 2018 to apply for a building permit by and a date of July 15, 2018 to obtain a building permit by. Based on these corrected timeframes, the applicant is requesting a twenty-four (24) month time extension, which would establish the following new expiration dates:

- Apply for building permit by: January 15, 2020
- Obtain building permit by: July 15, 2020

PRIOR REVIEWS:
The Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on November 10, 2015. The Planning and Zoning Board reviewed and approved the Site Plan Level III application on June 15, 2016, by a 7-2 vote, subject to the 30-day City Commission request for review period. The City Commission did not request to review the approval of the project. The original Planning and Zoning Board staff report is attached as Exhibit 2. The June 15, 2016, Planning and Zoning Board Minutes with results are attached as Exhibit 3.

REVIEW CRITERIA:
Pursuant to ULDR Section 47-24.1.M.5.a, Expiration of Site Plan and Conditional Use Approvals, an extension of time for site plan expiration shall be granted by the reviewing body approving the site plan when all applicable building, zoning and engineering regulations remain the same and good cause for the delay has been shown by the applicant. Good cause may include, but shall not be limited to, delay caused by governmental action or inaction or other factors totally
beyond the control of the applicant. An extension shall only be granted where an applicant has requested an extension during the effective period of the development permit. If any applicable building, zoning or engineering regulation has been changed during the twenty-four (24) month period, then the proposed development shall be reviewed only to the extent that the changes affect the proposed development. The Florida Building Code has been updated since the original site plan was submitted and the applicant will be required to address the requirements of the new Florida Building Code at the time of building permit submittal.

The applicant's request and responses to the criteria are attached as Exhibit 1. The applicant states that the request is necessary because the applicant is in the process of purchasing the property and needs sufficient time to complete the acquisition process and prepare for building permit submittal.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**
Staff recommends the Board approve this request consistent with:
ULDR Section 47-24.1 M.5.a, Expiration of Site Plan and Conditional Use Approvals

**PLANNING & ZONING BOARD REVIEW OPTIONS:**
If the Planning and Zoning Board determines that the proposed site plan extension meets the standards and requirements of the ULDR, the Planning and Zoning Board shall approve or approve with conditions necessary to ensure compliance with the standards and requirements of the ULDR.

If the Planning and Zoning Board determines that the proposed site plan extension does not meet the standards and requirements of the ULDR, the Planning and Zoning Board shall deny the extension.

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:**
Should the Planning and Zoning Board approve the development, the following Engineering conditions are proposed:

1. Applicant shall address the requirements of the new Florida Building Code at the time of building permit submittal.

2. Prior to submittal of building permit, the applicant shall provide information including drawings that indicate the new Florida Building Code does not impact the overall architectural style and finish of the originally approved design.

3. Applicant will be required to pay a Park Impact Fee for the proposed residential units prior to issuance of building permit in accordance with ULDR Sec. 47-38A, Park Impact Fees.

4. This project is subject to the requirements of Broward County Public School Concurrency. The applicant will notify the School Board Superintendent or designee of this proposal. Prior to submitting an application for placement on a Planning and Zoning Board or City Commission agenda, a written response from the School Board shall be provided by the applicant. Prior to application for final DRC approval, please provide confirmation from the School District that the residential development is exempt or vested from the requirements of public school concurrency, or a School Capacity Availability Determination (SCAD) letter that confirms that capacity is available, or if capacity is not available, that mitigation requirements have been satisfied.

**EXHIBITS:**

1. Application, Narrative and Site Plan
2. Planning Zoning Staff Report, dated November 19, 2014
3. November 19, 2014, Planning and Zoning Board Minutes
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT EXTENSION APPLICATION
Administrative / Planning & Zoning Board / City Commission

REQUEST TYPES:

☐ Extension, Administrative
(Projects that have been previously approved by the Development Review Committee)  $ 89.00

☒ Extension, Planning & Zoning Board
(Projects that have been previously approved by the Planning & Zoning Board)  $ 730.00

☐ Extension, City Commission
(Projects that have been previously approved by the City Commission)  $ 670.00

REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

NOTE: The following information must be submitted prior to the existing development permit expiration deadline. All documents (other than site plans) must be on letterhead, dated, and with author indicated.

