

MINUTES

BROWARD COUNTY PLANNING COUNCIL

AUGUST 23, 2018

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
Commissioner Angelo Castillo
Mayor Bill Ganz
Vice Mayor Michelle J. Gomez
Mary D. Graham
Richard Grosso
Commissioner Nan H. Rich
David Rosenof
Richard Rosenzweig

MEMBERS Commissioner Heather Moraitis (Resigned effective immediately)
ABSENT: Mayor Michael J. Ryan
Vice Mayor Beverly Williams

Also Present: Barbara Boy, Executive Director
Andy Maurodis, Legal Counsel
Linda Sunderland, Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department
James Hetzel, Principal Planner, City of Fort Lauderdale
Samantha Danchuk, PH.D, P.E., Assistant Director, Environmental Planning and Community Resilience Division
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, August 23, 2018.

(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.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Good morning.

PLANNING COUNCIL

AUGUST 23, 2018

dh/NC

MS. GOMEZ: Morning.

CHAIR STERMER: I'd like to call to order the Broward County Planning Council meeting of Thursday, August 23rd, 2018.

ROLL CALL:

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

THE REPORTER: Mr. Brion Blackwelder.

MR. BLACKWELDER: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Richard Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Yes, ma'am, here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Robert Breslau.

MR. BRESLAU: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Felicia Brunson.

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Angelo Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Here.

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

MR. DIGIORGIO: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Bill Ganz. Vice Mayor Michelle J. Gomez.

VICE MAYOR GOMEZ: Good morning.

THE REPORTER: School Board Member Patricia Good.

MS. GOOD: Here.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Mary D. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Richard Grosso. Commissioner Heather Moraitis. 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. Vice Mayor Beverly Williams. Mayor Daniel J. Stermer, Chair.

CHAIR STERMER: Here. And good morning, everybody.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

CHAIR STERMER: If everyone could please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance, and we're going to be led this morning by County Commissioner Nan Rich.

(THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE WAS LED BY COMMISSIONER NAN RICH.)

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, everybody, and good morning. I hope everyone's been having a wonderful summer. It's time to get back to business, at least for this month. We'll talk about next month during the Executive Director's report.

CONSENT AGENDA:

AGENDA ITEM C-1 - APPROVAL OF FINAL AGENDA FOR AUGUST 23, 2018

AGENDA ITEM C-2 - AUGUST 2018 PLAT REVIEWS FOR TRAFFICWAYS PLAN COMPLIANCE

AGENDA ITEM C-3

A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 28, 2018

AGENDA ITEM C-4 - EXCUSED ABSENCE REQUESTS

CHAIR STERMER: Is there a motion with regard to items -- the Consent Agenda, understanding there are requests -- excused absence requests from Commissioner -- from Mayor Mike Ryan, from Vice Mayor Beverly Williams, and Fort Lauderdale Commissioner Heather Moraitis has asked for an excused absence, and she has as well resigned from the Planning Council.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: She has?

PLANNING COUNCIL

AUGUST 23, 2018

dh/NC

CHAIR STERMER: Yes, she has. So we will await the appointment of a new member by Commissioner LaMarca. Is there a motion with regard to the Consent Agenda?

MR. CASTILLO: So moved.

MS. GOOD: Moved.

CHAIR STERMER: Moved by School Board Member Good --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: -- second by Commissioner Castillo. All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? That carries unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

REGULAR AGENDA:

AGENDA ITEM R-3 - COUNSEL'S REPORT

CHAIR STERMER: We are now up to the -- Mr. Maurodis's report, Counsel's Report, R-3.

MR. MAURODIS: No counsel report today.

AGENDA ITEM R-4 - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

CHAIR STERMER: We're up to the Executive Director's Report. Ms. Blake Boy.

MS. BOY: Good morning. Thank you so much. I have just a couple of items. I -- first I wanted to talk about the September Planning Council meeting. As it happens, we have no Public Hearing items for the month of September, so I would ask the Council to consider the cancellation of that meeting, making your next meeting October 25th.

CHAIR STERMER: Is there any opposition to doing that? Seeing none, that's what -- no, that's what we will do.

MS. GOMEZ: So moved.

CHAIR STERMER: The schedule is our schedule. Let me -- let's at least have a couple of second conversation. The Executive Director and I keep looking at, along with staff, our schedule and where applications are. And if we can arrange with applicants and not cause undue angst out in the development community and meet our scheduling, understanding what leaves here goes to the County Commission and things like that, we are trying our hardest to make our meetings as productive and effective as we can. And if there are months like September where we can either make sure stuff comes to

PLANNING COUNCIL

AUGUST 23, 2018

dh/NC

us in August or October, that's what we're trying to do. For the sake of us getting together every month just to say we're getting together, I think we all have more efficient ways to use our time.

So just so everyone understands, that's a conversation that actually goes on every six weeks or so with the Executive Director and I, and if -- when we can, we will bring back to you scheduling potential modifications like that, just so everybody understands it.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Well, I'd miss you all, but I understand.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR STERMER: Appreciate it. We have -- you weren't done. I apologize.

MS. BOY: Oh, that's okay. So if you want to cancel the September meeting and --

CHAIR STERMER: We're canceling the September meeting.

MS. BOY: Okay. The September meeting will be canceled.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: Okay. All those in favor -- is there any opposition to canceling the September meeting?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

CHAIR STERMER: Passes by acclamation.

MS. BOY: Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

MS. BOY: And also, normally at the September meeting is when I present the dates for the combined November/December meeting, because of the fall and winter holidays. So what I'd like to do is I'll send out a survey, a poll for you for the two potential dates of November 29th or December 6th for the Planning Council combined meeting date. And you can -- I can let you know what the preferred date is, and you can finalize that date at the October 25th meeting.

CHAIR STERMER: Perfect.

MS. BOY: For the October 25th meeting, I think that the -- I was going to work with the Chair to have a combined Land Use/Trafficways and Executive Committee meeting. In March, the Planning Council initiated a proposal to the Land Use Plan to consider how we can encourage residential development along the commercial corridors and the

PLANNING COUNCIL

AUGUST 23, 2018

dh/NC

former retail sites, and then the County Commission reiterated that at their April meeting. So I think we'll have a work style shop -- style shop -- workshop-style meeting at the October 25th prior to the 10:00 a.m. meeting, and then it would come to the -- possibly come to the Planning Council for first Public Hearing at your combined November/December meeting.

The last item that I have is I wanted to announce that I've done a little reorganization of Planning Council staff, and announce three promotions. Deanne Von Stetina has been promoted to be Assistant Executive Director. Pete Schwarz has been promoted to the Director of Planning. And Dawn Teetsel been promoted to the Assistant to the Executive Director, which is kind -- is still a planning position, but working some more on the administrative side. So we have a great staff and I'm just pleased to announce that and share that information with you.

CHAIR STERMER: Congratulations, everybody.

(Applause.)

MS. BOY: The --

CHAIR STERMER: Let the record reflect that Mr. Grosso's feverishly running to sit in his chair.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Run.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: As we all watch.

MS. BOY: For the Public Hearing items, we have seven speakers on Item PH-3 in Deerfield Beach, one of them being the applicant. And there are no speakers signed in for Items PH-1, PH-2, or PH-4. PH-1 and 2 are recertifications of local plans, and PH-4 is the update of the wetlands map.

CHAIR STERMER: Anything else?

MS. BOY: That --

COMMISSIONER RICH: I have a question.

MS. BOY: -- that concludes my report.

PUBLIC HEARING:

AGENDA ITEM PH-1 - RECERTIFICATION PCR 18-4

AGENDA ITEM PH-2 - RECERTIFICATION PCR 18-5

AGENDA ITEM PH-4 - AMENDMENT PCNRM 18-1

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Rich.

COMMISSIONER RICH: I just had a question on 4, if we're going -- I assume we're just going to move those through, so I just want to ask the question.

CHAIR STERMER: Sure.

COMMISSIONER RICH: So on the list of the -- on the wetlands map, it talks about different types of plants and, so forth, and I'm just wondering where it says, everywhere exotic melaleuca. Now, my understanding is melaleuca is not something that we want to be planting, and it's been pulled out places, you know, up and down the highways and stuff. So maybe I'm just missing something. Maybe this is a special kind of melaleuca. I don't know.

MS. BOY: I see that on the removal list, primarily.

COMMISSIONER RICH: I thought it was on the -- I thought it was additions.

MS. BOY: So the first page of Attachment -- sorry -- the first page --

COMMISSIONER RICH: Attachment 1.

MS. BOY: -- of Attachment 1, the first page, on the back of that page are the additions, and then the -- which would be page 3 is listed as the removals from the map.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

COMMISSIONER RICH: Okay. So all the things on Attachment 1 on the first page, additions to the Broward County Wetland Map --

MS. BOY: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER RICH: -- I mean, I looked at that and thought those are -- that's what's coming in. So if --

MS. BOY: Right.

