

MINUTES

BROWARD COUNTY PLANNING COUNCIL

JANUARY 24, 2019

MEMBERS Mayor Daniel J. Stermer, Chair
PRESENT: Thomas H. DiGiorgio, Jr., Vice Chair
School Board Member Patricia Good, Secretary
Brion Blackwelder
Commissioner Richard Blattner
Robert Breslau
Commissioner Felicia Brunson, via telephone
Commissioner Angelo Castillo
Mary D. Graham
Mayor Rex Hardin
Commissioner Nan H. Rich
David Rosenof
Richard Rosenzweig
Commissioner Beverly Williams

MEMBERS Mayor Bill Ganz
ABSENT: Mayor Michelle J. Gomez
Mr. Richard Grosso
Mayor Michael J. Ryan

Also Present: Barbara Boy, Executive Director
Andrew Maurodis, Legal Counsel
Nancy Cavender, The Laws Group

A meeting of the Broward County Planning Council, Broward County, Florida, was held in Room 422 of the Government Center, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, at 10:00 a.m., Thursday, January 24, 2019.

(The following is a near-verbatim transcript of the meeting.)

CALL TO ORDER: Chair Daniel Stermer called the meeting to order.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning, everybody.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Morning.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning. I'd like to call to order the January 24th, 2019 meeting of the Broward County Planning Council.

PLANNING COUNCIL
JANUARY 24, 2019
dh/NC

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

CHAIR STERMER: If everyone could please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance. I'd ask that we be led this morning by Mayor Rex Hardin.

(THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE WAS LED BY MAYOR REX HARDIN.)

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you. Please be seated.

ROLL CALL:

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Cavender, can you please call the roll.

THE REPORTER: Yes, sir. Mr. Brion Blackwelder.

MR. BLACKWELDER: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Richard Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Robert Breslau.

MR. BRESLAU: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Felicia Brunson.

CHAIR STERMER: She will be joining us by phone, hopefully.

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: Here.

CHAIR STERMER: There we go.

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: I'm here.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Angelo Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Here.

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: (Inaudible.)

THE REPORTER: Mr. Thomas H. DiGiorgio, Jr.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Bill Ganz. Vice Mayor -- I mean --I'm sorry. Mayor Michelle J. Gomez. School Board Member Patricia Good.

MS. GOOD: Here.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Mary D. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Richard Grosso. Mayor Rex Hardin.

MAYOR HARDIN: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Nan H. Rich.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. David Rosenof.

MR. ROSENOF: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Richard Rosenzweig.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael J. Ryan.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Beverly Williams.

COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Daniel J. Stermer, Chair.

CHAIR STERMER: Here. Good morning, everybody.

MR. DIGORGIO: Good morning.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

REAPPOINTMENTS:

CHAIR STERMER: And before we move to the first item on the agenda, we'd like to recognize some recent reappointments. Commissioner Rich, by the Broward County Commission. Mayor Hardin by Commissioner Fisher. Mr. DiGiorgio by Commissioner

Fisher. School Board Member Good by the balance of the School Board. Mary Graham by Vice Mayor Holness. And Commissioner Brunson by Commissioner Sharief.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

CHAIR STERMER: Madam Executive Director, the first item on our agenda today, please? Good morning.

MS. BOY: Good morning. Sorry. The election of officers.

CHAIR STERMER: Yes.

MS. BOY: The Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary are up for election today. The terms run the first meeting of the calendar year through the first meeting of the next calendar year, so the action is at the pleasure of the Council.

CHAIR STERMER: Anyone?

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I'd **move** the current slate.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

MAYOR HARDIN: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: There was a motion by Commissioner Castillo, seconded by everybody else sitting on the Planning Council.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR STERMER: Is there anybody else that would like to sit in this chair? That would like to sit in that chair? Or would like to sit in that chair? Seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye. All those opposed. Gosh, thank you all for your continued support. The three of us appreciate it.

(Applause.)

CHAIR STERMER: Congratulations. Listen, I think everybody knows we try our hardest to make this as inclusive and provide everybody with an opportunity, so --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I wouldn't go that far.

CHAIR STERMER: Yeah, it depends, you know. That's a --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Let's move along.

CHAIR STERMER: -- that's a separate issue.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

NOMINATIONS BY PLANNING COUNCIL TO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

CHAIR STERMER: We now have nominations -- nominations for the Executive Committee. Madam Executive Director, we need the officers plus four-at large members. Who currently sit on the Executive Committee?

MS. BOY: So, on the committee right now, Mayor Stermer, Mr. DiGiorgio, School Board Member Good, Commissioner Blattner, Commissioner Castillo -- I didn't bring my list -- I'm sorry.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Grosso. Mr. Grosso.

MS. BOY: He's on the Land Use/Trafficways Committee.

CHAIR STERMER: Oh, he's on the --

MS. BOY: Actually, Commissioner Williams. That's it.

CHAIR STERMER: Okay.

MS. BOY: Those are the members.

CHAIR STERMER: Anybody else want to be on the Executive Committee? Is there a motion to adopt the --

COMMISSIONER RICH: So, **moved**.

CHAIR STERMER: -- officers and the --

MS. GOOD: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: -- current members? Moved by Commissioner Rich, seconded by School Board Member Good. All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? We now have the Executive Committee.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

APPOINTMENTS BY CHAIR TO LAND USE/TRAFFICWAYS COMMITTEE:

CHAIR STERMER: We have the appointments to the Land Use/Trafficways.

MS. BOY: So those are all the members I just named, plus Mr. Grosso and Commissioner Brunson.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: So **moved**.

CHAIR STERMER: Is there anybody else that would like to serve on the Land Use/Trafficways Committee? You're more than welcome to. Seeing none, we'll move the current members. There is a motion by Commissioner Castillo, seconded by School Board Member Good. All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

CONSENT AGENDA:

AGENDA ITEM C-1 - APPROVAL OF FINAL AGENDA FOR JANUARY 24, 2019

AGENDA ITEM C-2 - JANUARY 2019 PLAT REVIEWS FOR TRAFFICWAYS PLAN COMPLIANCE

AGENDA ITEM C-3

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 6, 2018

AGENDA ITEM C-4 - EXCUSED ABSENCE REQUESTS

CHAIR STERMER: We're now up to the Consent Agenda. Are there any items to be removed before we get to the -- with regard to the Consent Agenda, we have excused absences requests from Mayor Gomez, Mayor Ganz, Mayor Ryan, and Mr. Grosso, just so everyone's aware with regard to Item C-4. Is there a motion with regard to the Consent Agenda?

MR. DIGIORGIO: So **moved**.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Move.

CHAIR STERMER: It's been moved by Vice Chair DiGiorgio, seconded by Commissioner Blattner. All those in favor of the Consent agenda, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? Consent Agenda passes unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

REGULAR AGENDA:

AGENDA ITEM R-1 - COUNSEL'S REPORT

CHAIR STERMER: Madam Executive Director, we're now up to Counsel's Report. Item R-1.

PLANNING COUNCIL

JANUARY 24, 2019

dh/NC

MR. MAURODIS: No counsel's report, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR STERMER: He's so consistent. Item R -- that's why we love to keep Andy around.

AGENDA ITEM R-2 - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

CHAIR STERMER: Item R-2, the Executive Director's Report. Good morning, Ms. Blake Boy.

MS. BOY: Good morning. Thank you. Congratulations to the officers and to the members of the committee. And congratulations to everyone on your reappointments to the Council.

I just really want to go through Items PH-1 through PH-5. And we have members of the public here to speak, so I want to go through each of those items, tell you how many people are signed in to speak, and then tell you about the Land Use/Trafficways Committee recommendations that happened earlier just prior to the meeting.

PH-1, there's no one signed in to speak on that item. It's the second Public Hearing.

PH-2 is a first Public Hearing in the City of Hollywood. We have 11 people signed in to speak. Some are for questions only, and some are for comment.

PH-3 is in the City of Oakland Park. We have five people signed in to speak on that item, some for questions only, and some to speak.

Item 4, we have -- sorry -- three people signed in to speak, and they're for questions only. Item 4 was the subject of the Land Use/Trafficways Committee meeting, and they recommended approval of the item. In addition, School Board Member Good brought up a point that the school -- the improvement related to the traffic roundabout at Southwest 172nd Avenue and Bass Creek Road, we're -- staff is going to update the report to memorialize that it's either going to be a traffic circle, a traffic roundabout, or a traffic signal, depending on what is warranted after construction. So that will be memorialized in the report, but I -- the uniform 85 feet was recommended for approval.

PH-5, there is no one signed in to speak. And the Land Use/Trafficways Committee took an action on that to recommend approval of that item. It's a proposed text amendment to allow for accessory dwelling units in the Broward County Land Use Plan. And, as I mentioned at that meeting, cities can be more restrictive and do not have to permit it in their plans.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you.

PUBLIC HEARING:

PLANNING COUNCIL
JANUARY 24, 2019
dh/NC

AGENDA ITEM PH-1 - AMENDMENT PCT 19-3

AGENDA ITEM PH-4 - AMENDMENT TO THE BROWARD COUNTY TRAFFICWAYS PLAN - BASS CREEK ROAD - PCTW 19-2

AGENDA ITEM PH-5 - AMENDMENT PCT 19-5

CHAIR STERMER: Seeing that no one signed in on PH-1, there are three people who signed in on PH-3 for -- PH-4 -- I'm sorry -- for questions only --

MS. BOY: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: -- and no one signed in on PH-5. Understanding that PH-4 and PH-5 come with a unanimous recommendation from the joint committee, who met previously to this meeting, is there a motion with regard to PH-1, PH-4, and PH-5?

MR. DIGIORGIO: So **moved**.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: Moved by Mr. DiGiorgio, seconded by Commissioner Castillo. Any further discussion? All those in favor of moving PH-1, PH-4, and PH-5 signify by saying aye. All those opposed? Those three items pass unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM PH-2

A - AMENDMENT PC 19-1

B - AMENDMENT PCT 19-1

CHAIR STERMER: Madam Executive Director, PH-2, please.

MS. BOY: PH-2 is actually two items, Item A and B, because it's a proposed activity center. So, A is the map version amendment. You can see the -- the area on the monitors in front of you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. BOY: And 2B is the text -- the proposed text amendment. This is approximately 19 acres of residential and commerce to an activity center designation of 1500 hotel rooms, 350 dwelling units, 150,000 square feet of Convention Center use, and 75,000 square feet of commercial and office use. It's generally located on both sides of A-1-A just north of Hallandale Beach Boulevard. The proposed amendment is intended to create a village-like atmosphere for the existing hotel, including the expansion of that use, some additional dwelling units, and then also the Convention Center and commercial uses.