☒ Completed Development Permit Extension Application
☒ Development Permit Extension Request Letter detailing the following information:
  • Narrative Response to Section 47-24.1.M.5
  • Original Development Permit Approval Date
  • Current Development Permit Expiration Deadline Dates (for both the permit application deadline and permit issuance deadline)
  • Requested Extension Timeframes (in months)
  • Extension Justification
  • Revised Development Permit Expiration Deadline Dates (for both the permit application and permit issuance deadline)

☒ Proof of Ownership
  • Warranty deed or tax record, including corporation documents if applicable

☒ Minimum Site Plan Submittal shall include the following:
  • Cover sheet on plan set to state project name and table of contents
  • Aerial photo, must be clear and current with site highlighted
  • Approved Site Plan and Landscape Plan
  • Approved Elevations of each façade
  • Approved Renderings (if applicable)

☒ Copies of Approved Final-DRC Site Plans
  • Two (2) reduced (11” x 17”) for Administrative
  • Fourteen (14) half size (12” x 18”) for Planning and Zoning Board
  • Seventeen (17) reduced (11” x 17”) for City Commission

Updated: 2/22/2013
### Applicant Information Sheet

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The following information is requested pursuant to the City’s Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR). The application must be filled out accurately and completely. Please print or type and answer all questions. Indicate N/A if does not apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>R 15056</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development / Project Name</td>
<td>1324 BAY VIEW DRIVE LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development / Project Address</td>
<td>1324-1326 BAYVIEW DRIVE FT LAUDERDALE FL 33304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>FOUR STORY MULTIFAMILY WITH 6 UNITS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** For purpose of identification, the PROPERTY OWNER is the APPLICANT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner's Name</th>
<th>1324 BAY VIEW DRIVE LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner's Signature</td>
<td>If agent letter provided, no property owner signature required on application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeff@hendrickshomes.com">jeff@hendrickshomes.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>954 646 1973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proof of Ownership**

- [ ] Warranty Deed
- [x] Tax Record

**NOTE:** If AGENT is to represent OWNER, notarized letter of consent is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant / Agent’s Name</th>
<th>Gustavo J. Carbonell Architect/Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant / Agent’s Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Gcarbonell@jcarch.com">Gcarbonell@jcarch.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>954 462 6565 x 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Letter of Consent Submitted**: [Y/E]

**Code Enforcement Review Information**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Submit this application to the Code Enforcement Division for review and sign-off. Contact the Code Enforcement Customer Service center at 954-828-5207 for more information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Enforcement</th>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Enforcement Signature</th>
<th>Staff Member Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
January 12, 2019

Department of Sustainable Development
Planning Department
700 NW 19th Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Fl. 33311

RE: BAYVIEW DRIVE LLC
A six-unit multifamily development
1324 Bayview Drive
Ft. Lauderdale, Fl. 33304
DRC Case R 15056

Narrative as it pertains to the City of Ft. Lauderdale, ULDR.

An extension of time for site plan expiration shall be granted by the reviewing body approving the site plan when all applicable building, zoning and engineering regulations remain the same and good cause for the delay has been shown by the applicant. Good cause may include, but shall not be limited to, delay caused by governmental action or inaction or other factors totally beyond the control of the applicant. An extension shall only be granted where an applicant has requested an extension during the effective period of the development permit. If any applicable building, zoning or engineering regulation has been changed during the twenty-four (24) month period, then the proposed development shall be reviewed only to the extent that the changes affect the proposed development.