COMMISSIONER RICH: -- that's not correct --

MS. BOY: Added to the map. Okay. And --

CHAIR STERMER: I think Commissioner Rich's question is on the second line, there's -- there is something for melaleuca on the addition side of on --

COMMISSIONER RICH: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: -- in addition to on the removals, there's two on the removals.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. BOY: So Linda Sunderland is here from the -- I'm sorry, I don't know the name of the department.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. SUNDERLAND: Whatever alphabet soup you want to call us this week, right. Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department. I manage the aquatic wetland resources program. The additions to the map basically mean sites that we have gone out and verified that there are wetlands there, and melaleuca is the type of habitat that's on that property. It's not saying we encourage it. It's just somebody asked us to come out and take a look at it.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Okay. And it's there. We're not adding any --

MS. SUNDERLAND: No, no, no. It's just --

COMMISSIONER RICH: -- to anyplace or --

MS. SUNDERLAND: -- a designation --

COMMISSIONER RICH: -- anything like that. We're (inaudible) --

MS. SUNDERLAND: -- on the map that says we have verified this site is wetlands --

COMMISSIONER RICH: Okay.

MS. SUNDERLAND: -- and it's not cypress. It's melaleuca. That's all it means.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Okay.

MS. SUNDERLAND: Okay?

COMMISSIONER RICH: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: And I would just point out that even though wetland's got melaleuca on it, it's still providing certain wetland functions, flood attenuation --

MS. SUNDERLAND: Absolutely.

MR. GROSSO: -- et cetera. It would ultimately be great if we could remove that with more natural habitat, but I don't think that makes it inappropriate to add to our wetlands --

MS. SUNDERLAND: Right.

MR. GROSSO: -- at all. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR STERMER: Absolutely. Any opposition to removing Items PH-1, PH-2, and PH-3 and moving those, and then we'll -- PH-4. I'm sorry. PH-4. We'll leave the Deerfield Beach on for hearing. Is there any objection to moving PH-1, PH-2, and PH-4?

MR. DIGIORGIO: So moved.

CHAIR STERMER: Moved by Vice Chair DiGiorgio, seconded by School Board Member Good. Any further discussion with regard to PH-1, PH-2, and PH-4? All those in favor, signify by saying aye. All those opposed? Is there somebody up there?

MS. BOY: No.

CHAIR STERMER: Okay. I thought I heard somebody. I thought I heard -- I'm hearing voices.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. DIGIORGIO: That's a different conversation.

CHAIR STERMER: Yeah, that's a different conversation.

PH-1, PH-2, and PH-4 all pass unanimously.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM PH-3 - AMENDMENT PC 18-8

CHAIR STERMER: We do have two presentations this morning. What I'd like to do, with the Board's indulgence, is move those presentations to after we do PH-3, since we have members of the public here. So let's do PH-3.

MS. BOY: Good morning. Item PH-3, PC18-8, is located in the City of Deerfield Beach. You may recall this is the second Public Hearing. The first Public Hearing was at your May Planning Council meeting, and the Planning Council did move to recommend approval at that meeting.

It's approximately 8.4 acres from a combination of Low-Medium (10) Residential Commerce and Low (5) Residential to Irregular (39) Residential. It's a small-scale

PLANNING COUNCIL

AUGUST 23, 2018

dh/NC

amendment, so it's less than ten acres, so it comes to two Planning Council hearings before it goes to the County Commission for consideration of adoption. The addition -- the impact of this amendment, the addition of 250 dwelling units, because there's 77 currently permitted by the plan in the land uses, for a total of 327 dwelling units.

The amendment was subject to Policy 2.16.2 regarding affordable housing, and the city has demonstrated successful compliance with that policy. There are sufficient public facilities and services to serve the proposed land use. The parcel is located adjacent to six single-family homes that border the northern side of the parcel, and the applicant and the city have been working together to -- regarding setbacks and landscaping to address any potential compatibility issues.

There were 13 speakers, public speakers, at the May Planning Council meeting. And, by your rules, there's no courtesy notices that are sent out for the second Planning Council Public Hearing, so staff contacted all of the public speakers that had left their phone numbers to inform them of this Public Hearing today.

The applicant has continued to work with the area residents regarding some of the concerns that were raised at the May Planning Council meeting. And in response to that, the applicant has submitted correspondence that's in your backup to restrict the maximum building height to six stories.

Planning Council, as I said, recommended approval at your May Public Hearing, and the recommendation today would be recognizing the maximum building height of six stories, subject to a legally enforceable agreement. The applicant has a -- has a short presentation and then there -- I think there's seven or eight other public speakers on the item.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Mele.

MR. MELE: Thank you. Good morning. Dennis Mele, 200 East Broward Boulevard, on behalf of the applicant. We appreciate the opportunity to come back to you again. Since May, we've been working with our neighborhood community group, and we've made some changes to the plan, not only reducing the height from eight stories to six stories, but I'll show you some additional items as well.

So this is the site. The Dixie Highway flyover is just to our east. Some people call this the Hillsboro River. Some people call it the canal. I like to think of it as a river because we're on the area where it curves in a -- kind of an oxbow configuration, and then as you get further north and west, it straightens out into a -- a straight line going east and west.

This is the property today. It is a boatyard. The reason I mention that is your recreation department talks about the importance of the boating industry, so I want to show you what we're doing with respect to that. But it is a -- a location where boats are stored and also boats are worked on, and then also launched into the river.

You see at the extreme north end, that piece that kind of sticks up in a little bit of a triangle. I'll be talking about that in a moment. That's right along 5th Street. So my client has also purchased the Freedom Marine boatyard, which you see on this drawing, and so the plan is to move the boats from the canal location to the Freedom Marine location. Both of these now have a series of racks that hold the boats. And if you're in that area driving along the road, you can see those boats up in the air.

So what our plan is is to build a new boat storage building on the Freedom Marine site so the boats won't be visible on these racks, which are not attractive, but they'll be in an enclosed building. If any of you are familiar with that area of Deerfield Beach, there's a similar building along US-1 just south of the Boca Raton line, and it looks very nice. And that's our plan for Freedom Marine, and to make the -- we think it'll be a much better appearance for the community.

Also you'll notice there's two parcels that you can see that are kind of large green areas, one that's a little bit north of Pennell and one that's directly east of Freedom Marine. Those are two city parks. I'll be talking about those in a minute, as well. These are just the land use categories. You see a portion of the property is commercial. A portion of the property is Commercial 2. Commercial 2 in Deerfield is like a heavier commercial. I know in most of the County, we only have one commercial land use category, but Deerfield actually has two. And then you have R-10 and R-5, which are both residential districts.

These are the acreage breakdown for each of the land use categories, and you see it adds up to the 8.4 acres. This is the site plan for the property. You see the river along the south, so now north is to the right. And so the rivers along the south. And you see the plans for -- for docks along the river. And then the main residential building is shown in kind of a M or a W, depending on what direction you're looking at. And then along the top, which is the western portion of the site, is the parking garage and townhome section.

Now, if you'll notice in the lower right you see a yellow arrow. The purpose of that yellow arrow, I'm going to show you in a moment the boardwalk that's planned for along the river that we are participating in with the city. And so one of the things that the neighbors asked us to do, as we were working on this project, is to provide a connection, a pedestrian connection from the street to the boardwalk. So I know it's hard to see, but way down in the -- in the lower right-hand corner, you see an area that's kind of light green, and you'll see a little walkway going through there. So that walkway will take you from the 5th Street sidewalk through our site to the boardwalk that will be right along the river. This was one of the things that we discussed with our neighbors.

As I was listening to the public comment at the last meeting, and then the comments that we've heard since the last meeting when we were here, I think one of the things that it is our job to do this morning is to talk about how we're trying to blend in with the community, what things can we do that will help not only our project, but the community itself. So in addition to this connection to the boardwalk -- and let me kind of get to that

now. These are what it looks like today. You see those racks in the distance, and then you see a rendering of a -- a portion of the building on the lower right.

So here's what I really wanted to get to. So you see in the lower part of the drawing, you see the site that is the subject of your amendment today. And then in the upper left, you see the Freedom Marine site. And so east of the Freedom Marine site there's a park. So we've been talking to the city administration about, as part of our construction, to also work with the city on the construction of the park. So you see that the park is both on the east side of Freedom Marine and the south side, and it kind of wraps around the site. And you also see that brown dotted line. That's the boardwalk along the river that we're planning. And right at the bend, about halfway between the Pennell site and the Freedom Marine site, is another city park. So the concept here is to make the waterfront accessible for everyone in the neighborhood.