Planning Council staff analysis finds sufficient public facilities and services to serve the

PLANNING COUNCIL

JANUARY 24, 2019

dh/NC

proposed land use. Regarding open space uses for the facilities and services, I would note that Planning Council staff has recommended in addition to the text amendment to memorialize a publicly assessible broadwalk along the Intracoastal to the west of the property as their open space improvement.

Regarding transportation, there were three transportation links on the regional transportation network that were significantly impacted, meaning that they created greater than a three percent impact to the 2040 long-range capacity. However, the roadway capacity analysis, when it was prepared, those three links remain at an acceptable -- projected acceptable level of service in year 2040, so there's no adverse impact to those links.

As the amendment is adding 350 dwelling units to the Land Use Plan, it is subject to Policy 2.16.2 regarding affordable housing. The city has submitted additional -- has submitted a study and information that was determined by the County's Planning and Development Management Division to meet the County policy. The amendment is also in the hurricane evacuation area for Categories 1 and 2, and subject to Policy 2.12.8 regarding impacts to emergency evacuation shelters and/or impact evacuation times.

In your backup, you'll find correspondence from both the County's Emergency Management Division as well as the city, Attachment 7 and 8A through 8D, outlining the discussions between the Emergency Management Division and the city's Emergency Management Coordinator. The County and city -- the County has stated that there is not sufficient -- there may not be sufficient emergency shelter availability, capacity, and the city has responded to that. The County and city are continuing the dialog and continuing the coordination of this policy.

The item is recommended for a second Public Hearing before the Planning Council. We just had the Charter amendment that says a minimum of one Public Hearing, but this is an item that the Planning Council staff, there is the outstanding issue with the -- regarding the emergency shelter time, so we're recommending that this is -- would be subject to a second Planning Council Public Hearing if the County Commission transmits it to the state for review, for their 30-day review. Planning Council staff recommends that -- it's a regular scale amendment, and, as I just stated, will require transmittal by the County Commission to the State of Florida review agencies -- the amendment be approved subject to the resolution of Policy 2.12.8 prior to a second Planning Council Public Hearing.

There are 11 speakers on the item. If you would like me to start --

CHAIR STERMER: Who's -- is anybody here on behalf of the applicant?

MS. BOY: Do you want the applicant to go first? It's actually the -- that's one of my first --

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Atkinson.

MS. BOY: -- ones. I have Leigh Kerr as the first speaker, but he says for questions only.

CHAIR STERMER: Okay.

MS. BOY: So, do -- would you like to call up the applicant?

CHAIR STERMER: Sure.

MS. BOY: Okay.

CHAIR STERMER: Yes, please.

MS. BOY: Okay.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Atkinson, or Mr. Kerr, or both of you. I've seen you both somewhere before. Good morning.

MR. ATKINSON: Good morning, Mayor, members of the Planning Council. I am Wilson Atkinson. I represent the owner and the applicant for this. Tonight, I brought -- or today, I brought several people with me.

Bruce Wiles (phonetic) who is the managing partner for the applicant and the property owner. Bruce is in the audience. Leigh Kerr, who is the land planner that filed this plan before you. John McWilliams, who is our traffic engineer, to answer any questions you may have on traffic. I believe Doug Gonzalez, if he's not here, will be here. He's the city attorney for Hollywood. Andria Wingett, who'll be the director, who is the Assistant Director of Development Services in Hollywood. Fritz Murphy, who is a principal planner for the City of Hollywood. And Jaime Hernandez, who is the Emergency Management Committee's representative for the City of Hollywood. Gus Zambrano is going to attempt to be here. He's Assistant City Manager. They have all represented to me that they would be here for the purpose of expressing to you the city's strong desire that this be approved.

For just a short backup, if you haven't seen this, is that the Diplomat exists. It's a thousand-room hotel. My conversations with the director for the -- Alan, for the County Convention Center, is that this is a critical part for the economy of Broward County. When it's full, it limits -- or when it's booked out, it limits what can be done in the area of Fort Lauderdale and what will affect the ultimate hotel that they will be putting up for the new Convention Center. I gathered from that conversation that they have strong support, but I did not ask him to be here.

If you're not aware of it, a hotel that has a thousand rooms cannot book the big conventions. With 1500 rooms, they can. So that's the purpose of enlarging this hotel. It's an economic base. It -- it'll benefit not only the city but Broward County, as a whole.

It will support the endeavors of Broward County with the Convention Center.

And in the process of doing it, so you can understand the concept, nothing will change on the east side of A-1-A. That stays the way it is. It's been there for years. It's recently undergone I think a 30 or \$40,000,000 renovation in -- internally.

Across the street, right directly across the street from the hotel, you have an existing parking garage on the south -- well, you first have a vacant lot, then you have an existing parking garage. Then you have what I would call an entertainment center that was built a number of years ago, the concept being they'd bring restaurants, bring things that bring the people. It has been a total loss. And then you have another parking garage in that standalone building. And then you have a -- it's where all their power, their water, et cetera. I call it utility. On the south side of that there's public access that's owned by the City of Hollywood and the CRA.

What we've envisioned is tearing down that inefficient building that's between the two garages. And our architect has shown a rendering that might be in your backup that shows a tower that will be identical or match the tower that's on the east. That tower will have an atrium at the bottom of 25, 30 feet, to be determined at site plan approval, but high -- high ceilings. The purpose being that whether it be a guest from the hotel across the street or whether it be a member of the public, they can enter that front, walk straight through, and they're at the Intracoastal. We will also have a pedestrian walkway on the south to allow people access to the Intracoastal the same way.

And my discussions with the CRA is we'll be able to do the same thing with them, at our expense, with utilizing their property at the north side of the property. So, between the existing building that are there now and the Intracoastal, we will make a pedestrian broadwalk, whatever you want to call it, where people can freely walk back and forth. We will take the ground floor of the parking garage set back probably 20 -- 15 or 20 feet, and turn those into active pedestrian uses, whether it be to get an ice cream cone, whether to be a soda. There will be benches out there for people to sit. All to be designed at site plan, but this is the representation that we have made to the City of Hollywood.

And City of Hollywood has then also said that their goals are to take that broadwalk that we'd be putting here on the south and extending it all the way to Hollywood Boulevard. The CRA is considering that. Apparently, they started to implement that, because I understand that to the north of us is a Publix that's just gone through site plan, and the city required them to do the same thing between the back of the Publix and the Intracoastal, with a suggestion they can have their Starbucks or whatever there to bring the people in. So that's the concept.

I read the report. I compliment your staff. I thought they did a wonderful job. I really didn't realize how much work had to go into these things. And recognizing the value of your time, recognizing the recommendation of the staff and the commitment that my client has to resolve 2.12.8, I would request that you approve this matter.

PLANNING COUNCIL
JANUARY 24, 2019
dh/NC

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Atkinson.

MR. ATKINSON: Thank you.

MS. BOY: The speakers, I'll call three at a time so that they're in a queue. Krystal Prieto, followed by Doug Gonzalez, followed by Danielle Brennan.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: Uh-huh. Yeah.

MS. PRIETO: Hello.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning, everybody. Just so everybody knows, not knowing at the end how many people may want to speak, we're going to limit everybody's comments to three minutes. And the Vice Chair's going to be in charge of the clock. Good morning.

MS. PRIETO: Good morning. How are you? Excuse me. My name is Krystal. I work at the Diplomat for just over five years now. And just recently, in the beginning of the month, on January 4th, the Diplomat announced the closing of two of the restaurants on what we call the landing, and they were to be closed on January 18th. One of those restaurants is actually where I worked. And this restaurant -- or the two of them, but my place of work, is located on the west side of A-1-A, the same site of the future development, of the land use amendment that it would permit, anyways.

Some of us have worked at the hotel for many years, some of us up to 15, 16 years we've worked there. And we've worked really hard to make sure that these are what I think the best hospitality jobs in south Florida. And so with the short notice of the layoffs that we received, of course, it was very alarming to the 32 workers, including myself there. And so we just don't want to be caught off guard again, and we just want to clearly understand what this development means for the workers that currently work there, and then perhaps future workers as well. And so we do have a couple of questions.

First, we want to understand what does that mean for the parking that is on this site, because we -- it's about 950 spots that are reserved for employees as well as the guests, and it's also available to the public as well. And these spaces, like I said, they are reserved for the employees and guest parking, and there's already like a shortage of parking on A-1-A, which causes a lot of traffic. People drive around looking for like beach entrances. And, you know, so it becomes very congested in that area, and it's a very like kind of restricted area.

And then number two, the gentleman did kind of specify a little bit, but just for clarity purposes, we want to understand is this an expansion of the current hotel, of the

Diplomat, or is it completely new and separate. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you. Appreciate it. Mr. Gonzalez.

MR. GONZALEZ: Good morning, Mayor, Council members. My name's Doug Gonzalez, and I proudly serve the City of Hollywood as the city attorney. As Mr. Atkinson suggested, we strongly, in the City of Hollywood, support this project. That is something we want on the record, first and foremost.

However, as with anything, there -- there is a rub here, and it's a significant rub. An item before you is to expand or require the city to provide services, emergency services in the event of an evacuation, and certain -- certain sheltering services that are statutorily not the burden or requirement of the city. Rather, what is happening here is the County is in part trying to shift to the city its responsibility under Florida statutes to provide sheltering and evacuation services. And it's interesting, too, because this is the first time in the State of Florida where this has been proposed.

In the State of Florida, currently, all 67 counties provide the sheltering and evacuation services in the event of a significant storm. This measure is the first time we've noticed, it's the first time that the Florida Department of -- of Emergency Management, the Florida Department of Emergency Management has noticed that this has been proposed as well.

They have noted to us in two emails, one back in November, and I would like to read that email to you just briefly. Answering a question from our Emergency Management staff, the Division of -- Florida Division of Emergency Management stated that the Division has not heard of any county in Florida attempting to compel municipalities or entities other than the local School Board to participate in emergency or disaster sheltering. It seems only Broward County is acting in this manner.

We are also not aware of any county discouraging or denying, either presently or in the past, Land Use Plan amendments such as the one the Diplomat is seeking due to issues with hurricane evacuation or sheltering. The Florida Department of Emergency Services once again reiterated that stance two days ago when it wrote us and said we have commonly interpreted the Statute to assign the responsibility to the County itself.