To whom it may concern;

The referenced residential development that consists of 6 multifamily 3-bedroom units in a 4-story structure received final DRC, Development Review Committee, approval from the City of Fort Lauderdale on December 15, 2016.
Application to obtain a building permit is to be submitted prior to July 15, 2018. A building permit application was filed on December 28, 2018 under building permit 16122017. Comments have been addressed and pending the final Broward County Environmental approval and a few other items.

A building permit is to be obtained prior to January 15, 2019. This application is hereby submitted prior to the expiration date to request an extension of an additional 24 months to obtain a building permit prior to January 15, 2021.

The developer is in the process of obtaining financing and completing other necessary documentation in order to secure the pending Broward County permits as well as payment of the impact fees.

Sincerely;

[Signature]

Gustavo J. Carbonell, A.I.A. Authorized agent.
September 15, 2015

City of Ft. Lauderdale
Sustainable Development Department
Planning and Zoning 700 NW 19th Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33311

Re: Site plan approval process for parcel located at 1324 -1326 Bayview Drive,
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

A.K.A. BEACHWAY HEIGHTS UNIT B 25-27 B LOT 17 SW 10, 18
FOLIO NUMBER: 4942 36 08 0150

Sir or Madam;

I, MAHIDASHTIZAD, SHAHAB, Manager of 1324 BAY VIEW DRIVE LLC, authorize my architect, Gustavo J. Carbonell, to act as my authorized agent for any submissions and approval processes in regard to the referenced multifamily project.

Respectfully;

Signed and notarized before me this day of July, 21015

Notary public

Kim A. Zafke
1457 NE 4th Avenue • Fort Lauderdale, FL 33304 • Phone: 954.462.6565 • Fax: 954.527.0857 • www.guscarbonell.com
Florida Limited Liability Company
1324 BAY VIEW DRIVE LLC

Filing Information
Document Number: L15000050113
FEI/EIN Number: NONE
Date Filed: 03/19/2015
Effective Date: 03/19/2015
State: FL
Status: ACTIVE

Principal Address
4020 SW 30TH AVE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33312

Mailing Address
4020 SW 30TH AVE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33312

Registered Agent Name & Address
MAHIDASHTIZAD, SHAHAB
4020 SW 30TH AVE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33312

Authorized Person(s) Detail
Name & Address
Title MGR
MAHIDASHTIZAD, SHAHAB
4020 SW 30TH AVE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33312

Title MGR
BULHACK, KENNETH
4020 SW 30TH AVE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33312

Annual Reports
No Annual Reports Filed
The just values displayed below were set in compliance with Sec. 193.011, Fla. Stat., and include a reduction for costs of sale and other adjustments required by Sec. 193.011(8).

### Property Assessment Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Building / Improvement</th>
<th>Just / Market Value</th>
<th>Assessed / SOH Value</th>
<th>Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$295,920</td>
<td>$653,900</td>
<td>$949,820</td>
<td>$837,490</td>
<td>$15,796.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$295,920</td>
<td>$653,900</td>
<td>$949,820</td>
<td>$761,360</td>
<td>$13,756.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$295,920</td>
<td>$426,990</td>
<td>$722,910</td>
<td>$692,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2019 Exemptions and Taxable Values by Taxing Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Just Value</th>
<th>Portability</th>
<th>Assessed/SOH</th>
<th>Homestead</th>
<th>Add. Homestead</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Exempt Type</th>
<th>Taxable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>$949,820</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$837,490</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$837,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board</td>
<td>$949,820</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$949,820</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$949,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>$949,820</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$949,820</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$949,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>$949,820</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$837,490</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$837,490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sales History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Book/Page or CIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/28/2015</td>
<td>WD-D</td>
<td>$1,336,800</td>
<td>112900031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/2004</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>38578 / 1405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/1/1992</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
<td>19512 / 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1/1992</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>$66,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjust. Bldg. S.F. (Card, Sketch)</th>
<th>3627</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eff./Act. Year Built: 1982/1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Special Assessments