Now, in addition, along our western boundary is 1st Avenue. And so we've been talking to the neighborhood about doing streetscape improvements, landscape improvements, and other improvements that the neighbors believe are important for the area. Also, I know there's been some concerns in the neighborhood about how people will access the two parks. They want them to be accessible, but you don't want to burden any one single property owner by having everyone walking behind someone's house. So part of the plan for the boardwalk is also to provide a means of access through a public space to get to the park so that no individual property owner is burdened.

And so I know that when we're talking about an eight-acre site, it seems like we're talking about much more now, but as we've been working with the neighborhood, that's something that they told us is important to them, and so it's important to us, too. We've had a number of discussions with city administration about this, and this is something that we hope that we'll be able to bring about as part of the project.

I know there's neighbors this morning that are here to talk. One of the things that we've heard about is you see the Dixie Highway flyover kind of going diagonally from the lower left to the upper right of this drawing. And just to the east side of that Dixie Highway flyover is the Pioneer Grove area of Deerfield Beach. This is an area where the city has undertaken a lot of planning efforts to see that area revitalized. And so we feel that this is a continuation of that.

Just on the other side of Dixie Highway, right at the bottom of the drawing, where the river goes to its extreme southern point, is another city park. So you have three city parks along the water, the two that I've mentioned, the one that's right next to Freedom Marine, the one that's in the upper center portion of the drawing right at the bend at the river, and then the other one, the third one, just on the other side of the Dixie Highway flyover. And so the concept is to be able to link all three of these parks so that you have public access between them, and you have that ability to go along the river.

One of the things that we did in addition to having additional neighborhood meetings is my associate, Alicia Lewis, and I met with one of the neighborhood leaders and walked

throughout the entire neighborhood to see what are people doing along the water today. We were there from about 4:00 p.m. to about 5:30 p.m. on a weekday. And we went there at that time specifically because not only did we want to see what was happening, but we also wanted to see the traffic.

Now, no one will deny the traffic is heavy on Hillsboro Boulevard. It is. But traffic is not heavy in the neighborhood. We saw people coming home from work. We saw people leaving to run errands. We also saw people using the water. We saw people eating -- you know, eating a snack along the water while seated there. We saw people fishing. And so the idea here is to make it more accessible for everyone. There are certain streets that end at the water, but there's not a lot of access right up to it. I mentioned the three park sites. I know there was also concerns we heard about at neighborhood meetings to make sure people could access those parks without interfering with someone's privacy in the back yard of their home. So that's the other reason we're looking at this, as well.

So I know you have additional speakers. At the end of the public comment period, I'd like the opportunity to respond as appropriate. If you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them. Thank you very much.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Mele. Ms. Blake BOY.

MS. BOY: The public speakers, I'll call three at a time just so that they're aware. The first public speaker is David -- Dave Mirantz, followed by Jim Mathie, followed by Hugh Andison.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning, Mr. Mirantz.

MR. MIRANTZ: Good morning, Mr. Chair and ladies and gentlemen. My name is Dave Mirantz, and I'm the Executive Director of the Deerfield Beach Economic Development Council. And the application before you is not an isolated project where few will reap short term gain and long term -- at the long-term expense of many. It is, in fact, consistent with the citywide economic development strategy that was adopted unanimously by the County Commission in August of 2016. The strategy stands by itself, but is a roadmap of a vision to prosperity for all the city stakeholders.

But just as important is that the formation of this strategy has been a vehicle of robust community participation, a rarity in this day of divisiveness and apathy. Prior to the adoption of the plan in August of 2016, the City of Deerfield Beach was one of the few, if not the only, City of its size in Florida without a comprehensive plan that would outlive, by definition, the terms of elected officials.

In 2014, an Economic Development Task Force presented a well-researched and compelling argument for the city to invest in an economic development strategy. The Commission again unanimously approved the project, and it was awarded to the FIU Metropolitan Center, who conducted a number of community outreach programs.

PLANNING COUNCIL
AUGUST 23, 2018
dh/NC

In February, April, and August of 2016, separate documents, the bench -- benchmark data, the SWAT (phonetic) analysis, and the strategy itself were presented to the Commission, and, once again, all approved unanimously. The plan includes four overarching strategies. At the top of the list is a livable connected downtown, which we call Pioneer Grove. You, as planners, should be interested in learning that the plan for Pioneer Grove itself was -- was designed as a result of the city winning a national contest by a national association of planners which resulted in some of the best planners in the country happily doing the work for the city at little or no cost. And just this year, the plan for Pioneer Grove was recognized as the Plan of the Year by the State of Florida. And, of course, the LAC for Pioneer Grove was approved by this very board.

But equally important is that the plan has been a vehicle in which the community has participated in crafting a vision for the future of the city. I won't waste your time, but I have some very detailed information from the plan that talks about the goals and how this project meets those goals. It clearly identifies the need for workforce housing. Deerfield Beach has more than twice the average amount of targeted industries in the County, but the plan goes on to state that over 80 percent of the employees at these targeted industries live outside of Deerfield Beach, which greatly impacts our ability to maintain the millage rate for the rest of the folks that live there. This project is adjacent to the Pioneer Grove and LAC, which we just talked about.

Our ask today is that you approve this project so that the stakeholders can continue to craft a vision at a local level. Your voting in the affirmative would represent a clear blow to apathy and the divisiveness that plagues the public process. The City of Deerfield Beach has come a long way in creating valuable public input. Your affirmative vote will only help the continuation of the process for the long-term benefit of all. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Mirantz.

MS. BOY: Jim Mathie, followed by Hugh Andison, followed by Felecia Poitier.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning, Mr. Mathie.

MR. MATHIE: Good morning. I'm here to speak in favor of this project. I'm Jim Mathie. I own a little company called Chiefy, LLC. Makes me an author, a writer, and actually a blogger now. But I'm also a resident of Deerfield Beach. And I'm kind of the nautical guy in Deerfield. I've also been a member of the Broward County Marine Advisory Council, and we basically talk about how we can improve accessibility to the community. I'm also on the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce in Deerfield Beach.

But back in 2013, we created the nautical destination plan and presented it to the City Commission. It was actually modeled after the Pompano Beach Economic Development Plan. So we kind of stole a little bit of that, but then kind of took it to the nautical turn. It worked out okay, I think, and I think I see Pompano doing some nautical type

improvements, too. But I'm also a -- a boater, a diver, and I'll say sometimes fisherman. So that kind of puts me in a position to see what's going on. And when we created this nautical tourism or nautical destination plan back in 2013, we had an opportunity see what Deerfield had to offer. And it was kind of an eye opener, because I -- I've been here for 40-something years, and, you know, you kind of have to put it in writing and you have to sort of put it together. And it's pretty cool. I mean, Deerfield has two inlets. We have the Hillsboro Inlet and we have the Boca Inlet. And if you live in Deerfield, you have accessibility to two ocean inlets. As a boater, that's huge.

Of course, we have a beautiful beach and international fishing pier, and great reefs to fish and dive off of. But we also, on the western end, have Quiet Waters Park, which is a County park, has Splash Adventure and Ski Rixen. But connecting the two, the east and the west, what I call the bookends, is the Hillsboro River. And I do like to call it the Hillsboro River because it kind of gives it a little bit of, hey, back in the old days. And it was a river, back in the old days. But theoretically it connects our community. So I do see the Pennell's Marina as right now -- I mean, it's the oldest marina that we have in Deerfield, over 60 years old. I know Mike Pennell well, the owner now, and I knew his dad really well. And they're an integral part of our nautical community.

However, I do see the fact that they've tied this project into Freedom Marine to build a -- essentially a storage facility in a building, which is like Marina 1, that'll really enhance the area, and then also give an opportunity for -- for people with connecting the parks, which I think was actually part of our plan. So I do see this as a benefit, an economic development benefit. I also see this as an opportunity to revitalize an area and improve an area. Of course, connecting it underneath the flyover is probably pretty cool with being able to have access to the waterway. So, for sure, I'm in favor of this project. I think it's a great project, and I hope that you vote positively. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Mathie.

MS. BOY: Hugh Andison, followed by Felecia Poitier, followed by Dennis Michael.

MR. ANDISON: Hugh Andison will be waiving speaking at this time, but I would like to say I'm in favor of the project.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Andison. Ms. Poitier.

MS. BOY: Followed by Dennis Michael.

MS. POITIER: Good morning.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning.