The Statute we're talking about is Florida statute 252.38. And according to pages 1 through 3 of the Florida Emergency Shelter Plan provided by the Florida Department of Emergency Management, Florida statutes 252.38 provides that safeguarding the life and property of its citizens is an innate responsibility of the governing body of each political subdivision of the state. This places the duty for evacuating and sheltering at-risk citizens during an emergency or disaster upon county governing boards.

That is the Board of County Commissioners. That is not the City of Hollywood. The city stands and remains willing to talk with County staff regarding these issues. The proposal seems to be, I've been told that there will be four staff members requested by the City of

Hollywood to be in these shelters. However, I want you to know that the City of Hollywood neither has the staff nor the facilities to provide these services. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Gonzalez. Ms. Brennan.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. BOY: Followed by Lori Vun Kannon for questions only, Andria Wingett for questions only.

MS. BRENNAN: Good morning. My name is Danielle Brennan. I'm an attorney with Kay Bender Rembaum, and our law firm has the pleasure of representing the Hallmark of Hollywood Condominium Association, located just south of the western Diplomat property.

I'm here today not to object nor to support the change in the land use amendment. I'm simply here to express the association's disappointment that the Diplomat did not reach out to the Hallmark, either being proactive or after receiving notice of this particular hearing, the number of times that our association has contacted the Diplomat to engage in meaningful conversation regarding the plans that the Diplomat has for this particular property.

The Diplomat and the Hallmark of Hollywood, they're no strangers. They've had conversation regarding the redevelopment of the west property in the past, and, quite frankly, they're feeling a little bit neglected. And that's all I really have to say. And I would like the Diplomat representatives in the room today to reach out to the Hallmark and get a conversation going. That's all.

CHAIR STERMER: I'm sure Mr. Atkinson has heard you loud and clear.

MS. BRENNAN: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you.

MS. BOY: Sorry.

CHAIR STERMER: It's okay. We're up to Lori.

MS. BOY: (Inaudible.) So Lori Vun Kannon, it's checked for questions only. I don't know if she wants to make a comment.

MS. VUN KANNON: (Inaudible.)

MS. BOY: Questions only. Okay. Andria Wingett from the City of Hollywood, questions only? Okay. Questions only, Jaime Hernandez. Questions only. John McWilliams,

questions only. David Steder.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Steder.

MR. STEDER: Good morning, Mr. Mayor, ladies and --

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning.

MR. STEDER: -- gentlemen of the Council. My name is David Steder. I have been employed at the Diplomat Resort for nearly 12 years now. My co-workers and I have come here today to better understand what will be happening to the hotel. The land use application does not specify whether the additional 500 rooms will be separate -- will be a separate hotel or an expansion of the current hotel. The last decade has brought many changes in ownership and hotel operators, all of which brought many challenges.

Will this new 500-room and commercial development be an expansion of the Diplomat Beach Resort or a separate hotel? This is very important to us to understand, given the fact that the property was not put -- has been -- recently been put on the market earlier this month for sale. We want to know who we'll be dealing with, and is this going to be developed by the current owner, or will we be intending this site to enhance the sale? Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

CHAIR STERMER: Appreciate it. Thank you.

MS. BOY: The final speaker is Tracy Jackson. For questions only or do you want to make any comments? From the County's Emergency Management Division. He's coming forward.

MR. JACKSON: Hi.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning, Mr. --

MR. JACKSON: My name is Tracy --

CHAIR STERMER: -- Director. How are you?

MR. JACKSON: Very good. How are you all doing this morning?

CHAIR STERMER: Good.

MR. JACKSON: My comments are actually brief. We recognize and support the cities along the Intracoastal's right to develop. We support that. We feel like whatever's good for a particular city's also great for Broward. Our position is to help make sure that Broward, all of Broward's safe. And the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. JACKSON: I'm so sorry. The communications that we exchange with Hollywood indicate these things. And you were, I guess, told that this is something that's new and it's only being done in Broward and so forth and so on. I can't really speak to the emails or whoever sent them. But I can tell you that this is a consistent practice for Broward County, and that we're consistently reaching out to and working with all our Intracoastal cities to request their help in helping us to make sure that, should we have a need of opening shelters, that we would have enough people to operate those shelters. That's all.

CHAIR STERMER: Appreciate it. Thank you, sir.

MS. BOY: That concludes the public speakers.

CHAIR STERMER: Anybody else from the public wish to speak on this item before we bring it back to the board?

MS. BOY: I think Mr. Atkinson might --

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Atkinson? Or would you like to wait for the end and wrap up at the end? Your choice.

MR. ATKINSON: Whichever. If you want answers to these questions, I can give them to you.

CHAIR STERMER: We'll take those.

MR. ATKINSON: Okay.

CHAIR STERMER: And just so the board's aware, we're going to turn to Commissioner Blattner, first, since this item is emanating from Hollywood. We're going to ask him what's going on in the City of Hollywood with regard to this item. Then I've got School Board Member Good and Commissioner Rich.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR STERMER: Wait, wait, wait, wait.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: We're going to have Mr. Atkinson, first?

CHAIR STERMER: Let's let Mr. Atkinson --

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: I don't get to talk about him?

CHAIR STERMER: You can do that after.

MR. ATKINSON: Well, first of all, let me say that I didn't know so many members of the union were going to be here until I walked in today. Otherwise, I would have had conversations with them. It's an expansion of the hotel. Yes, they -- they are correct, there was -- there is talk of the hotel being on the market. I can't tell you that the purpose of that is to actually sell it or to establish what the true value is, which will be very necessary when it comes to financing this expansion, assuming it's approved.

The existing food courts were recently closed because they have been losing money even during the season. There's -- there's just not enough activity on the west side of A-1-A, which is part of the reason for bringing the activity center, that and the city's request that we bring that to be.

Most of the questions that were answered -- asked today are appropriate at site plan approval. You would have addressed all the issues that the City of Hollywood has to address at site plan approval. We are aware of them, but the nuts and bolts of what's this going to look like, what's that going to look like, et cetera -- and, by the way, the -- the lady that said that she doesn't have a job across the street, I do believe she has a job. I'm not aware of any of those employees not having jobs. Maybe not at that particular place, but somewhere within the hotel. They do have a very strong union contract. That union contract requires the hotel to provide parking. There was a study done, and I think it came to your attention about four years ago, that showed there's a considerable excess of parking for the existing facilities, and those would be utilized. If more is necessary, that would be put in. Did I answer all those questions? Hopefully.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Atkinson.

MR. ATKINSON: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to say hello to Mr. Jackson. It's good to see you again. The Diplomat's been a very successful project. The city is thrilled with its success. I learned yesterday that one of their restaurants was chosen as the best -- best hotel restaurant in the United States. I think it's called Monkey Tail; correct?

But things change. And the development on the Intracoastal side never really took off. So that property needs to be redeveloped. If you were the property owner, you'd want to do that, too. Which is why the city is encouraging and supporting that development. The issue is purely on the issue of sheltering.

In all fairness and all honesty, everyone of us would believe that there have to be shelters in Broward County, and that they have to be staffed, and there has to be some certainty that they will be staffed in the event of an emergency. But it's clearly our interpretation of state statute that that is not the city, the municipality's responsibility. It's Broward County's responsibility. And it is a big one. So this may end up being a dispute

between lawyers, as often is the case, on the interpretation.

But we could encourage the Commission -- this board, pardon me, to pass this issue, allow the city and the County to continue dialog over the next month, and when it comes back, hopefully there's a resolution. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Commissioner Blattner. School Board Member Good.

MS. GOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There was -- Mr. Gonzalez, when he came up, he made a statement that the city had to have four staff members. I just wondered if he could come back up again and just confirm, and where is that stated? How was that stated?

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Gonzalez.

MR. GONZALEZ: Thank you. Good morning, Ms. Good.

MS. GOOD: Good morning.

MR. GONZALEZ: That is something I was informed this morning. I don't know if that is in your backup, but I was being told this morning that the County would be looking for four people from the city to staff a facility. That may not be something that's proposed in front of you as to a particular number, but -- but Mr. Atkinson can give us some background on that. I just found out about this this morning.

MR. ATKINSON: Trying to find resolution to this issue, about ten days ago, Leigh Kerr and myself had a conversation with Tracy Jackson and one of his staff members telephonically. And during that conversation, the question said, well, what kind of support do you really want the city to do? Because the city believes that it's going to have to -- at least what was told to me -- create an emergency center, meet the state standards, which are very onerous, et cetera, et cetera. And he said, no, we -- we just want them to provide security and staffing.

I said, well, that's a big question. I said the practical matter of this particular matter is that none of the hotel guests are going to affect these emergency centers. Our evacuation plan is so clear. It says that they are to be out before the storm arrives. They have adequate time to arrange their trip -- their trips back home. None of the people that I am aware of that can afford to pay for a Diplomat Hotel is going to go to an emergency center.

However, at such a point in time -- it's a 350 room tower, which is a residential component to an activity center, is constructed, that possibility exists. Again, I don't believe the people that would pay the -- the money for those type of units would be necessarily using the emergency center, but assuming that there's a percentage that do that, my client's prepared to address that. But we can't address it in -- in the city's name.

MS. GOOD: Thank you.

MR. ATKINSON: And -- yes?

MS. GOOD: It was just a brief question, so I appreciate the response.

MR. ATKINSON: Okay. Did that answer -- that -- but that's where the four --

CHAIR STERMER: Okay.

MR. ATKINSON: -- parties came from, from that conversation.

MS. GOOD: I'm not finished.

CHAIR STERMER: No, I didn't think you were.

MS. GOOD: Oh, okay. So, understanding that the request to provide security and staffing, is that only if in the event it was a municipally run shelter? Can someone answer that?

MS. BOY: Mr. Jackson's coming up.

MR. JACKSON: Hi. I'll get closer. Yes, it's only in the event of an activation of a shelter within that city's --

MS. GOOD: That's -- that's not what I asked.

MR. JACKSON: Okay. I'm so sorry.

MS. GOOD: My question is is the request for them to -- the city to provide security and staffing would only occur if the shelter was a municipal shelter?

MR. JACKSON: All the shelters during an emergency event are County run and operated shelters --

MS. GOOD: Well --

MR. JACKSON: -- so --

MS. GOOD: -- I'm really -- I'm very well aware.

MR. JACKSON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GOOD: The staffing is done by the School Board, is my understanding, based on an agreement that we're working with the County.

MR. JACKSON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GOOD: So that's -- the School Board now is going to be required to have managers at the shelters, and we have staffing that will be at the shelters. And that's all coordinated with you and the County to ensure. And I guess the listing of the shelters is also coordinated with the County.