- Fire: 03
- Garb: R
- Light: 3
- Drain: 03
- Impr: R
- Safe: R
- Storm: 3
- Clean: R
- Misc: R
## Permit

### Permit Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Date</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>thomc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issued Date</td>
<td>Operator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Number</td>
<td>16122017</td>
<td>Project Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.O. Number</td>
<td>Operator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.O. Issued</td>
<td>Usage</td>
<td>CNDO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Permit Number**: 16122017  
**FOLIO NBR**: 9236080150  
**Permit Type**: BNEWCSM  
**Balance Due**: $44,254.92  
**Property Address**: 1324 BAYVIEW DR  
**Status**: Open
Applied Value 2713000 Units 21704

Calculated Value 0 Contractor TBD

Property On Permit

FOLIO NBR 9236080150

Unit

Address 1324 BAYVIEW DR
City/State/Zip FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33304

Owner On Permit

Name JEFF HENDRICKS HOMES III INC
Address 1324 BAYVIEW DR
City/State/Zip FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33304-1623
Type Private

Applicant

Name ANN MARIE HAMMOND
Address
City/State/Zip
Type Other

Miscellaneous Information / Notes

NEW 4 STORY 6 UNIT CONDOMINUMUM 3BED 3.5 BATHS
NOC ELEVATION CERTIFICATES REQUIRED

4/18/17 R-RECHECK B F G M P

09/22/2017 PLANS OUT TO HENREY FOR CORRECTION


5/30/18 RECHECK B F G
PROPOSED NEW CONDOMINIUM FOR:
"BAYVIEW DRIVE LLC"
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA 33304

BAYVIEW DRIVE

G.J.C.
05/14/2015
14-055
Proposed New Condominium for:
Bayview Drive LLC
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33304

Site to be Zoned R-25 (Multi Family) Min. Lot Size 50' x 100' - According to the Zoning Ordinace of the City of Fort Lauderdale

1. CONTEXT PLAN

2. NOT USED

3. TYPICAL SITE DETAILS

4. SITE & BUILDING DATA

5. LEGAL DESCRIPTION

6. SITE & BUILDING DATA
PROPOSED NEW CONDOMINIUM FOR:
"BAYVIEW DRIVE LLC"
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA 33304

1324 - 1326 BAYVIEW DRIVE

GUSTAVO J. CARBONELL, P.A.

05/14/2015

14-055

G.J.C.

AS NOTED

F.S.

"BAYVIEW DRIVE LLC"

14-055-A-2, 10/11/2016 12:35:53 PM, _AutoCAD PDF (General Documentation).pc3
**REQUEST:** Site Plan Level III Review; Waterway Use / 6-unit multifamily residential development with yard modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>R15056</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>1324 Bay View Drive LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Location</td>
<td>1324 Bayview Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Size</td>
<td>14,797 square feet / 0.33 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Residential Multifamily Mid Rise District (RMM-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td>One Multifamily Buildings to be demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Land Use Designation</td>
<td>Medium-High Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicable ULDR Sections</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-5.36, Table of Dimensional Requirements for the RMM-25 District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-23.8, Waterway Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-23.11, Modification of Required Yards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-25.2, Adequacy Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-25.3, Neighborhood Compatibility Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Proposed</strong></th>
<th><strong>Required</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Density</td>
<td>8 units max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>5,000 square feet min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Width</td>
<td>50 feet min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>55 feet max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Length</td>
<td>200 feet max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Area</td>
<td>35% min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>13 spaces min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setbacks/Yards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (W)</td>
<td>25 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (S)</td>
<td>½ Height = 23 feet 1 inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (N)</td>
<td>½ Height = 23 feet 1 inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear (E) water</td>
<td>½ Height = 23 feet 1 inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear (E) water</td>
<td>Pool 20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notification Requirements</strong></td>
<td>Sec. 47-27.6. Sign Posting 15 days prior to meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Required</strong></td>
<td>Approve, Approve with Conditions, or Deny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Planner</strong></td>
<td>Florentina Hutt, AICP, Planner II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**
The applicant proposes a project consisting of six multifamily residential units along the Seminole Lake Waterway located at 1324 Bayview Drive. The project consists of a four-story structure, which includes three residential floors constructed over the ground level to include a lobby, residential amenities and parking garage. The applicant is requesting for the pool and deck to be placed within the required 20 foot landscape area adjacent to the waterway. Portions of the proposed building are also proposed within the required setback area.