MS. POITIER: Felecia Poitier, 140 Northeast 5th Street, Deerfield Beach. As I said at the last meeting, our main concern is the density level of this area. We understand that these people have to make good economic use out of their property, but once you open

the door, to this level, from ten units to 39, you're opening the door to ruining our neighborhood. In order for that to work, they're going to have to have at least the six stories. In Deerfield, the height limit is four, with maybe a variance for maybe five floors. We -- we just feel as if once the density is changed to 39 units, that really opens the door to ruin our neighborhood, because on those streets that Mr. Mele talked about, there are three fingers of the canal, as he mentioned, that goes behind the houses. We know what the ultimate goal and plan is, including with Pineapple Walk and the changes in the walkway and the connectors and all of that. But we really don't want to be pushed out. And the change to 39 units will hasten us being pushed out.

And part of this packet -- this project, 327 units. They said the -- that part of -- some of this unit -- these units will meet the affordable housing/workforce housing requirements. If that is indeed the case, then that means that we're talking about families, and probably young families. But yet, in this packet, it says that they're -- that this proposed amendment would -- would generate only seven students into the schools that would cover that project, that -- where the students would go unless they go to private school. Affordable housing but you're only going to generate seven students? 327 units, but you're only going to generate peak p.m. hours 118 trips? Net p.m. peak hours at most 144, with 327 units, plus the people who already live there? The numbers look funny to me.

The connector connecting the parks, this is all nice and -- it's nice dressing. The walkway was going to be -- had already been approved anyway. It's just that, knowing the City of Deerfield, as each developer comes in, they're asking them to help complete this waterway as part of their project. That lowers the cost for the city, probably the County, too. But all of that is a part of getting approval.

By a show of hands, how many of you have ever heard the term, the heart of the Gold Coast? Anybody? Anybody? The heart of the Gold Coast used to be the Chamber of Commerce's slogan for Deerfield Beach. Why? Because the City of Deerfield Beach is basically 40 miles north of Miami and 40 miles south of West Palm Beach, which there, ergo, the heart of the Gold Coast.

We understand that we have the last prime building area left in the eastern portion of Broward County. We know that. But we are asking you to consider how we feel when our families have been on that waterfront since 1918. You chose the density. Four, five years from now, maybe I'll even say within two or three election cycles in Deerfield, the next thing we're going to have is a developer-backed referendum to change the height limit. Once that goes through -- because they will pay for it -- that opens the door. That means, ooh, we can get high rises back there on that water. Ooh, we can sell waterfront living. And those changes will help hasten the demise of our neighborhood and push us out of there. And we are trying hard. This is all we have left. This is all we have left.

Now, you notice at the last meeting we had quite a few people from the neighborhood here. A few people had to work this morning, they couldn't make it. But you know why

a lot of them aren't here? Because they feel the fix is in. What can we do? We're nobodies. Nobody's going to listen to us. But I'm asking you all to listen to us today. Even though they aren't here, do something different. Make it ten units, maybe even 15 units. But 39 per acre, that's -- that -- that -- that's -- the math just doesn't add up for me. Especially with what they're saying the proposed effects are. How can that be, with 327 units?

Yes, they met with us. They showed us the changes. So they lopped two stories off the main building and put them on top of the garage as townhouses. Still you got -- that's still that huge building, six stories, the garage, six stories. Really? You're still two stories above the height limit. We're asking you to please limit the density to perhaps 20, maybe, maybe 25. But I would ask 20 units per.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Ms. Poitier.

MS. POITIER: Don't help -- don't help developers push us out of our neighborhood. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Ms. Poitier.

MR. GROSSO: Mr. Mayor, I have a question.

CHAIR STERMER: Well, let's get all the speakers done and then we'll bring him back. Mr. Michael.

MS. BOY: Followed by Val Lewis, followed by Emma Sampson.

MR. MICHAEL: Good morning, everybody. I'm Dennis Michael. I live at 1636 Southeast 7th Court, Deerfield. I've been a Deerfield resident since 1977. And, I guess like Mr. Mathie, I'm a boater. I've been on -- on the water all -- all my life, as a kid growing up and what have you. I'm from Jupiter, and I -- I know the Jupiter area really well. And as a kid, I was able to use the waterways and the rivers and, you know, ski off them and be able to navigate and use the banks of the water and what have you.

This particular project, to me, it looked good because of -- of the access that people will have, both from the water to the land and from the land to water, both sections. And I don't know about densities, I don't know any of that type of thing, but as a -- as a boater, as a long-time resident of Deerfield, I'm for the project. I think it'll enhance the whole area, as far as like Mr. Mathie said, we're a water type community. And I think it'll be good for the community, but that's -- that's just me.

And I like the idea of the new boater facility over there at Freedom, because I've been using Pennell's, and I was sad to see him go, but I'll be happy to go to the other place. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Michael.

PLANNING COUNCIL
AUGUST 23, 2018
dh/NC

MS. BOY: Val Lewis, followed by Emma Sampson, followed by Latavian Laster.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning, Ms. Lewis.

MS. LEWIS: Good morning. Hi. My name is Val Lewis. What's amazing to me is I hear everybody say this will enhance the area, and this is good for the area. I live on that water. I live directly on that water. And I don't want a boardwalk connecting this area that walks behind my house. How would you feel if you lived there and there is a boardwalk that you can walk on any time of the night, any day at any time, and do whatever?

And what's so scary to me is that now we're -- we're acting like we want to build a park there. My family has lived in that area over 50 years. This area that they're talking about building a park has been vacant for years. So now all of a sudden, since we're building this beautiful luxury condos, we need a park? Why not more affordable housing? Why not regular single-family homes? We don't need these condos and these big buildings just to be able to say we want to beautify the area.

I'm not a boater. I'm not a fisher. I -- I love the water the way it is. It -- it's nice. It's calm in the evening time to be able to go back there and sit back there and look at the water. I don't want this area to be bombarded with boats because we've added this big building, and now all you see is boats after boats, and you hear the noise and the roaring of the boats.

That's not fair to us. And I would ask that you put yourselves in our position. We live there. And we have always lived there. And now, all of a sudden, we want to beautify the area with this here? This area, this should be out on the beach. It shouldn't be in a residential area. I mean, the boat dock, that's fine. We've -- we've never had a problem with that. It has never bothered us. I -- I do believe something should go there, but this six-story, eight-story condo unit to connect this around to the marina, that's not fair to us.

That's not fair to us. It's not fair to my family who's lived there. And everybody is standing up saying, oh, I think this will be real good for the area. It'll beautify the area. But you don't live there. We do. And I ask that you don't vote in favor of this project.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Ms. Lewis.

MS. LEWIS: Thank you.

MS. BOY: Emma Sampson, followed by Latavian Laster, followed by Stephen Graham, from the City of Deerfield Beach, for questions only.

MS. SAMPSON: Good morning, Mr. Mayor and others. I live at 495 North Deerfield Avenue. This project is right in my back door. There's one block before my street. I'm having issues like some of the others who have spoken before. I'm having issues with a parking garage, either three or four stories. That means there's cars. 1st Avenue,

PLANNING COUNCIL

AUGUST 23, 2018

dh/NC

Northeast 5th Street, and Deerfield Avenue are the only traffic areas, as far as I know. I know the professionals have worked with this project and they have done studies, but we, as a resident, I don't know what they know.

But I live there. I love the area. And I know that the owners have purchased the property, and there is no issue with them doing something with the -- with that area. But how much they do is our concern. How many of you have visited that area? Anybody? I love the area. It's the only area that is calm. I love my mornings, my birds and -- but an eight-story building, even a six-story is going to interrupt that.

And I know development is expected in all of south Florida. I used to work with the Planning Council -- planning department in another city. So I realize and I know there's a long-term plan for this particular area. But we are residents who pay the taxes that we're asked to pay. We live there. And the reason we're there is because we like the area.

I'm sure you like the area that you live in. But how much change would you like to see done to your area that would change it totally? I like the water. I'm not -- I like boating, but I'm not -- I don't own a boat. And how many people are we expecting to use this area for boating? It's just that the local people are going -- as I see it now, we're on the backside of this development. We're the guys next door.

The traffic is going to come through our area. Delivery, any service units, everything is going to be along 1st Avenue, unless the city has something in mind that we're not aware of. So we -- we, as residents, are not saying we disapprove of their project, because it -- it seems to be indicated that we don't want the project. It's not that we don't want the project. It's just how much of the project you want to put in our backyard. And I thank you for listening, and I hope you at least lower the number of units that's going to be decided and approved in this area. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Ms. Sampson. Appreciate it.

MS. BOY: Latavian Laster, followed by Stephen Graham.

MR. LASTER: Good morning, everybody.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning.

MR. LASTER: I totally agree with what the previous people that just came up and spoke about. Only thing I may have different to say is I don't approve of six stories. I live at 120 Northeast 5th Street. That's directly close up to where the project is going to be. And I sort of feel six stories is too high still. I feel it won't be no privacy.