So, I'm just trying to understand in some of the comments to ask the city to provide staffing, they wouldn't staff our schools. So, I'm trying to understand the comment. The request to have city security and staff would only happen if the city were to provide a city facility to be a shelter?

MR. JACKSON: In terms of this amendment, what the -- our position is that we are asking all cities who do this to commit to us that they would help us with staffing and security of the sheltering.

MS. GOOD: I know what you're saying now, but this is really important to me --

MR. JACKSON: I understand. I'm trying --

MS. GOOD: -- because we have an agreement with the --

MR. JACKSON: -- to understand your question.

MS. GOOD: -- County, so I just want to understand.

MR. JACKSON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GOOD: So, are you saying that -- are you asking the city to man and staff security and volunteers, at a School Board shelter?

CHAIR STERMER: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. JACKSON: (Inaudible.)

MS. GOOD: I'm asking him. Can he answer?

CHAIR STERMER: Sure.

MR. JACKSON: We're -- we are asking them to participate. They won't be there on their own. It's not their shelter. It'll be under our auspices. We're responsible to train the managers and to do those things, and they would fall into that group of people being trained. As you might imagine, we're still working through those details with the School Board to see who --

MS. GOOD: Yes, we just recently got the agreement.

MR. JACKSON: -- right -- and if they'll be available. And we're hopeful that we'll be able to sign it and have it sealed and delivered, and that'll be awesome. But today, what we have is a future need when hurricane season starts, and we need to be prepared for it and we're asking --

MS. GOOD: No, I --

MR. JACKSON: -- cities --

MS. GOOD: -- understand.

MR. JACKSON: -- to --

MS. GOOD: Does that agreement, that you are working with in the final stages with the School Board, include language that says that other individuals may utilize our school sites for purposes of shelters?

MR. JACKSON: No.

MS. GOOD: And so that's why I'm asking the question. This is the first I'm hearing of it. And I may not be aware of it, but if our own school district staff, who's been in discussions with the County staff regarding these agreements, which are really critical to the safety and security of our residents, should a hurricane hit, I think it's critically important.

So, I don't know how we can ask it of the city here and not make that part of the discussion of the agreement. So, I would ask that if that's the -- it's not for me to say what you all desire, but if that's part of your desire, then I think it needs to be part of the conversation that you're having with the school district staff.

MR. JACKSON: It is.

MS. GOOD: And I don't know what problems that may pose. I --

MR. JACKSON: It --

MS. GOOD: -- don't -- I don't know.

MR. JACKSON: -- it doesn't, because they belong to us. All shelter workers, et cetera, County trained, County approved. That's our responsibility --

MS. GOOD: Yeah, but we're going to --

MR. JACKSON: -- to the School Board.

MS. GOOD: -- be providing staff at those shelters.

MR. JACKSON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GOOD: They're going to be -- ultimately, you'll reimburse us, but it'll be district employees and district school site managers that are going to be manning those shelters. And it's a quite undertaking. So, I want to make sure that, as a district, we're equally prepared to deal with these issues, but offline, I think you need to have -- I'll have a conversation with the superintendent, and I'm sure you'll have greater conversations with district staff.

To the comment of the gentleman who came up that said individuals that utilize the Diplomat pay such -- you know, would never use a shelter, that, to me, is -- it's not an appropriate comment. Many of the people that go to the Diplomat -- I've stayed there myself -- may be coming from out of town and would have nowhere to necessarily go should a hurricane arise abruptly to this County. So I think that it is critically important that this issue be addressed in some fashion, and I don't think that because the Diplomat is a high-end hotel and a successful high-end hotel, that we have -- have to somehow brush away the need for these individuals who want to go there to have a place, a safe place to go to should a hurricane hit our shores.

I'm -- I want to make sure that I understand the letter that was written in the backup regarding -- from Emergency Management, that the County -- they speak to the fact that there's a statutory duty to proactively plan for appropriate evacuation. So, is the statutory requirement to just proactively plan, or is the statutory requirement that a plan be formalized before this gets approved?

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Jackson. Aren't you glad you came this morning? We are.

MS. GOOD: I love the bowtie, by the way.

MR. JACKSON: Oh, thank you. Yeah, I'm glad I was invited. I'm not sure -- I'm not sure I understand the question. Could you --

MS. GOOD: Okay.

MR. JACKSON: -- help me out?

MS. GOOD: I'll -- I'll try to --

MR. JACKSON: Help me.

MS. GOOD: -- just read --

MR. JACKSON: I'm sorry.

MS. GOOD: -- the letter, because it's your letter.

MR. JACKSON: Uh-huh.

MS. GOOD: So, in here you indicate that the County's not discouraging development due to any inability to meet its statutory responsibility, but rather it is complying with its statutory duty to proactively plan for appropriate evacuation when approving development in an area.

So, my question is is the statutory requirement that you proactively plan, or is the statutory requirement that you have a formalized plan before something's approved?

MR. JACKSON: I'd have to find that out. That's interesting. You're saying does the formalized plan have to be in place before the requirement's approved?

MS. GOOD: I guess what I'm -- and I'll be -- I'll just say this. It's one thing to talk and plan and say this is what we think we should do, this is what we want to do or -- with the developer, or does the County require and agreement, formalized agreement, with the developer prior to second hearing that says this is what's going to happen in the event of an evacuation.

MR. JACKSON: I apologize. I don't have that answer, but I'll be happy to talk to some folks who are way smarter than me with this stuff and get back to you guys.

MS. GOOD: So -- I'll end with this. So, then my issue here is that there were comments as to that this be handled prior to the second -- I guess I'll -- Ms. Blake Boy, this has the opportunity to come back before us?

MS. BOY: Yes. This is recommended for a second Public Hearing due to this outstanding issue and the dialog that is continuing. So, you don't -- as I mentioned, the Charter amendment that passed for the minimum of one Public Hearing, as staff, we've made the recommendation that it does come back. So, this would go, if the plan -- whatever action the Planning Council takes today, that recommendation goes to the County Commission for their consideration of transmittal to the State of Florida review agencies.

Upon conclusion of that review, it would come back to you for a second -- be scheduled for a second Public Hearing, and then back to the County Commission.

MS. GOOD: So, my question is do -- does your staff want there to be a formalized agreement handled by this issue?

MR. MAURODIS: If I could, this is something that we were talking about and have considered. The section of the plan that we're review- -- that this hinges on, as far as

I'm considering solely your review as a recommending agency on a Land Use Plan amendment to allow for additional development. So that's what we're talking about here. If this is approved, there's going to be more development, more units there --

MS. GOOD: Right.

MR. MAURODIS: -- more activity there. And the Policy 2.12.8 talks about discouraging Land Use Plan amendments which negatively impact hurricane evacuation clearance times and/or emergency shelter capacities.

Now, a lot has been said about who's responsible for what, and some good points have been made with regard to that. But your job here as a recommending agency is to look at the proposed development, with the input of your staff, determine whether this would negatively impact hurricane evacuation clearance and/or emergency shelter, because there's two -- two aspects of that.

And if that is the case, then you would have the right to recommend negatively on that, because it does not meet that part of the policy. Now, the applicant has been put on notice of that. And, again, their point is saying, well, the County is supposed to take care of all of that, which is like the County is supposed -- and the state are supposed to take care of all kinds of roads.

But if the road network is not there, what do you do on some plans? You deny them, because of the road work, even those it may not be the requirement of the city to provide a regional road network or a County road network. We understand that. So what you have to do here is, one of your considerations, is the capacity there to provide adequate shelters for protection of people, before you increase the burden on that system of shelters. Because that's what you're doing. Hollywood is asking that you increase the burden upon those shelters. And so that's something you need to consider in your Land Use Plan amendment.

What we're hoping is that by way of discussion and working positively with the applicant, and they -- I think they've shown a desire; they've been communicative on that -- on that, even though there's an underlying legal point that was made -- well made by their counsel -- what -- this is the opportunity for the -- so many times how we mitigate situations. So, we have an application that creates an additional burden. There's a concern with what -- whether that burden will negatively affect emergency shelter capacity. So that the opportunity in between is to come up with some mitigation or something that would ease that concern. And that's --

MS. GOOD: So I --

MR. MAURODIS: -- what we're --

MS. GOOD: -- guess --

MR. MAURODIS: -- talking about.

MS. GOOD: -- I'm still perplexed that I can't get a definitive answer as far as -- and it's not your job -- is just if there is not a formalized evacuation/shelter to address the concern at the time of second hearing, then the County would raise an objection?

MR. MAURODIS: Well, you --

MS. GOOD: Or the --

MR. MAURODIS: -- you could say, on what is the standard for that objection, you're saying. Yeah.

MS. GOOD: Because the Emergency Management director didn't --

MR. MAURODIS: And -- and I think --

MS. GOOD: -- indicate that. And so before I, as a -- I know what I would say, personally, but I'm here as a Planning Council member --

MR. MAURODIS: Yes.

MS. GOOD: -- so that's why I'm asking the questions, because before I accept the recommendation to have something by the second hearing, I want to make sure that it's going to be a County requirement.

CHAIR STERMER: Can I just try to refresh your recollection, and for the members as well. And Mayor Hardin will remember this. We had a project, a land use amendment that came before us months ago from Pompano -- in Pompano. And it was in regard to a marina project --

MS. GOOD: Uh-huh.

CHAIR STERMER: -- on Federal Highway. And that was the first time this policy came forth, because the County is changing its policy. This is a change in policy, and that was the first land use amendment, this is the second, that they're trying to have impacted by this change in policy. And at the time of that, the applicant agreed, in coordination with the city, that the applicant would provide --

MS. GOOD: Uh-huh.

CHAIR STERMER: -- the staffing asked by the County, if I recall correctly, in coordination with the city. But there was an agreement --

MS. GOOD: Uh-huh.

CHAIR STERMER: -- between the applicant and the city to resolve what the ask was --

MS. GOOD: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: -- from the County.

MS. GOOD: It was addressed.

CHAIR STERMER: It was addressed. So, this is the second time this is happening. And, to your question, they're County shelters. There are no municipal shelters. They are located wherever your facilities, School Board facilities, or other facilities, like the BB and T, which is a County facility, that may be open.

And now what the County is saying is in addition to your staffing, the County is now trying to condition land use approval -- land use amendment approvals in certain cities on those cities providing staffing at shelters that are run by Broward County and staffed by the School Board. That's, in a nut shell, what this is.

MS. GOOD: Okay.