**PRIOR REVIEWS:**
The Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on November 10, 2015. All comments have been addressed, and are available on file with the Department of Sustainable Development.
REVIEW CRITERIA:

**Waterway Use:**
Multifamily developments up to 55 feet in height are permitted in the Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density (RMM-25) zoning district on parcels abutting a waterway, provided the criteria outlined for a waterway use, defined further below, are met.

Pursuant to the City’s Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) Section 47-23.8., Waterway Use, developments abutting waterways shall be designed to preserve the character of the neighborhood in which they are located, harmonize with other development in the area, and protect and enhance the scenic quality and tranquility of the waterways. This section also requires a 20 foot landscaped yard adjacent to the existing bulkhead line. The applicant is requesting a modification to this requirement as the proposed pool will be placed 7 feet 7 inches from the seawall.

The building is set back 20 feet and 7 inches from the waterway, while large windows and corner balconies enhance the rear elevation, thus contributing to an attractive open space at the rear of the property. Views to the waterway are also preserved by providing 18 foot side yard setbacks at the ground floor and 15 feet setback at higher floors, maximizing the views to the water and increasing the air and space between adjacent buildings.

The applicant has submitted narratives regarding the project’s compliance with Section 47-23.8, Waterway Use to assist the Planning and Zoning Board in determining if the proposal meets these criteria. The narratives and site plan are provided as part of the backup materials.

**Modification of Required Yards:**
Pursuant to ULDR Section 47-5.36 - Note B, dimensional requirements for the RMM-25 zoning district, require a yard setback of 23 feet 1 inch (equal to half the height of the building) on all sides, except the front yard which is required to be 25 feet. The applicant is requesting a yard modification for the portions of the building that project into the required yards.

Pursuant to ULDR Section 47-23.11.A.3, Criteria for Modification of Required Yards, the Planning and Zoning Board may consider a request to modify the required yards provided that by adjustment of the yards it is found there is continuity of architectural features with adjacent properties, which encourages public pedestrian interaction between the proposed development and the existing neighborhood. As proposed, the scale, massing and the architectural treatment of the building are consistent with the development pattern of this neighborhood. Improved pedestrian experience is achieved by a proposed sidewalk connection along the street, separated from vehicular traffic by a landscape buffer. Two walkways leading to well-defined pedestrian entrances, highlighted by metal frame swing gate with trellis, aluminum horizontal picket fence with decorative stone caps, and improved landscaping in the front yard contribute to the quality of the public space and encourage pedestrian interaction with the building. In addition, the design of the building enhances the pedestrian experience through the mix of natural materials, façade articulation, and the use of large balconies that provide transparency and movement. These balconies and the large windows provide visual interest along both waterway facades, as well as from the street view.

Pursuant to ULDR Section 47-19.2.BB.2, Swimming pools, hot tubs and spas, the pool shall be subject to the minimum yard requirement of the zoning district in which it is located when it is accessory to a multifamily dwelling. The applicant is requesting the yard modification include the encroachment of the pool within the minimum yard required setback, or 7 feet 7 inches from the seawall. This is consistent with other requests and the pattern of pool locations in the general area.

The applicant has submitted narratives regarding the project’s compliance with Section 47-23.11, Modification of required yards, to assist the Planning and Zoning Board in determining if the proposal meets these criteria. The narratives are attached with the site plan and submittal material.