My major issue is still also about the in and out of the roadways and, I mean, for like emergency units and stuff like that. I feel like it's -- it's still going to be too much for that one little street to take. And I just still feel that six stories is still too high.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, sir.

MR. LASTER: Uh-huh.

CHAIR STERMER: Appreciate it.

MR. LASTER: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Have a great morning.

MS. BOY: So one -- someone just signed in to speak, Eddie Oichen (phonetic). I'm sorry, I -- Eddie Oichan --

MR. DICKENS: Dickens.

MS. BOY: -- Aicken? Sorry.

MR. DICKENS: Dickens.

MS. BOY: Aicken. Yes. Dickens, sorry.

MR. DICKENS: Good morning.

CHAIR STERMER: Good morning.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning.

MR. DICKENS: My name is Eddie Dickens. I grew up and was raised over there in that area. I guess some of the issues that haven't been addressed, I haven't heard anything about what type of pilings will be used in the area, what type of effect will it have on the ground, on the homes around the area. Haven't heard any of that stuff. Nobody's said nothing to me about that, or to us. I don't know.

And also in the area, you cannot change the traffic flow in a small area that we have. We just have to deal with it, but I want to know what kind of -- are we prepared for what's to come, far as emergency evacuations for hurricanes and such and so forth. There is a canal over in that area. Are we prepared for, you know, if it's an overflow of wastewater over in the area?

Also, the height of the building is a major concern. Nobody lives over there that we all have concern for. People outside of there don't live there, so it don't affect them. It affects us. And, you know, we already have, like I said before -- to you before, we already have the high-rise overpass over there. You know, we don't want to be looking at nothing but hard stuff all the time. We would like to see the sunshine also, as well. We don't want to wake up to steel buildings and all that stuff around us. We want to see some sunshine, as well.

You know, I just think we ought to take that stuff into consideration, and we need to find out the tactics of -- method of -- or what type of drilling are they going to be doing for the pilings and so forth, and the impact that it's going to have on the wetlands and so forth around there. Okay?

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Dickens.

MR. DICKENS: Thank you.

MS. BOY: The final speaker is Stephen Graham from the City of Deerfield Beach. He signed in for questions only, so I don't know if he wants to speak. Oh, sorry, Steve.

MR. GRAHAM: Good morning. Steve Graham. I'm the Assistant Director of Planning and Development Services with the City of Deerfield Beach. I am here for questions only, but certainly this item is before you because the application came through the -- the city through its initial process and -- and passed the first reading to be transmitted to the Planning Council.

So, you know, the City Commission has already, you know, signaled its intention that it would like to see this matter reviewed further at -- at this level. So if there are any questions, I'm happy to take them. Otherwise, that's it for me. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Graham. Mr. Mele.

MR. MELE: Thank you. Dennis Mele, 200 East Broward Boulevard, on behalf of the applicant. Just a few responsive items. The plan for this building is to have about five percent of the units be three bedrooms. The balance will be split approximately equally between one bedroom and two bedrooms. So I think that the School Board analysis was accurate, and I think the traffic analysis is accurate, as well. I don't think in a building of this type, with a very, very small percentage of three bedrooms, you're going to have large families.

Secondly, the question about being pushed out. When we had the neighborhood meetings, we heard a lot of questions about were we trying to buy more property than what we've already purchased. We are not. We also heard people mentioning eminent domain. Well, clearly, we are not a government agency. We don't have the power of eminent domain. And I think that I was at a meeting here at least a couple times when you had an amendment in the southern portion of Broward County where we heard a lot of the same fears from neighborhood people, and I don't think there was any intention of doing that there, either.

So I know that that was one of the comments made. We are buying this property and Freedom Marine. We're not looking at anything else. Boat traffic. You have these two major marine operations now. We're consolidating them into one. So I don't think we're going to have increased boat traffic. I think we're going to have it centralized in one location instead of two. And if you live in between the two now, you're probably going to

see more -- you probably have seen more traffic than you will see in the future, because it'll all be consolidated in one place.

There was a question about the height limit. The height limit in the city code in the district that we would be looking at is 75 feet. We are lower than 75 feet. So we are not increasing the height limit. There was a question about a referendum to increase the height limit, and changes that were made to Chapter 163 a few years ago no longer allow referenda for these kinds of things. So I don't think that's applicable, either.

Why aren't more people here? Well, I would like to think it's because of the efforts we made between May and today to meet with the residents, talk to people about what we're doing. The meeting you had in May was a 10:00 a.m. meeting on a Thursday, just like this one. So I don't believe it's a matter of work schedules. I think that the -- unfortunately, the common thing that happens is if you satisfy people, they stay home. If they are still not satisfied, they come out. So I don't think that the reduction in the number of people has anything to do with except that.

Why the parks today? When we first came to the city to talk to them about our plan, the city showed us what they wanted to do with parks, with the park that's on the other side of the overpass that's part of Pioneer Grove, with the two parks here. So while the residents may not have seen activity on it, the city planners were already working on all three of these parks to do plans for the future, and we said, how can we participate. So it didn't happen as a result of us filing this application. It was already underway.

There was a question about how we're going to build the building. The City of Deerfield Beach has outlawed dynamic compaction. We can't do that. And we're also not doing battered pilings. I'm not an architect, but I understand that those two methods would be ones that would cause vibration, and we're not using either one of them.

If you have any other questions, I'll be happy to answer them. Thank you very much.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Mele. Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you, Chair Stermer. I'm not too sure who the people are to answer this question, but maybe we'll start with counsel, and they can get the answers from the other people.

Right now, the waterway, the Hillsboro River, has the boat traffic on it between the two marine facilities. Roughly how deep is that, and is there going to be any dredging to allow deeper boats to go to the property that's further west that's going to be retained?

MR. MELE: We are not doing any dredging, nor do we have the right to do so.

MS. GRAHAM: Well, you can apply for a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers, couldn't you?

MR. MELE: We -- we don't see any need to do it, because if you look at that, first, you have a bridge at Dixie that you have to go under, and then you have additional bridges as you go out further. So we don't anticipate any dredging, and we're not asking --

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. So the depth of the waterway is sufficient?

MR. MELE: It's sufficient for the boat --

MS. GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. MELE: -- the type of boats that come to these two locations today.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Secondly, they mentioned that this walkway, one of the speakers who actually lives on the water -- I don't remember her last name, but she actually has waterfront property right now on the river -- mentioned the plans for the boardwalk. Legally, how is that being done? I know it's not eminent domain. You stated that. But how are they taking the properties that abut the river now to put in the boardwalk for easements or whatever? How does that work legally?

MR. MELE: Well, first of all, along our two locations and along the two city park locations, that would be available today. Obviously, to complete the boardwalk, they're going to have to work with property owners in between, or have some ability to put it over the water itself. I don't know how they're going to do that. The other thing that I did hear is a concern about people being there at night. And at least the design that I saw would be able to be closed at night, just like certain city parks are closed at night.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. So to put the boardwalk over the waterway, that's like a littoral right or something like that. Again, I'm not an attorney, but I know there's different things that govern doing those types of things. How would -- how would that get done? From the city approval or from the Army Corps of Engineers if that's considered a navigable waterway?

MR. MELE: It -- it is a navigable waterway. But I would have to defer to the city as to the method they're using. What we said is if they can make it available, we will help them build it.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Then the 75 -- thank you for having all the answers. So this -- I'll try to be quick. The 75-foot height limit that you stated, is that the height to the roof deck above the highest habitable floor, or is that -- how is that measured from grade?

MR. MELE: The city planner just said the roof deck of the highest habitable floor.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. So you actually can mechanical equipment and other appurtenances above that roof deck, just like some other municipalities allow in their zoning codes; correct?

MR. GRAHAM: That is correct. Our code does allow --

MS. GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. GRAHAM: -- some mechanical equipment to be (inaudible).

MS. GRAHAM: So 75 feet is the top of, say, a concrete deck above the top floor of units, but on top of that, you can get your cooling towers up there and a lot of other equipment. That is not limited by the 75-foot height.

MR. GRAHAM: That's correct under our current codes, yes.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. And then, finally, there was one speaker --

MR. MELE: If I could -- if I could just add, our height measured in the method you just described is approximately 67 feet.

MS. GRAHAM: That's not very high ceiling heights in those luxury condos, though, is it?

MR. MELE: Six story building, six to seven feet. I just asked the architect.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Okay, well, taller ceilings are nicer, but --

MR. MELE: Well --

MS. GRAHAM: -- I'm just -- I just needed to know about the 75 feet.