CHAIR STERMER: So, this is, like I said, the second time we've had it. The first one was up in Pompano. And we did approve it then, understanding that this policy is far from clear, far from being --

MR. MAURODIS: And staffing is not the only -- it's -- staffing is just one of considerations.

CHAIR STERMER: Correct. And then when we get to staffing, don't forget, those that would do the staffing need to be certified past a certain level.

MS. GOOD: Uh-huh.

CHAIR STERMER: Those people would be taken away from their local governments to provide the local municipality that they work for the services that they would be providing to their local community. And, potentially, depending on where the shelter may be located, if that shelter isn't closed shortly after the storm, they may be, in some respects, taken away from their full-time day job at their municipal government to continue to provide services pursuant to this new policy that the County is trying to put forth. I think you can tell where I stand on the policy.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR STERMER: So I hope -- I just wanted to refresh everyone's recollection that we did see this a few months ago, and the applicant -- and I understand Mr. Atkinson's willing to work with the city and work with the County, but there are granular details that Mr. Gonzalez -- because, at the end, the County's going to look to the city, and he's got

to protect his client, the City of Hollywood. And I say that as an elected from one city, understanding the rest of the electeds up here understand the issue well, because at some point, it's going to impact us all. So, before I -- let me -- did you have anything further?

MS. GOOD: No, (inaudible).

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Rich, and then followed by Commissioner Castillo.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Well, thank you for clarifying, actually, the point that I wanted to make. And I was going to ask Tracy about what cities, and I know that Pompano is one of those cities that has worked with the County. And let me just say this. This is -- part of this conversation, to me, is pretty offensive, because we're a County as a whole. The County is accepting its responsibility. It's putting up the money. It cannot staff all these shelters. And it's not only the School Board that should be staffing shelters, but individual municipalities should be helping as well. And that's what Tracy has been trying to do by going out and trying to include individual municipalities for the appropriate staffing level for the facility.

And to state, as was mentioned, that nobody at the Diplomat is going to use the shelter, I would urge everyone to go back and take a look at the pictures of the evacuation of the last hurricane in south Florida, when the whole Keys was evacuated and everyone made a beeline north. And people ran out of gas. People couldn't get where they were going, and they went to the shelters. The shelters were filled. And it's the responsibility, to me, it is, anyway, as long as the burden is increased here, any land use modification, change, puts a further burden on the shelter, then I think we have to take a look at that and make sure that we make this safe for all County residents. This is -- this goes way beyond Hollywood. It goes way beyond any one municipality. We are looking at the entire County.

So, for me, in order -- you know, when this comes back, we are going to need to have, you know, some agreement that this issue will be addressed. And I think it's clear the County is accepting its responsibility. The goal and requirement is comprehensive sheltering plan for the whole County, and that's what we're trying to do. But we can't do it without the help of people and staffs throughout the County in the different municipalities, as well as the School Board.

The County is paying. The School Board could not afford to pay for the shelters. The County is paying for the shelters, but the School Board is coming up with staff. So, everybody needs to play their part, and I think then we can, you know, feel that we have done the right thing for the residents of Broward County in the case of any emergency that comes to us.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Castillo followed by Mr. DiGiorgio.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: When I think about this emergency management need that we have, which is clear because of our weather, it's not clear to me to what extent, as we look at this application, this applies necessarily to different hotels, relative to how they're built and what's going on.

I was Human Services Director here for two years, and that was a long time ago, but I remember being activated twice, and part of my responsibility was, in fact, to get these shelters up and running. And there were some tourists at these -- at these shelters. I visited each and every one of them during those activations. But they were very few. They were very few because most of them were either at the hotel or, if they found that the hotel, which continued to operate because it had its own generator and it was built to withstand these kinds of storms, and if, in fact, they were uncomfortable there, they got on a plane and they left.

The majority of the people who were in shelters were the people who lived here. So, I think every county has to take care of its own. The way an emergency plan would have to dictate or play out in Monroe County is different than how one would play out in Dade or Broward or elsewhere. But I still don't have a clear sense of what the actual need would be in the event of a natural emergency, how that would impact this particular hotel.

So, I understand that while this issue is large, and I understand that while it has many moving parts and there are different issues and the need to come together and figure it out, getting back to the application, I'm not sure, because it's not laid out to me, what the actual impact of this is. For all I know, a hurricane comes and they flick on the generator, and the people stay at the Diplomat. I don't know.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner, this is --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Evacuation.

CHAIR STERMER: -- this is --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I'm just looking at the four corners of the application.

CHAIR STERMER: -- which is why -- this will come out sounding wrong, but this is the County trying to say we want to import a -- we want to create a policy. We want your buy-in, and we can object to a Land Use Plan unless we get what we want.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Well --

CHAIR STERMER: I -- and, please, no, Commissioner, I understand the need for countywide sheltering. This isn't about that. This is holding up a city or an applicant on a project when there are better ways, conceivably, to institute this policy through interlocal agreement and conversations we have with regard to everything in this County. To me, to hold up a city who's supporting an applicant --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: -- to redevelop a parcel that -- particularly this parcel, that is an economic generator in this County --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: -- to get four people for a shelter, there are better ways to go about doing it. That -- my visceral problem is not the issue, it's how it's being done.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: And that's why --

CHAIR STERMER: And the same thing -- I said the same thing when the issue in Pompano happened. So, Commissioner, my apologies.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Listen, no, and I appreciate the interjection, because it's consistent with what I'm saying. And that's why I support my colleague, Blattner's, idea that we move this thing forward and allow the discussion about this emergency management thing, which is a -- which is a necessary discussion to have, to evolve, as it should. But this application should not be held up for that reason, not in my opinion.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. DiGiorgio, followed by Mayor Hardin, followed by Commissioner Blattner. Anybody else? Mr. Rosenzweig. Mr. DiGiorgio.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Did you -- you have a quick question?

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER RICH: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: Oh, no, he --

MR. DIGIORGIO: Did you have a question -- did you have a question specifically for Mr. Castillo --

COMMISSIONER RICH: Yes.

MR. DIGIORGIO: -- before I speak?

COMMISSIONER RICH: And I just want to clarify. I did not say to hold up the application.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: No, no, I --

COMMISSIONER RICH: I said, upon return of this application, this needs to be

PLANNING COUNCIL

JANUARY 24, 2019

dh/NC

addressed --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yes, ma'am, I agree.

COMMISSIONER RICH: -- one way or another.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I agree.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Do I have the floor?

CHAIR STERMER: Yes.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Thank you. So, I appreciate you clarifying that this did come before us in Hidden Harbor, and we had very similar discussions. The city staff work -- did work it out with the County staff, behind the scenes. But I do believe this is going to be something that comes up in front of us all the time.

To Commissioner Castillo's point, I think it's important that we understand what our role is here. And I appreciate, Andy, what you just said about what we can potentially do or not do based on these. I think this is a very tough place for us to negotiate these decisions. I want to talk -- the city manager from Hollywood talked about what you had gotten in response from the state agencies about what the County's responsibility is.

MS. GOOD: City attorney.

CHAIR STERMER: City attorney.

MR. DIGIORGIO: City attorney. I'm sorry. Thank you. Thank you for the clarification. But I do know in Pompano Beach, they looked at the same thing, and I think they got very similar responses, that it is the County responsibility. I understand that. One of the things they also got back, too, is expected that these -- that these projects will generate more tax dollars that would then, of course, go back to the cities and the County, and that would enable that to happen.

I'm not sure what the answer is as far as staffing these facilities. I'm not sure it's our responsibility to come up with that answer. But we do have to have a comprehensive plan, because every one of these -- every one of these proposals that come before us are going to be held up on this issue if there is not real dialog with the cities out there and there's a clear understanding of what the expectation is. But I definitely do not believe that this project should be held up based on that, especially at the first reading, and maybe not even at the second reading. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. DiGiorgio. Mayor Hardin followed by Commissioner Blattner.

MAYOR HARDIN: Thank you, Chairman. I just -- just a -- I'm just -- a question. Ms. Blake Boy, why is the -- why does staff recommend approval of this --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MAYOR HARDIN: -- if this staffing of shelter issue is not dealt with?

CHAIR STERMER: Because it's coming back.

MS. BOY: Sure. The staff's recommendation is based on a couple of things. One, it's based on the continuing dialog. If we had no information from the city or applicant regarding emergency evacuation and sheltering and the discussion they were having, it would have been a -- it would have been a recommendation for denial for you to move forward, but we would have noted the same thing we noted.

Since there is the dialog -- and this is a regular scale amendment as opposed to a small scale amendment. The small scales are generally heard, when there was two Public Hearings required, back-to-back months, so there was really no time to even consider like how that could work out for the second Public Hearing.

So because it's a regular scale amendment, because there's a continuing dialog, that's why our recommendation for this first Public Hearing is wrapped up in this, and then also the recommendation for a second Public Hearing, because we are -- I think we're in the position of if we don't have a resolution -- and staff's not naming the resolution as staffing, that that's going to be what happens.

But if the -- there's a policy resolution prior to the second Public Hearing, staff could continue to support it. If there's zero resolution, from the staff's position, that would lead to a recommendation of denial at the second Public Hearing.

MAYOR HARDIN: Okay. So --

MS. BOY: If that makes sense.

MAYOR HARDIN: -- if there -- if it's not worked out by the --

MS. BOY: Right.

MAYOR HARDIN: -- second hearing, you're going to -- well, staff --

MS. BOY: Right.

MAYOR HARDIN: -- will recommend --

MS. BOY: So, we would say --

MAYOR HARDIN: -- denial.

MS. BOY: -- and how we usually structure a recommendation like that would be like I recommend -- staff recommends denial due to the, you know, this policy not being resolved. If the Planning Council wanted to move forward with a recommendation of approval, we usually would structure it for that so it's very clear in your information, you know, what you're moving forward or what you're, you know, recommending for denial.

MAYOR HARDIN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BOY: Sure.

MAYOR HARDIN: Because, I just -- yeah, Pompano Beach I think may have been the first city that had to deal with this issue. And I agree with what's been said by several people here today that this is an issue that needs to be dealt with, but it's not a city issue, in my mind. It is a County issue. And, yes, everyone in the County should participate in solving this problem.

This -- I don't think this is a good way to go about doing that. It's -- especially, you know, it's -- does Hollywood bear the full responsibility, or Pompano Beach bear the full responsibility for providing staffing for these shelters -- I don't think they should -- based upon a land use amendment, if this is a County issue. And, yes, it's an issue that needs to be dealt with at the County level, and they will make their decision how they deal with it.