**Adequacy and Neighborhood Compatibility:**
The neighborhood compatibility criteria of ULDR Sec 47-25.3 include performance standards requiring all developments to be “compatible with, and preserve the character and integrity of adjacent neighborhood,
the development shall include improvements or modifications either on-site or within the public rights-of-way to mitigate adverse impacts, such as traffic, noise, odors, shadow, scale, visual nuisances, or other similar adverse effects to adjacent neighborhoods. These improvements or modifications may include, but shall not be limited to, the placement or orientation of buildings and entryways, parking areas, bufferyards, alteration of building mass, and the addition of landscaping, walls, or both, to ameliorate such impacts.

The properties surrounding the site are zoned RMM-25, the same zoning district as the subject property. Mass and scale of buildings in the proximity to the proposed project generally vary from one to four stories.

The project’s design achieves appropriate scale, light and ventilation through varied massing, building separation, and variation of fenestration, presence of large balconies and treatment of façades with quality materials. The lot will be enhanced by the proposed design of the building which incorporates large open balconies with glass or aluminum railing, glass windows and doors along most of the facades to provide a more transparent view corridor to the waterway and allow for air and space between buildings.

The applicant has submitted narratives regarding the project’s compliance with Section 47-25.3, Adequacy Requirements, and Section 47-25.3, Neighborhood Compatibility Requirements, to assist the Planning and Zoning Board in determining if the proposal meets these criteria. The narratives are attached with the site plan and submittal material.

Parking and Circulation:
As per ULDR Sec. 47-20, Parking Requirements, 13 parking spaces are required for the proposed multifamily residential use, as follows:

\[
\text{3-bedroom units @ 2.1 spaces x 6 = 13}
\]

\[
\text{TOTAL: 13 parking spaces required}
\]

The applicant is proposing to provide 15 parking spaces on-site. A new five-foot sidewalk and landscaping treatments will be constructed at the entrance to the property from the street.

Comprehensive Plan Consistency:
The proposed development is consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan in that the residential use and density proposed are permitted in the Medium High Residential land use category.

Public Participation
The rezoning request is subject to the public participation requirements established in ULDR Sec.47-27.4. Notices were emailed to Coral Ridge Civic Association, where the site is located. The applicant held a Public Participation meeting on November 22, 2015. The agent presented the project and explained the request for yard modification.

The information and affidavits provided meet the Public Participation requirements for a site plan level III application and are included in the backup.

STAFF FINDINGS:
Staff recommends the Board approve this request, consistent with:

ULDR Section 47-5.36, Table of dimensional requirements for the RMM-25 district
ULDR Section 47-23.8, Waterway Use;
ULDR Section 47-23.11, Modification of Required Yards;
ULDR Section 47-25.2, Adequacy Requirements; and
ULDR Section 47-25.3, Neighborhood Compatibility Requirements.

The applicant has provided a narrative response to the criteria, which is provided in the plan sets. Staff concurs with applicant’s assessment and finds that the application meets the requirements.
STRATEGIC CONNECTIONS:
This item is a Press Play Fort Lauderdale Strategic Plan 2018 initiative, included within the Neighborhood Enhancement Cylinder of Excellence, specifically advancing:

- Goal 5: Be a community of strong, beautiful, and healthy neighborhoods.
- Objective 2: Enhance the beauty, aesthetics, and environmental quality of neighborhoods.

This item advances the Fast Forward Fort Lauderdale Vision Plan 2035: We Are Community.

PLANNING & ZONING BOARD REVIEW OPTIONS:
If the Planning and Zoning Board determines that the proposed development or use meets the standards and requirements of the ULDR and criteria for site plan level III review, the Planning and Zoning Board shall approve or approve with conditions necessary to ensure compliance with the standards and requirements of the ULDR and criteria for the proposed development or use, the issuance of the site plan level III permit.