MR. MELE: -- we know that the height is sensitive, and we're trying to pay attention to it.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. And then, finally, someone stated about revitalizing the area. There's all this talk here in the County and all over south Florida for -- about affordable housing and workforce housing and things like that. It sounds to me from the speakers who have lived there, some have been there a long time, 20, 30, 50 years, someone said. Would we call that area right now, like, affordable housing for the workforce that's there? I don't know who would answer that question, but, you know, just does -- I don't seem to understand how we have affordable housing and workforce housing in an area now that we would displace it. Maybe I'm misunderstanding something.

MR. MELE: Well -- well, keep in mind, we're not displacing any housing. This is a boatyard and vacant property. We're not removing one single residence in doing either one of these projects.

MS. GRAHAM: Right. No, I understand, on your parcel, correct.

MR. MELE: And I think in terms of the character of the area, either the Board members from Deerfield or the city planner could answer that better than I can.

MS. GRAHAM: No. No. The reason why I'm asking is one of your speakers, who doesn't live in the neighborhood -- I don't remember who it was -- said that this whole development plan and what's coming perhaps in the future as the City of Deerfield imagines it, would -- would increase development there. Not on your property. Your property's simply just the first one coming before it. And I wanted to know why --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. GRAHAM: -- the revitalizing of the area was needed. He didn't say it was blight, but is that something that's getting discussed when you're presenting to the homeowners?

MR. MELE: It sounds like someone up there wants to answer that question.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: No. I'm going to -- I just told the Mayor he's speaking next.

MR. MELE: Oh, okay.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Okay, so I'll defer to how the Mayor will address that. Thank you very much, counsel.

MAYOR GANZ: And before I do, Ms. Graham, and I'm sorry, because I had -- I had someone in my ear at the moment, if you could repeat what your question and concern is. You're trying to say it doesn't need to be revitalized, that area?

MS. GRAHAM: Someone made a comment, one of the speakers. He did not live in the area. And he mentioned that this whole plan was to revitalize the area, not just this one --

MAYOR GANZ: That's the --

MS. GRAHAM: -- application.

MAYOR GANZ: -- Pioneer Grove plan that is on the eastern portion of this. This doesn't necessarily fall directly into Pioneer Grove, all of that, but --

MS. GRAHAM: Okay.

MAYOR GANZ: -- that whole neighborhood, but it's mostly the neighborhoods that are to the south of Hillsboro Boulevard, including the City Hall area, as well.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you very much. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Mayor Ganz, the floor is yours.

MAYOR GANZ: Thank you. And I'm going to bring up our city planner, not that he's going to owe me any favors, but I just want some clarification and some fact. There are four different zoning areas, categories in the -- in this -- this parcel; is that correct?

MR. GRAHAM: Yes, that's correct. There's a mix of residential zoning districts and commercial zoning districts.

MAYOR GANZ: Okay. As Mr. Mele pointed out, no one's being displaced on this. What you have now is a hodgepodge of zoning, and some of that zoning category does allow for the height that this has been reduced to. That was one of our biggest concerns, going beyond the height. The eight stories down to six certainly was something that we wanted to see, not just as a board, but I can tell you, as a Commission, we wanted to see that as well. That was one of our biggest concerns.

Much of the issues that I feel that -- that need to be addressed can be addressed through the site plan approval which will come before the city. Whatever is built there is going to have an impact on the neighborhood, because much of that is undeveloped. If you take the current zoning categories that are there now and you build them out to their maximum ability, you're going to have an impact on the neighborhood no matter what is built. And -- and that's hard to kind of adjust for, because people have rights to be able to build on property based on what the zoning categories are.

So what I -- what I see here, this area does need revitalization. The Freedom Marina has been a -- long been a -- a thorn in the side of the City of Deerfield Beach, between code enforcement violations that have piled up to ridiculous numbers and -- and constantly been an issue over in that area.

We have a park that has limited access that is a beautiful little slice over there, and we are desperately in need of being able to utilize it and do something with it, as opposed to being an overgrown area with very limited access and very limited use.

This area, right now, if you look at that entire area over there, 71 of the 131 properties are homesteaded. So a little less than half of the homes that are over there are not homesteaded. That means they're probably rentals or absentee landlords. You have a lot of areas that are not developed over there.

So this neighborhood, there are people that have been here for generations. And certainly we don't want to do anything that's going to destroy their way of life. But change is needed over there. And this project, with the -- with the consideration that's been put into working with the neighborhood, and trying to reduce the height limits, and what we have the ability to do as a city to be able to control and -- and limit some of the impact on the neighborhood through our site plan approval process, you know, we fully

support this project. We think it is a much needed item for the city.

And I can tell you from the city standpoint as a body that sits up there that makes these decisions, we don't just approve any single project that comes forward. We are sensitive to neighborhood concerns. There was a major project that was presented in an area that was desperately in need of revitalization, had not been developed in decades, over on Dixie Highway. We knew that that would have a tremendous impact, a negative impact. We listened to the neighbors. We came out and the City of Deerfield Beach never even moved it to -- to come before the Planning Council because we recognize that certain projects aren't right for certain areas. And no matter what it might do to our tax revenues, we want to make sure that we protect our neighborhoods, and that's what we would look to do. And we've done that consistently as a Commission.

Not everyone's going to like every project that comes forward. We understand that. We respect that. We try to work with the neighborhood as best as possible. I do appreciate the fact that the people that are bringing this project forward recognize that. Of course, it also helps when you tell them we're not approving it unless you lower the -- the height, but they did that, which is what you'd hope would happen. It's not perfect for everyone. We understand that. But there are ways to -- to work with them to try to limit some of those that might have a negative impact.

Overall, this is going to be nothing but a positive impact for not only that neighborhood but the overall City of Deerfield Beach, which is why we support it.

CHAIR STERMER: (Inaudible.)

MAYOR GANZ: I'm done. Sorry.

CHAIR STERMER: Okay. Mr. Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: I've got a couple of things. First of all, I'd be interested in giving a member of the existing community a couple of minutes to come up and respond to anything that the applicant said.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Grosso, no, no, no. That's -- that's not how we do it. If you want to ask a question and get the community to respond, but we -- the -- our process is usually that the applicant speaks. The community -- anybody from the public speaks. The applicant closes, and then we ask questions. We don't continue the back and forth of having people come back and forth. Otherwise, let's clear the rest of our day, and we'll be here for the rest of the day.

MR. GROSSO: Then I have some questions.

CHAIR STERMER: If people have a question, as a question.

MR. GROSSO: I have some questions (inaudible). The -- the predominant neighborhood --

CHAIR STERMER: If you could also just -- Richard, if you could also just use your microphone.

MR. GROSSO: -- the --

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you.

MR. GROSSO: -- the neighborhood next door, are those single-family homes, one story, two stories?

MR. DICKENS: They're single-family homes.

CHAIR STERMER: Folks, Mr. Dickens, please. We can't be doing that.

MS. BOY: So I put up the --

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you.

MS. BOY: -- the land use map so that -- and then I'll switch to the aerial also. So you can see the surrounding land use here is Commerce on the County plan, and the yellow is Low (5) Residential, a maximum of five dwelling units per acre. When you look at the -- at the aerial, so primarily the development in this area is single-family, and I would say, single -- single-level multi-family in this area. You can -- sorry. Let me go back to our aerial.

So here's the aerial. So you can see that along, I think it's 1st Avenue, the development is -- it's not fully developed. There's a lot of vacant parcels across the street from this developed -- development area. To the north of the property is single-family residential.

MR. GROSSO: And the -- and you said the max density is five per acre?

MS. BOY: Well, the -- that's what the Land Use Plan permits. I believe that there -- there's some multi-family directly across the street on the west side of 1st Avenue. I didn't -- I didn't calculate the density for it, but it's multi-family on about -- it looks like about -- it's under the red letter as multi-family. It's about probably 14 or 15 units.

MR. GROSSO: The resulting density of this project would be?

MS. BOY: The resulting density of the proposed Land Use Plan amendment is to 39 dwelling units per acre.

MR. GROSSO: In your recommendation that we would find it compatible, was that -- did I understand that to be based on proposed landscaping plan?

MS. BOY: So the policies in the County plan addressing compatibility in situations such as this, because there are plenty of areas in Broward County where you even have High-50 next to single-family residential, and when we've done the analysis working with the city, really relies on setbacks and buffering through the site plan process, like the -- the Mayor was speaking of.

MR. GROSSO: And so on compatibility, you don't factor in scale, size, density, heights? That's not the predominant compatibility --

MS. BOY: So the assumption --

MR. GROSSO: -- factors?

MS. BOY: -- the assumption for Irregular-39 would be either mid-rise or high-rise. So more than four stories of development. It's certainly weighed in, but the County plan does not -- does not regulate height or bulk or setbacks.

MR. GROSSO: But it does require compatibility of adjacent uses; right?

MS. BOY: Reliance on the city -- on the city codes is how the -- how the policy in the plan states it.