But, yeah, having dealt with in on a personal level, it doesn't seem fair that coastal cities are the ones that are being asked to shoulder part of the responsibility, a greater part of the responsibility, than any other cities in Broward County. If we wanted to craft some way -- and, here again, this is a County issue, but some way where all cities participated, that would -- that would make more sense to me.

But on top of which, just asking a city to put forth additional resources is really penalizing a city and could jeopardize their overall emergency management situation if a true need arises. Because then the city only has certain -- certain elements to donate to this staffing situation, also. So, in case of an emergency, it's -- it needs to be a countywide issue. And I agree that this doesn't seem to be, to me, to -- should be linked to a Land Use Plan amendment. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you. Commissioner Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Thank you. And thank you, Mayor Hardin, for bringing up some of those points today. I think the issue -- from what I'm hearing, I believe the issue is pretty clear. It's a County responsibility. The County needs to have a comprehensive plan to staff its shelters. And it should not be holding up municipalities with land use approval, as they are doing today. To me, it's very objectionable.

PLANNING COUNCIL
JANUARY 24, 2019
dh/NC

And as several of you pointed out, this will come up again with the next big housing project in a city, which is really not appropriate. But I believe that it is unlikely that there's going to be a solution, resolution between the city and the County. And I believe that what will happen at the next meeting is exactly what Barbara Blake Boy just said. Staff will recommend denial. We will recommend approval, because this needs to go forward.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you. Mr. Rosenzweig.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Thanks, Chairman. Just sitting back looking at this from my local perspective, Deerfield Beach has no sheltering program per se. We sheltered in Pompano Beach. And so it's really unfair, at this point, to single out any one city to have to carry the burden without us sharing in that responsibility, if it comes down to the city being involved in this. And this should be looked at in a countywide situation where every city, at some point, has to come to bear some of the responsibility.

And not all emergencies may be hurricanes. There can be issues with other things coming up with climate change and others that could actually bring a -- an emergency faster so that you need more sheltering available in these areas to take care of those people who are here visiting or conventioning or whatever. And this has to be looked at very deeply from a lot of different areas, and that's only part of it.

The other part is -- and I hate to bring this up -- but other counties have to bear responsibility, too, and I don't think we have a good adequate plan for south Florida for total evacuation, because I think it should be done in stages. In a hurricane, in particular, as we saw with the last major hurricane, where we should have had Stage 1 from Monroe County coming north before Broward County moves north and North Palm Beach moving north. This requires counties working together, the three counties, on an evacuation plan totally.

But, again, it comes back to the cities. You know, Deerfield Beach has, as I say, no sheltering plan of any place except Pompano Beach, until we get our act together. But, unfortunately, we have to share in this plan, as well, and I'm sure that my city will take a hard look at what I'm saying here. But I do think that we have responsibility to help, and I don't think our people going to Pompano should have a free ride, as such, to come and take advantage of other cities' situations they're stuck with. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Rosenzweig. School Board Member Good. And is there anybody else that wants to speak on the sheltering issue before we turn to the housing question that Commissioner Rich wants to speak on? Anybody else on the sheltering issue? Okay. School Board Member Good.

MS. GOOD: Yes. Is Mr. Jackson still here? Yes, sir. So with regard to your letter, is the issue, then, that there is insufficient capacity at the existing shelters that the County has earmarked that would serve this development?

MR. JACKSON: Essentially, yes. Remember, we're adding living space; right? So, there's dwelling units, which we would anticipate to have more than one person living there. And so we're actually building in the evacuation zone, which is why it comes before you.

MS. GOOD: So --

MR. JACKSON: That's why it's highlighted.

MS. GOOD: -- so your department reviewed the evacuation zone area and the shelters that are located within that area, and you feel that there's not sufficient capacity within those current shelters to deal with this development's expansion?

MR. JACKSON: Technicality. There would be no shelters in the evacuation zone, but the shelters at large.

MS. GOOD: I meant -- right. Where they would go when we want them out --

MR. JACKSON: Correct.

MS. GOOD: -- of the area.

MR. JACKSON: Exactly right. That's the only reason it's coming. We're adding living units in an evacuation zone, so we know those people have to go somewhere, that those residents have to evacuate.

MS. GOOD: Correct.

MR. JACKSON: They have to.

MS. GOOD: So I guess -- I'm sorry. I apologize I asked incorrectly. So your department evaluated where individuals in this area, in this evacuation zone, would go to, should a shelter be required, and those shelters have -- don't have the capacity to deal with this expansion.

MR. JACKSON: It -- it's a little bit of an art, but we can't target a shelter, because we don't know where the --

MS. GOOD: Okay.

MR. JACKSON: -- emergency may occur. But on a general basis, we know when we run out of shelter space, if we run out of people to work it, that's happened as recently as Irma, so we understand what the history of what's happened in Broward, that if we add more, that the impact is going to be felt. We're not able to quantify that.

MS. GOOD: So you're unable to say that a specific area is insufficient. You're just

saying based on the past storm, maybe your shelters were at capacity. Is that -- is that how you make the -- I'm trying to understand a little bit, in a very simplistic way, how you make the determination that something doesn't meet your requirements.

MR. JACKSON: In the original letter to the city, we indicated that in -- during Irma, the -- Broward County's evacuation shelters were -- capacity was being reached.

MS. GOOD: So you -- so your department feels that expansion of this development would somehow adversely impact that capacity.

MR. JACKSON: My department is saying that we're adding 680 residences, so by default there will be more people that --

MS. GOOD: Okay.

MR. JACKSON: -- we potentially have to deal with.

MS. GOOD: And so your request to the city is --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. GOOD: -- to -- so within the City of Hollywood, because -- is your request that the City of Hollywood identify a shelter within their city limits?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MR. JACKSON: No. For the purposes --

MS. GOOD: No, of course not --

MR. JACKSON: -- of this --

MS. GOOD: -- right?

MR. JACKSON: -- we want their assistance with staffing.

MS. GOOD: Right.

MR. JACKSON: We'd be opening up the shelters.

MS. GOOD: So your issue is not the facility itself, but the staffing.

MR. JACKSON: Yes. I'd like to --

MS. GOOD: Okay.

MR. JACKSON: -- use a different word than issue. Our request is that the city assist us with staffing emergency shelters.

MS. GOOD: Okay. So the -- I'm getting to the point. So the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MS. GOOD: -- the staffing wouldn't resolve the evacuation problem. The staffing would resolve one issue, but not the problem itself. So that's why I'm trying to further determine, based on comments from everyone, your request of the city is to provide staffing, but how would that deal with the insufficient shelter capacity?

MR. JACKSON: In addition to not having as much shelter capacity as we would like, we've discovered that we don't have as many shelter workers as we would like, because, obviously, people live here, so they can get impacted. We'd like to have the ability to have as many people as we possibly can in order to be able to staff shelters, because we will not know how many shelters we need, how many could be activated, or what measures we have to take. So it's an abundance of caution approach, and we feel that the four staff people for the potentially a thousand, 1500 new residents that would be affected by an evacuation, is a reasonable --

MS. GOOD: But I -- I guess --

MR. JACKSON: -- calculation.

MS. GOOD: -- to the point of the shelter issue itself, the inability for there to be sufficient shelters to address this expansion project, I'm trying to -- and I'm not disagreeing with the need, but I'm -- I'm trying to figure out exactly what you're asking of the city. You're not asking them to identify a shelter within their city limits. You're merely asking them for staffing; is that what you're saying?

MR. JACKSON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GOOD: Okay. And to the issue of shelter capacity, because that's the crux of what we're talking about, have you reached out to the school district regarding additional shelters?

MR. JACKSON: The school district has provided us with a list of structures. Those become our shelters.

MS. GOOD: The -- I'm really trying to be really --

MR. JACKSON: As am I.

MS. GOOD: -- if the -- if the issue is lack of shelters -- and I know that the district provides you a list, but that doesn't mean that the County couldn't say, we need more. I

don't know that that list is all encompassing. So my question is is the -- have you requested from the school district additional shelter locations to address the needs within this area?

MR. JACKSON: I don't know if we requested that of the school district. I do know that we requested the municipalities, through their emergency managers, to please evaluate their cities and determine what and if other shelters might be available for common use.

MS. GOOD: Okay. Again, I'm all about it's a County issue. This has an impact on my agency, tremendously. But, again, we get reimbursed through the County. Before I understand what we're saying here -- and don't get me wrong, I believe that this issue needs to be addressed. Who addresses it is still a question for me, because if there's insufficient capacity to deal with an evacuation in this area, that concerns me. And I do feel that that's part of a conversation that this council needs to have to address. I do believe that.

Now, how that's addressed, I don't know if we're going about it in the right fashion. So I hope that before the second reading, should this pass today, that greater conversations have to have with a variety of agencies to deal with this issue, because I think it is an issue that this council should address.

And I would hope that you would -- you know, somehow if we can get some correspondence between you and the school district to ensure that either we do have additional shelter capacity to provide -- I don't know that we do. But if we do, if they are, how can they be handled, and then the staffing associated with those. Because somehow or another, this will need to be addressed. And if the municipalities are saying it's not under their umbrella, then someone else is going to have to address it in some fashion. But I think the developer must be part of that conversation. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner, let me -- School Board Member, and, Commissioner, I'm turning to you after, but let me also refresh everyone's recollection. After Irma, as Irma was winding down, there was a significant effort to close the shelters in the public schools, and there was a significant reach out by the County to the cities to say, hi, where -- can we move people to your community centers, that you will then staff?

MS. GOOD: Uh-huh.

CHAIR STERMER: There -- there is a process that is trying to be implemented, and the problem then, as we all recognize in this, isn't being parochial, but if it becomes parochial, is, hypothetically, folks from the east side get evacuated to the west side. They can't go home, and yet they're telling the cities in the west you need to, in your community centers, shelter people.

I'm just -- that's the bigger conversation. And my frustration is I never thought this conversation was anything but about staffing. Now the director is actually saying there is

a capacity issue.

MAYOR HARDIN: Uh-huh.

CHAIR STERMER: That's the first that that statement has ever been reared before this board. That there's a capacity issue. That's never been said before. It was always about how do we assist in the staffing of shelters. And the cities don't determine how many shelters to open. It's not a city program. And during Irma, when Falcon Cove was full, Everglades opened. And it's not a decision the cities make. But yet they're now being told, give us staff.