If the Planning and Zoning Board determines that the proposed development or use does not meet the standards and requirements of the ULDR and criteria for the proposed development or use, the Planning and Zoning Board shall deny the site plan level III permit.

Exhibit

1. Public Participation affidavit and report.
It was noted that a quorum was present at the meeting.

**Staff**
Ella Parker, Urban Design and Planning Manager  
DWayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney  
Karlanne Grant, Urban Design and Planning  
Florentina Hutt, Urban Design and Planning  
Randall Robinson, Urban Design and Planning  
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communications to City Commission**
None.

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

Vice Chair Hansen called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m. and all recited the Pledge of Allegiance. The Board members were introduced, and Urban Design and Planning Manager Ella Parker introduced the Staff members present.

II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion made by Ms. Golub, seconded by Mr. Heidelberger, to approve. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.
III. ELECTION OF BOARD CHAIRPERSON

Motion made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Ms. Golub, to nominate Leo Hansen as Chair. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Ms. Golub, seconded by Mr. Glassman, to nominate Catherine Maus as Vice Chair. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chair, Leo Hansen explained that representatives of associations and groups are allowed five minutes of speaking time, and individuals are allowed three minutes.

IV. AGENDA ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. R16010**</td>
<td>BRYL Development, LLC / Flagler 626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. R16005**</td>
<td>ALTA Flagler Village, LLC / Alta Flagler Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. R15049**</td>
<td>FTL 22 Venture, LLC / 6-Unit Multifamily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PL6004**</td>
<td>SR 84, Inc. / Furniture Consignment Warehouse Plat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. R15056**</td>
<td>1324 Bay View Drive LLC / 1324 Bayview Drive Multifamily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Notes:

Local Planning Agency (LPA) items (*) – In those 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.

1. **Applicant / Project:** BRYL Development, LLC / Flagler 626
   **Request:** Site Plan Level III Review; Conditional Use for Building Height / Multifamily Residential Development in Downtown Regional Activity Center – Urban Village
   **Case Number:** R18010
   **General Location:** 626 NE 1st Avenue
   **Legal Description:** Lots 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, Block 318, Progresso 2, According to the plat thereof as recorded in book 2, page 18, Miami-Dade, in Broward.
   **Case Planner:** Randall Robinson
   **Commission District:** 2
There being no other questions from the Board at this time, Chair Hansen opened the public hearing. As there were no individuals wishing to speak on this Item, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Mr. McCulla, to approve. In a roll call vote, the motion passed 9-0.

5. Applicant / Project: 1324 Bay View Drive LLC / 1324 Bayview Drive Multifamily
   Request: Site Plan Level III Review; Waterway Use and Modification of Required Yards for 6-unit Multifamily Residential Development
   Case Number: R15056
   General Location: 1324 Bayview Drive
   Legal Description: Lot 18 and the Southwesterly 10 feet of lot 17, "Beach Way Heights Unit 'B'", according to the Plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 25, Page 27 of the public records of Broward County, Florida.
   Case Planner: Florentina Hutt
   Commission District: 1

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

Courtney Crush, representing the Applicant, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the Item, which is a proposed six-unit condominium in an RMM-25 zoning district and is subject to the City’s medium/high land use designation. The property is currently a triplex.

Ms. Crush explained that the Item has come before the Board as a waterway use request with a yard modification. The proposed structure will have one level of parking and three floors, each of which will include two three-bedroom units. A sun terrace will be located on the roof.

Waterway use requires a 20 ft. setback, and the building is set back 20 ft. 7 in. from the water; however, the Applicant requests that the pool be located within this waterway setback. Ms. Crush noted that many single-family homes include a pool within the setback area. The building will be 46 ft. 2 in. in height, which is measured to the top of the railing of the sun deck. The Applicant requests reduction of the side setbacks, which will be landscaped, to 18 ft. 6 in.