MR. GROSSO: Our policy in our plan, it requires compatibility is caveated by based on --

MS. BOY: Well, generally --

MR. GROSSO: -- landscaping, buffers, and other such factors --

MS. BOY: -- on reliance --

MR. GROSSO: -- in the city code?

MS. BOY: -- of city -- yes, on reliance of municipal plans to address the direct compatibility of these types of uses.

MR. GROSSO: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Rich. Mr. Grosso, I don't -- Commissioner Rich, I'm sorry. If you have questions, please. I don't want to limit. If you have questions --

COMMISSIONER RICH: Yeah.

CHAIR STERMER: -- from the public, ask the question. And if you want them to respond, that's fine. But to constantly invite people back and forth when --

MR. GROSSO: Yeah. I got what I needed.

CHAIR STERMER: I just --

MR. GROSSO: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: -- wanted to make sure. Commissioner Rich.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Okay. So I think the question was asked about affordable housing, or it was brought up by Ms. Graham. So I understand that the -- according to the Planning Council notes, Deerfield Beach affordable housing study was found to be in compliance -- compliance with the policy that's been used. So I want to know if there is any affordable housing. People got up here and they -- and they talk about multi-use, live, work, play, but people can't live where -- where they work or play, in many cases here. So I'm just asking about what it -- has there been any consideration and has there been anything, a -- a buy-out at all with regard to this? Can you comment on that?

MS. BOY: So -- thank you. So I would say in response to Policy 2.16.2, the information submitted by the city was deemed to meet the policy. If you're deemed to -- the municipality is deemed to meet the policy, then there's no -- there's not -- there's no buy-out, because they're deemed to meet the policy. The buy-out comes if there's no information submitted by the municipality or if the information is not deemed to meet the policy. Then there's a buy-out for a set aside of 15 percent or a dollar per square foot.

Some cities do have -- meet the policy, inclusive of a payment, but that's not a buy-out. It's included in their policies that they use to meet that. I would defer to the applicant regarding the consideration of any affordable units.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Mele.

MR. MELE: Just wanted to make a couple of points. In the reports that you see, and I think it's Attachments 12 and 13, the City of Deerfield Beach actually has a Housing Authority. And so one of the things that was shown is the city, through its Housing Authority, has actually build three apartment complexes in the city and is working on more. And those apartment complexes are restricted, I think, to very low in one case and low income in the others.

So although we will have units that will have rent levels that would qualify as affordable, we are not deed restricting them, which is what would be required if we were asking for affordable housing credit. The city's program was found to comply with the affordable housing policy, and I think the fact that their Housing Authority adds to that was a real plus. And I think it was recognized by your planning department staff and the Planning Council staff.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Mele.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Okay. Well, that's what I -- I mean, I think most of you know my position on this. You know, we -- the affordable housing problem is getting worse

and worse and worse in Broward County, and we're not doing anything to fix it -- very little, anyway. So there is going to be a rational nexus study done, and they've been contracted now with the people that will be doing that so that we can, you know, get a better grasp on what is going on in this community.

It -- I'll tell you, it -- this -- this bothers me, because we don't have a lot of land. There aren't a lot of opportunities, and we're letting a whole generation of people just, you know, go by without -- without doing anything about affordable housing. And I just, you know, question. I -- you know, I understand, you know, that, obviously, development is necessary. We have more and more people. As a matter of fact, in here it says there -- there's a potential need for additional residential units to accommodate the city's projected population. It's growing. So -- but we have no place for people to live who work hard in our communities.

And also the seniors, this whole issue of Silver Tsunami with seniors who are having no place to live. So I just -- it's -- I think it's very sad that we're just not incorporating that. And I understand what the policy says now, and that's why, you know, I'm focused on the fact that I think we need to take -- revisit it and make changes to accommodate the crisis that's going on in our community.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: So back in 1974, when this -- when this Broward County Planning Council was created and I was far away, the reason it was created was -- and put into the Charter was so that a place as vast as Broward County, with as many cities as -- as it had would have a place where development projects could go and could be discussed to make sure that it made sense from one end of the County to the other.

And in order to get that done, we created a documented called the Comprehensive Plan. And every city has one. It becomes part of our countywide Comprehensive Plan. And the jurisdiction of this -- of this Council -- and this is my second privilege to serve on this committee -- is to -- is to carry out our duties in comparison to what the standards are in the Broward County Consolidated Plan, the Land Use Plan. That's our -- that's our jurisdiction.

Our job is not to duplicate what cities do. Specifically not do duplicate what cities do. We have -- the people who elect the cities -- well, some of us are elected, but no one -- nobody elected us to be here. That's not our job. Our job is on behalf of the people and -- and there are folks here who are appointed from all different parts of the County so that -- so that we can all together, as one County, come together and -- and have a sense, as we sit in judgment of projects, as against what? As against the -- the Land Use Plan of the County and the Comprehensive Plan of the County.

Compatibility has always been a theme here, because it's a difficult thing to put your finger on. I myself would say that a nuclear power plant next to a single-family home raises compatibility questions. I would -- I would have to say that a -- let me pick a wild

example that would never happen in Broward County -- that an immigration detention center in a rural area would be a compatibility issue. I would have to say that a bus depot in the middle of a residential block rather than in an industrial area at the end of a bus zone might be a compatibility issue.

But if the standard is going to be that multi-family and single-family can't coexist because they're not compatible, there are very few places in Broward County that are compatible, and very few beach communities anywhere on the planet that are compatible.

Communities change and they evolve. And it's the job of cities, not County boards, it's the job of cities to sit down and figure out how to make it work within those cities. Now, I just feel very, very strongly that that's not the role of this committee is to get involved in the things that belong at the cities. The staff has presented a plan. There are two hearings here intentionally for a purpose, so that where concerns are expressed, it gives the developer an opportunity go back to the community and assuage those concerns. We want people to be happy. But at the end of the day, I mean, it's either -- it's either the project complies or it doesn't comply.

I'm glad -- I'm glad to see whether or not -- I'm glad to see that the project is a little shorter. That bothered me when it -- when it first came, that the height came down. I'm glad to see that. But, frankly, that's a -- that's a matter for the good people in -- who are elected in the City of Deerfield Beach to decide.

So while I respect every single word that was said here and the people who live in that area and who have to deal with this issue, and I commend everyone for their great citizenship in coming forward, I have yet to find -- I took an oath when I sat down in this chair, just like all of us did. And my oath is to make decisions in -- in conformance with the -- with the plan that the County has. And I haven't heard a reason to vote against it.

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

MS. GOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Blake BOY, can you put the map on that shows like the whole canal front?

MS. BOY: I'll check.

CHAIR STERMER: The other one.

MS. BOY: This aerial you want; right?

MS. GOOD: The -- the larger one, I think. That's me. No. The map. Can you put the map on? I don't want to see me.

MS. BOY: (Inaudible.)

MS. GOOD: Yes.

MS. BOY: Okay. This one?

MS. GOOD: No. Keep going. Keep going. Keep going. It's like an aerial view. Keep going. That -- where I think when Mr. Mele came up, he -- there. There's one, though, that they showed the project --

MS. BOY: Oh.

MS. GOOD: -- and like connection between these two.

MS. BOY: Sure.

MS. GOOD: I'm sorry. I'm not --

MS. BOY: That's okay.

MS. GOOD: -- being very descriptive.

MS. BOY: Right there.

MS. GOOD: There you go. Okay. So just a question on -- so the dash line area, is that the proposed boardwalk area? I don't know if it's -- if you, sir, would be the appropriate person to answer.

MR. MELE: Yes, that brown dash line is the proposed boardwalk. And it also goes where you see the docks, too. So it goes where you -- the dash line, as you get further south and you see the line sticking out, the boardwalks along that dock area, as well.

MS. GOOD: And did you say during the presentation that this area is -- this proposed boardwalk is already contemplated --

MR. MELE: It is --

MS. GOOD: -- currently by the city --

MR. MELE: -- it is my --

MS. GOOD: -- or?

MR. MELE: -- understanding that the city has been working on three parks, the two --

MS. GOOD: Uh-huh.

MR. MELE: -- that you see here, the one that's right up at the top right, and then right at

the bend of the river you see an area with a lot of trees. That's another park. And then when you go underneath the overpass, just to the east of that, there's a third park. And so it's my understanding that the city, from city administration, that it has been their goal to connect all three of these locations.

MS. GOOD: Okay. So when you showed this area connecting, it's not something that really falls under the control of the applicant.

MR. MELE: No, it does not, but what we said was that we would participate in it not only on our waterfront, we would build our part, but that we would also participate to help make the connection. And then way up at the top left where we have the Freedom Marine property, we would do it there, as well.

MS. GOOD: Okay.