I'm not opposed to working through to find a solution, as long as the community, 2,000,000 people who live in this County across Sawgrass to seagrass, north to south, participate in it, and it's not one local jurisdiction's obligation should the shelter be there when they didn't have a choice in that matter. I'm just -- and I again will come back and say, I don't like the idea of trying to hold up a land use amendment to try to get something for it. That's my frustration.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Point of information --

CHAIR STERMER: So --

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: -- Mr. Chair.

CHAIR STERMER: -- Commissioner Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Yeah. I think we've heard all this, and if it is an issue, that needs to be discussed. But there seemed to be a sentiment among many speakers here that this -- the land use amendment should not be held hostage to the request for shelter personnel. I don't -- I don't object to any of the discussion except it's circuitous. We're going around and around on this. Maybe that's a discussion that needs to take place between the County Commission or within the County Commission. I don't think that's our role here.

CHAIR STERMER: I agree, but the director actually now raised, in his last comment --

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: I know. And he --

CHAIR STERMER: -- the capacity issue, which --

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: -- I know.

CHAIR STERMER: -- hasn't been raised before.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: And he did that because we keep finding flaws in the original argument.

CHAIR STERMER: Understood. We're now going to turn to Commissioner Rich to talk about housing.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Well, I don't think it's a flaw in the argument. You know, you don't know what -- what happens. Each and every storm is different, and where it goes, and who's evacuated is different. So you cannot say today there's going to be X number of shelters here, X number of shelters here. You never know.

Last one, last hurricane, Hurricane Irma, the shelters in Weston filled up. We needed another shelter. I happened to be at -- there at Everglades. We went there. We opened up a shelter. But it took time because of staffing. So, I mean, that's why I think cities need to be included and need to be prepared. There was -- there was a School Board principal, assistant principal that came --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER RICH: -- you know, to try and get it open quickly, because we had a line a mile long because the others were filled. We had pet shelters. We didn't have enough pet shelters. Special needs. I mean, there are all kinds of things here. I think -- and I kind of -- I'm going to say it again. Nobody here, including myself, has said we should hold this up for this.

We said we want to have it resolved. Some discussion. And the fact that you said that it won't be, Commissioner Blattner, I'm really sad about that, because people need to sit down on both sides and need to work this out on behalf of everyone in our community. And our community keeps growing. 64 households move into our community every day. So, I mean, this is only going to be exacerbated, and we need to deal with it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

MR. ROSENOF: Chairman?

CHAIR STERMER: What -- one second, Mr. Rosenof.

Commissioner Rich, you still have the floor. You want to talk about housing?

COMMISSIONER RICH: I do.

CHAIR STERMER: Okay. I didn't want to miss the opportunity.

COMMISSIONER RICH: I do. Okay. This is another thing that I think we need to talk about when this comes back. We just made a -- some of the wording in here is somewhat inconsistent with what I think the County and the City of Hollywood just agreed to in a partnership that would provide significant funding for affordable housing.

But one of the things that we talked about is it was a three-pronged approach, and one of the prongs was new units. And the way it's referred to in the current proposal, which says provides significant funding for affordable housing issues, and we know that there's renovation, repair, first time home buyer, so forth, but you can't solve the problem without new units. And so I think that needs to be a discussion, especially in light of the agreement which was entered into by the County and the City of Hollywood, which did include the concept of new units.

CHAIR STERMER: Anything further on this item? Is there -- let me suggest that the -- if there's a motion to approve, that it be conditioned upon it coming back for a second hearing, and that there be further correspondence -- I don't want to say, resolution, because there might not be resolution, but continued dialog with regard to the 2.12.8 issue between the applicant, the County, and the city. I don't want to say how -- you know, I --

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: I'll **move** it with those.

CHAIR STERMER: Moved by --

MAYOR HARDIN: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: -- Commissioner Blattner, seconded by Mayor Hardin. Any further discussion on the question? Madam Blake Boy.

MS. BOY: Sorry to interrupt. Just Commissioner Rich's point about the additional information and clarification about the TIF funding, also if that could be included prior to the second Public Hearing.

CHAIR STERMER: And that be included as well. School Board Member Good.

MS. GOOD: So the way that you stated the motion, there's really no requirement for resolution, just conversation?

CHAIR STERMER: Well, whatever the conversation is, staff will come back at second reading and make a recommendation. It may be to approve. It may be to deny. If there's no resolution, Ms. Blake Boy's already indicated she may very well recommend denial at the second hearing. So we're suggesting there continue to be conversation because, based on that dialog, may impact staff's recommendation on second hearing. Whether we choose to listen to staff's recommendation at second hearing is the prerogative of the Council. But -- as we've done in the past. But I just put that out there. We can't edict what the resolution's going to be. I'm just --

MS. GOOD: My intent is there not be just chitchat but that there be --

CHAIR STERMER: Agreed.

MS. GOOD: -- productive conversation. Okay.

CHAIR STERMER: I think everybody understands, those are -- that are sitting in the room, both from Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Gonzalez, on behalf of the city, and Director Jackson, who's here, that that conversation continues and be meaningful, not just passing emails in the dead of night. Mr. Rosenof.

MR. ROSENOF: Yeah, just a quick question. Would it be appropriate to reach out to the County Commission and ask for some sort of workshop so we don't end up in the same conversation over and over again? Because it seems like we don't have clear direction on what we're supposed to be doing here.

I like the idea of bifurcating the shelter issue from the approval itself, but I still feel like I don't have a firm direction of how I'm supposed to vote on these things. I feel like I have contradicting --

CHAIR STERMER: Let me suggest the following --

MR. ROSENOF: -- you know what I mean.

CHAIR STERMER: -- to you. And I'm going to say something that Commissioner Rich isn't -- the Mayor has organized three meetings for next week with the various mayors in an effort to create a council of mayors, and I will raise this with the Mayor next Monday. The first meeting is next Monday, which I am attending, and I will specifically raise this with Mayor Bogen to start the dialog amongst the 32 governments in a first effort to move this conversation forward differently so we all have a better understanding. I think that's at least the first step. So I will do that.

Anything further on the item as presented, that it be -- that the approval be conditioned upon it coming back for a second Public Hearing after the County and the state review it and provide any comments, that it be conditioned on continued dialog between the affected parties, and that the housing issue be reviewed, and come back? Commissioner, anything else?

COMMISSIONER RICH: That's it.

CHAIR STERMER: Okay. I just wanted to make sure. All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? The motion carries unanimously. Thank you, everybody. And, to the public, just so you understand, when we look at land use amendments, we don't get to the granular detail. My suggestion is the guy who stood up, Mr. Atkinson, you all don't let him walk out too far down the hall and have a conversation with him. Okay?

(Laughter.)

CHAIR STERMER: Sorry, Mr. Atkinson, but, you know, it is what it is.

PLANNING COUNCIL
JANUARY 24, 2019
dh/NC

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Mr. Chairman, if I may.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Rosenzweig.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: I realize this is passed to this point. I'd request when you go to the Mayor's meetings that they take into consideration the possibility of sitting down with the County and the School Board and coming out with where shelters are. Because in Deerfield -- I may have misspoken -- where I am in District 3, we have no shelter.

CHAIR STERMER: Understood.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: There may be others in Century Village --

CHAIR STERMER: Understood.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: -- but we -- Monarch High School is our -- it's our point. But if we could find out what shelters are around the County and what capacity they are and have -- how many people are required to staff those --

CHAIR STERMER: Yeah.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: -- might give some impetus to how we set this whole thing up in the County.

CHAIR STERMER: Understood.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM PH-3 - AMENDMENT PC 19-2

CHAIR STERMER: Item PH-3, the first Public Hearing on an amendment to the Broward County Land Use Plan for the City of Oakland Park, Amendment PC 19-2. Ms. Blake Boy.

MS. BOY: Good morning. This is --

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning. It's still morning.

MS. BOY: -- good morning -- oh, yeah, it's still morning. This is located in the City of Oakland Park. It's the former Oak Tree Golf Course. It's approximately 140.7 acres, from a majority of recreation/open space and some residential uses to an overall density of irregular 2.88 residential. It's generally located on the west side of Northwest 21st Avenue between Commercial and 44th Street.

Planning Council staff analysis finds sufficient public facilities and services to serve the proposed land use. Regarding open space, the former golf course is not included in the City of Oakland Park's open space inventory, and therefore there will be no impact to that -- to this -- if this change takes place. However, the applicant has committed to a nine acre open space dedication to the city in perpetuity that will be determined at the time of the site plan, working with the city.

One regional transportation link on Prospect Road between Commercial and Powerline is significantly, more than three percent, impacted, and also adversely, because it degrades the level of service to an unacceptable -- from an acceptable level of service D to an unacceptable level of service F.

To mitigate the impact to the regional transportation network, the applicant has offered the following mitigation: Restricting the dwelling unit type. And that reduces the trips, but the same link continues to be adversely impacted. So they've offered mitigation as far as transportation improvements at the intersection of 21st and Prospect, including dual westbound turn lanes, protected signal phasing, increased storage for turns, and a continuous second lane through 21st between Prospect and 44th Street. The Broward County Traffic Engineering Division has reviewed the proposed mitigation and concurs that it will mitigate the impacts to that link.

Regarding schools, there is sufficient capacity in the planning area. However, a small portion, about six acres, was the subject of a Land Use Plan amendment back in 2004, and there was an educational mitigation agreement entered into at that time. And the applicant has confirmed that it will work with the School Board staff to ensure that that mitigation agreement becomes part of this Land Use Plan amendment if approved.

As I mentioned, the amendment site is a former golf course, and the Broward County Land Use Plan has significant policies regarding Land Use Plan amendments for former golf courses or open space. And in this case, the applicant has been determined to comply with all environmental assessment and remediation requirements related to those policies.

The amendment is adding 335 dwelling units to the Broward County Land Use Plan, and it is therefore subject to Policy 2.16.2 regarding affordable housing. The city has provided some affordable housing data, and the County staff has requested additional information prior to the second Planning Council Public Hearing. So, again, the same situation as before, we are recommending a second Planning Council Public Hearing in this case to get that information affirmed and confirmed by County staff regarding Policy 2.16.2.

This is a regular scale amendment, so it will require transmittal by the County Commission. Regardless of your recommendation today, it will require action by the County Commission to transmit it to the state for review by the State of Florida review agencies. And upon return of those comments, recommendation to come back for a

second Public Hearing for the additional information regarding affordable housing.

Separate from the affordable housing information, there is -- the applicant has committed to the open space requirement, the resolution of the educational mitigation agreement related to the old Land Use Plan amendment, the transportation improvements. So all of those things will be -- have been proffered as mitigation for the Land Use Plan amendment and will be subject to legally enforceable documents to ensure that they are taken care of. There are four speakers on the item. If you'd like me to start calling them, the --

CHAIR STERMER: (Inaudible.)