Code standards for yard modifications require the following:
- Superior site design
- Continuity of architecture
- Compatibility
- Incorporation of architectural features
Ms. Crush concluded that the setback to the western facade is 25 ft. and includes two exterior parking spaces. The remaining parking spaces are inside the building. The parking requirement for the building is 13 spaces. Deliveries or moving trucks may use the two exterior spaces, and trash containers are inside the building and pulled to the street once per week.

Mr. Glassman requested clarification of the project's neighborhood participation process. Ms. Crush explained that the minutes of the Coral Ridge Homeowners' Association's semi-annual meeting are included in the backup materials and indicate unanimous support for the project. At the Association's request, the Applicant has requested construction of a sidewalk on the east side of Bayview Drive. The Association also asked the Applicant to communicate their concerns with the lack of a sidewalk to the City.

Mr. Heidelberger observed that most projects located on a waterway request side yard modifications and the ability to build closer to the water. He asked how denial of these requests would affect the existing plan, particularly with regard to waterway proximity. Ms. Crush replied that if the request were denied, the project would need to be significantly redesigned. She reiterated that the building itself is 20 ft. 7 in. from the waterway.

Ms. Golub requested clarification of where the exterior parking spaces would be located. Ms. Crush replied that the spaces are located between the paver driveway and the garage. There will be no gate separating the driveway from Bayview Drive. Jeff Hendricks, builder for the Applicant, explained that the intent was to place parking inside the building, with green space outside. He felt it was likely that visitors to the building would use the outside parking spaces.

Mr. Hendricks continued that visitors may access the sidewalk that leads to the building's entrance, or may call to have access through the garage. Mr. Heidelberger suggested moving the planned gate further from the walkway to allow visitors access.

Florentina Hutt, representing Urban Design and Planning, stated that the request is for Site Plan Level III, Waterway Use. The project consists of six multi-family residential units along the Seminole Lake waterway. Staff has determined that the proposed design meets waterway use criteria, and that continuity of architectural features with adjacent properties is preserved. The scale and massing of the building are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

The Applicant has met with the Coral Ridge Civic Association to present the project. Residents at this meeting provided positive feedback. Staff recommends approval of the request.

Mr. McCulla requested clarification that if the roof were not used as a sun deck, non-habitable roof features would not be counted toward the building's height. Ms. Hutt
confirmed this, further clarifying that if the deck's railing were not counted toward the height, the requested variance could be measured in inches rather than feet.

Ms. Golub noted that the Applicant plans to keep the existing seawall and dock on the property, and asked if they would be required to rebuild the seawall to the newly proposed minimum height. Ms. Hutt advised that seawalls are reviewed during the permitting process.

Ms. Golub asked for information about the setback within which the existing pool on the property is located. Mr. Hendricks replied that the existing pool was constructed in approximately 1970, and estimated that it is within 10 ft. of the seawall.

Ms. Desir-Jean asked if Staff has reviewed Code to reconsider the requirement that waterway uses such as this Item must come before the Board. Ms. Parker replied that as older sites are redeveloped, Staff seeks to maintain aspects such as parking, clear visibility to the waterway, and activation of façades.

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

John Totino, representing the Board of Directors of the Hawthorne Bay Condominiums, asserted that he has not seen the project before tonight. He expressed concern that construction of the project as described could set a precedent within the area, and characterized the structure as more of a five-story than a four-story building, which would be much larger than adjacent properties. He added that the perpendicular docking planned for the site would also be substantially larger than docking for nearby properties.

Mr. Totino concluded that his view from an adjacent property would be obstructed by the proposed project.

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

Attorney Spence clarified that the Board could not address the issue of the sidewalk, as it is outside their purview. He noted that the Board of Adjustment could address this aspect of the project if they wished.

Motion made by Mr. McCulla, seconded by Ms. Desir-Jean, to approve. In a roll call vote, the motion passed 7-2 (Vice Chair Maus and Mr. Heidelberger dissenting).

V. COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION

None.