MS. BOY: -- first speaker is Dennis Mele --

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Mele.

MS. BOY: -- the applicant.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning, Mr. Mele.

MR. MELE: Good morning. Dennis Mele, 200 East Broward Boulevard on behalf of the applicant. First, I want to confirm that we will do each and every one of the things that Ms. Blake Boy just mentioned. We typically do a restrictive covenant at probably your second reading to deal with the traffic and all the other issues.

What I really want to say about this, this course has been closed for over ten years. There's been a number of people, in the past, who have tried to do something here, and they never were successful, largely because they couldn't gain the support of the surrounding community. We think we've done that now. We'll find out if that's true. There are some other speakers here. I believe they will tell you the same thing I'm saying.

But significantly, what we -- what we did, we started out with a plan that was much more dense. We reduced it a couple of times. We've finally gotten it down to a level where people in the neighborhood could say, we support it. I've got a bunch of slides I can show you how our density is lower than everybody around us, but maybe it's better if you hear from the public. And then if you have any questions for me, I'll come back. Thank you very much.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Mele. Thank you for the commitment up front.

MS. BOY: The next speaker is Drew Iorio, followed by Pete Schwarz, followed by Michael Flynn.

MR. IORIO: I relinquish my time.

CHAIR STERMER: We don't let Mr. Schwarz testify on anything, do we?

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Isn't there a six year (inaudible)?

CHAIR STERMER: There -- there's a -- we don't let -- no, no, no, no.

MR. SCHWARZ: Good morning. It's nice to see you all. Pete Schwarz, Assistant Director of Planning --

(Laughter.)

MR. SCHWARZ: -- and zoning for the City of Oakland Park. Long time no see.

CHAIR STERMER: Does anybody find him credible?

(Laughter.)

MR. SCHWARZ: I'm just here to affirm that the City is still working to resolve the affordable housing issue. We have hired a consultant and study has been done. We'll be meeting with Mr. Stone next week. And we agree with the staff's recommendation. We hope for your --

CHAIR STERMER: Thank --

MR. SCHWARZ: -- approval.

CHAIR STERMER: -- thank you, Pete, and welcome back.

MR. SCHWARZ: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Good luck out there.

MS. BOY: Michael Flynn, followed by Jeff Schnars.

MR. FLYNN: My name's Mike Flynn. I'm the president of the Oak Tree Homeowners Association. I've lived there for 25 years. I can tell you that this project that we've worked with Pulte for over two years, two and a half years, to try to figure out what we want to do or what we could agree to. I'm a golfer. I watched that golf course go away, and I didn't like it at all. And we hung out as long as we could, and because I was the president of the homeowners' association, I took the Pulte proposal to the homeowners at Oak Tree. And based on their cooperation with us, we are in favor of what is going to go into this property.

I think it -- it does two or three things that are important to us. First of all, with regard to our property values in that particular community, the way the development is put together, I think it's going to actually enhance property value. At the same time, I think

it's density-wise enough so that if mitigation is done properly, that we will not be adversely impacted.

I have to tell you, though, that the traffic study that Broward County did is still something that we're really concerned about. I don't know how many of you get to drive by where we are out there on Prospect between Commercial and Oakland Park, on 21st or 44th. I always am curious to note that we're Level F on so many of these roads, with regard to level of service, and now mitigation gets us to D. Being a teacher, I always thought D wasn't quite good enough --

(Laughter.)

MR. FLYNN: -- so I would always hope that when we look at mitigation of traffic -- and I know Pulte is -- has worked with us on this. They know our concerns. I would hope that as we do this, the County and the city and everyone gets together to try to do the best we can here.

I want to note also that the land where the golf course is is under an environmental protection order, because we know it's contaminated. And Pulte, of course, has agreed to remediation and so forth. We will be carefully watching all of that.

And third is the drainage. Because of where we are, when it rains we get a lot of water, and there's a very complicated drainage network between Lauderdale Lakes, Tamarac, and Oakland Park there. So we're very concerned with that, as well.

But I'm here to represent the community, and the community is in favor of this. We have been in consultation with the surrounding communities of Lake Emerald and Eastland Cove and all of the Twin Parks down on -- on Prospect. Everyone's been involved in this.

So we're not -- we're not here to object. We're here to -- to promote it. And understand, we're going to keep watching, because we've got to make sure that the mitigation that's done is done properly. I thank you very much for letting me speak.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Flynn. Truly appreciate it. And Mr. --

MS. BOY: Schnars, which is --

CHAIR STERMER: -- Schnars.

MS. BOY: -- for questions only.

MR. SCHNARS: Questions only.

CHAIR STERMER: Okay. Anybody else from the public wish to speak on PH-3? Any questions from --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I'll **move** the item.

CHAIR STERMER: Moved by Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Oh, I'm sorry. MS. GRAHAM: Mayor?

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you, Chair Stermer. I do have a couple questions. I presume Mr. Mele would answer them. Barbara, you had provided a quick summary as the presentation got underway. But could you just -- I presume you've already done some kind of engineering for the stormwater and all of that.

MR. MELE: Yes.

MS. GRAHAM: Because I drive by there at least three times a week. Okay, I live northwest of there in Fort Lauderdale. And sometimes I go on 44th, which is my preferred route. Otherwise, if I circle around Prospect up to Commercial, the lights, I know all about what to avoid different times of the day, for many, many years.

It's a great site. The topography is such, though, where there's quite a variation in elevation, I presume because of the golf course design years ago. So whether or not they're going to be picking the median finished grade, so to speak, to comply with FEMA and the house finish floor elevations, is there going to be -- if you don't mind, is there going to be a lot of fill that's brought in, or is there a way to just cut and level it so that it all becomes what it needs to be, and reconfigure the stormwater retention lakes? Because the stormwater is my point here.

MR. MELE: I have a picture I'm going to show that'll help me answer your question.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BOY: Go to the -- where do you want to go?

MR. MELE: Right there, yes.

MS. BOY: You want to go forward?

MR. MELE: Yeah, that's --

MS. BOY: You're good?

MR. MELE: -- what I want to do. Thank you. So --

MS. GRAHAM: (Inaudible.)

MR. MELE: -- on the screen now you see our plan.

MS. GRAHAM: Uh-huh.

MR. MELE: And so I know the colors are a little weird, but that dark green is actually lakes. So you see we're digging extensive lakes throughout this property. You notice them along the north. You notice them along the south. I'm not sure why they're dark green, but, at any rate, we're doing a lot of lakes.

So bottom line here, we've already been in contact with the Broward County EPD, which is the drainage authority for this area, Lenny Vialpando's group. We're already working on the permitting. So we will be handling this drainage very carefully. We know that this property provides drainage for some of the surrounding properties. We'll still be doing that. So this is something we're spending a lot of time on.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Yeah, because I mean, it looks roughly like 30 percent, 35 percent, or awfully close to that, is the lakes. And if you have to do a 45 degree angle repose, which is the maximum, along the banks, I mean, those are going to be pretty deep. Okay. Thank you. That answered that. My second question is your ingress and egress are at the two points with the red arrows?

MR. MELE: That's correct. The --

MS. GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. MELE: -- the main entrance, which is for visitors and the residents, is on the Prospect Road side, and then the 44th is just residents only.

MS. GRAHAM: And so it's it a gated community?

MR. MELE: That's correct.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. And so for the emergency vehicles coming in, I presume they would come from Oakland or Tamarac or what have you, the response times to get back in there and wield their way around those streets is sufficient?

MR. MELE: So they can come in either way, of course.

MS. GRAHAM: Uh-huh.

MR. MELE: Emergency vehicles can come in either way. And as part of the development review committee process at the City of Oakland Park, the City's Fire Department and Police Department were both involved in the review, and they'll continue to be involved as we do site plans and everything else to make sure that the response times are good.

MS. GRAHAM: Right. Because I know there's a fire station south on 21st, south of 44th.

MR. MELE: Right.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. I appreciate seeing the site plan. I know that's not something we normally get to see. You've got the homeowners buying into it. Where are the town houses, if you -- if I may ask?

MR. MELE: The town houses are in the -- kind of the lower right-hand portion of the site.

MS. GRAHAM: Southeast side?

MR. MELE: Yeah, close to --

MS. GRAHAM: Uh-huh.

MR. MELE: -- the 21st and Prospect Road intersection.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Thank you very much. It's a nice property.

MR. MELE: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Rich.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm just pleased that you're saying all the different things that are going to be addressed or discussed. So that would include the affordable housing issue?

MR. MELE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER RICH: That's all. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Anybody else on PH-3? There was a motion by Commissioner Castillo --

MAYOR HARDIN: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: -- Mr. Blackwelder. Sorry.

MR. BLACKWELDER: I had one question. I'm a little confused with the different numbers on the traffic impact. There is an impact of level of service going from a D to an F on Prospect Road, because of this project; is that -- that's correct?

MS. BOY: Yes, that's correct. There's two analyses in your backup. One is the initial analysis based on just a straight 2.88 single family home analysis. That's plus I think 379 trips. And then the applicant has agreed to deed restrict the property to a mix of townhouse and open -- I'm sorry -- and single-family homes, and that's plus 279.

MR. BLACKWELDER: So he's -- he's lessened the impact they might have caused --

MR. MELE: Correct.

MR. BLACKWELDER: -- (inaudible).

MS. BOY: They've reduced the impact and then mitigated that impact as --

MR. BLACKWELDER: But they still -- even with that, it still goes down a level of service to an F.

MR. MELE: That's correct, but then when we make the improvement that we've committed to make, it's a traffic neutral result. We take care of our --

MR. BLACKWELDER: Okay.

MR. MELE: -- traffic by making that improvement. And the Broward County Traffic Engineering Division has already signed off that that improvement is appropriate and that it will mitigate our impact.

MR. BLACKWELDER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: There was a motion by Commissioner Castillo, a second by Mayor Hardin. Any further discussion with regard to the item? All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? Motion carries unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

OTHER BUSINESS:

CHAIR STERMER: Is there anything else before the Planning Council this morning, Ms. Blake Boy?

MS. BOY: No.

CHAIR STERMER: Seeing that, we want to -- on behalf of the Vice Chair, the Secretary, and myself, I want to thank you all -- we want to thank you all for your continued confidence. Have a good morning everybody. We stand adjourned.

(The meeting concluded at 11:45 a.m.)