MR. MELE: And so, as I mentioned earlier, obviously there's a lot more work to do, because there's other private properties in between, but this is a goal that the city had before we got there.

MS. GOOD: So this is kind of a long-range goal so that your -- your project is not contingent upon the boardwalk being there. It's just something you're proposing as far as working with the city to kind of interconnect the two -- two pieces of property.

MR. MELE: It's something they were already working on. They talked to us about it. They asked us -- asked us if we would help, and we said we would.

MS. GOOD: Okay. I just wanted to get the connection between that proposed boardwalk and then the two pieces of property. And then, Ms. Blake BOY, the issue of access, buffers, height restrictions, does that fall under the purview of the Planning Council?

MS. BOY: No, it does not.

MS. GOOD: Okay. The only thing that would fall under our purview would be the density?

MS. BOY: Yes. You're making a recommendation on the density.

MS. GOOD: Okay. And so I guess getting to some of the points that some of my colleagues on the Council have made, we certainly sympathize with the issues raised by the residents, but we're a little bit -- our hands are tied when it comes to issues that I think are -- are more planning and zoning related. Those fall under the purview of the local City Commission?

MS. BOY: Correct.

MS. GOOD: Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Rosenzweig.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Thank you, Mayor. Being a resident of Deerfield Beach and having been on the Planning Council -- or the City Commission, once it's coming forward, I am concerned when the residents start raising issues that will come before the council -- not this council -- I'm sorry -- the City Commission, because security is a major issue that they've raised. And also our parks have time limits on them when they're closed, so they know that no one's going to come in in the evening. I'm sure that it's all (inaudible) with the city. And also the possibility of having to control parking and -- and traffic in that area, that we could have limited access to the parks, using stickers or other means, so we don't have access to the point where residents don't have access to their parks, as well.

And so those are the only concerns I have coming before the decision on this, that we look at those issues to make sure the residents realize that we listened to them. We hear them, and we're concerned with all their issues, not just the height, and not just the density, but those are things that will come before the city, as well, to make sure that we understand what's going in that area to make it developable and -- and (inaudible), you know, for their livability to make it a -- a nice area, a pleasant area, and make sure it doesn't turn into a Catfish Road type of thing, that we have a good idea of -- of the livability of that area and make it a beautiful port in the city.

Because everything now is coming north. Development now is in our area, and we feel the impact of it. And we're trying to look at this, as the Mayor said, as an overall project to make sure that all these developments tie in together to make us a livable, workable, playable city. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Rosenzweig. Mr. Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: Thank you. What I -- I'd like the board to consider that it's our job to enforce our Comprehensive Plan. Policy 2.10.2 says the compatibility of existing future -- the compatibility of existing and future land uses shall be a primary consideration in the review and approval of amendments to the Broward County and to local Land Use Plans. There's no caveat there about limited to landscaping or city code or plan.

Policy 2.10.3 says in order to prevent future incompatible land uses, the established character of predominantly developed areas shall be a primary consideration when amendments to the Land Use Plan are proposed. Those are policies that we are to enforce. I don't think we would be enforcing those policies if we said yes to this project.

We have not given primary consideration to the community character of the established adjacent residential neighborhood. That's what the language of our plan says. It's to be enforced. It means something. And I'm concerned that we are not giving that, by relying on site planning and other things that may happen later, due consideration.

This seems to be substantially higher in scale, greater in scale, substantially higher in density than the surrounding land uses. I would want my fellow Commissioners, Council people, to enforce this policy as it's written in this -- on this proposed amendment. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: To Mr. Grosso. Could you please cite that policy again? Because I want to make sure that it's in the minutes from the --

MR. GROSSO: Policy 2.10.2, Policy 2.10.3.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you. Again, they're allowed to do development -- they're allowed to do development on the site. I'm not against the development that they want to do. Unless I'm misreading the backup here in Section 2, page 1, they're adding 250 dwelling units over the entire parcels for their project.

They did lower the height, but not one unit was taken away. So that -- without being able to look at a site plan, which we're not supposed to review on, anyway, however they repackaged everything on the property, I have no way of knowing. But, again, not one unit was reduced from the application that we saw in May. Is that correct? Am I misunderstanding this?

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Mele.

MR. MELE: We reduced the height. We did not reduce the density.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you. Thank you.

MR. MELE: But -- but I have to point out, when you look at compatibility, please look at Map 1. Can we put that up? We've talked about the single-family homes, but we have not talked about the other things that are next to the property.

To our south -- no, I mean, Barbara, this one right here -- you see each unit -- each use is labeled. Immediately to our south is a warehouse. Immediately south of that is a boat repair yard. If you go one block further south, there is the manufacturing plant for Moving Water Industries. I understand they are the largest manufacturer of water pumps in the world.

This is not an area that's all single-family. So when you're looking at compatibility, please look at all four sides of the property. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mr. Mele. Anybody else? Mayor Ganz.

MAYOR GANZ: Thank you. I think that point is important, because you talk about the character of the neighborhood. I'm curious what you think the character of the

neighborhood is, if you think it's not compatible, because I can tell you as someone who's familiar with the neighborhood, I understand the -- the immediate impact on the -- on the single-family residential that are right across from this. And we're certainly sensitive to that, and that's why we've asked them to work with them. That's something that we plan on holding them to.

To even show you how we've taken this as a city, and positions that I've taken over the years, the old Deerfield Beach Country Club, when that was taken away and put into an industrial park, we made sure that there was a -- I think it was a 99-year deed restriction to make sure that there was no bleed-over from that project that could come into the single-family homes. We wanted to protect the neighborhood. That was our goal. That was something that I proposed and put that in there to make sure that we didn't see that whole single-family residential area to be consumed by development over the years.

What you have here in that area is a hodgepodge. This is a way of tightening that up. I understand there's concerns with the height restrictions. Some of those zoning categories that exist now allow for what we're approving.

The density, I have concerns with the traffic. That -- that's my biggest concern with this project right now is the traffic. I think that's something we can work through. Again, there will be an impact because it's not developed over there. If it was fully developed to what's allowed right now, without any other change, there would be an impact on the neighborhood. So I'm certainly sensitive to that.

When it comes to this walkway, that walkway has been proposed since the early 2000s, I believe. And it was really interesting, because they went as far as applying for an MPO grant to say that they wanted money for the walkway, yet, it was private property back through there. I don't know how you put a walkway through two marinas, because this -- this walkway was supposed to extend from Pioneer Park, which is far to the east, all the way out to Deer Creek, which is far to the west part of the city. Really interesting to be able to get a grant for something where you don't own the property which you're trying to put a project in. So we're a long ways from having that sort of walkway to go through.

I think what the whole point was that was made by Mr. Mele and this project is that should that come forward and should we be able to work with the private owners over there to come to an agreement to be able to put that in place, they would work towards doing that and do it on their own private property. So I look at this as a way of eliminating something that's what I would call unfortunate zoning. It will be a vital impact to not only that area but to our city, as a whole. And, again, I -- I ask for your support.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you, Mayor Ganz. Is there a motion with regard to the item?

MR. DIGIORGIO: I'll move the item.

CHAIR STERMER: Moved by --

MAYOR GANZ: Second.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

CHAIR STERMER: -- Mr. DiGiorgio, seconded by Mayor Ganz. Any further discussion? Madam Clerk, please call the roll. This is on a motion to approve the item as presented.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Brion Blackwelder.

MR. BLACKWELDER: No.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Richard Blattner.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Robert Breslau.

MR. BRESLAU: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Felicia Brunson.

COMMISSIONER BRUNSON: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Angelo Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yes.

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

MR. DIGIORGIO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Bill Ganz.

MAYOR GANZ: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Vice Mayor Michelle J. Gomez.

VICE MAYOR GOMEZ: Yes.

THE REPORTER: School Board Member Patricia Good.

MS. GOOD: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Mary D. Graham.

PLANNING COUNCIL

AUGUST 23, 2018

dh/NC

MS. GRAHAM: No.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Richard Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: No.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Heather Moraitis. Commissioner Nan H. Rich.

COMMISSIONER RICH: No.

THE REPORTER: Mr. David Rosenof.

MR. ROSENOF: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Richard Rosenzweig.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael J. Ryan. Vice Mayor Beverly Williams. Mayor Daniel J. Stermer, Chair.

CHAIR STERMER: Yes.

The item passes 11 to 4.

VOTE PASSES 11 TO 4 WITH BRION BLACKWELDER, MARY D. GRAHAM, RICHARD GROSSO, AND COMMISSIONER NAN RICH VOTING NO.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Would it be out of order if I would ask, through the Chair to the -- our attorney, this issue -- this issue of compatibility has come up many times. This is a recurring theme. And it shouldn't -- it -- I think it should be -- I think it should be more clearly defined and explained.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I'm -- I'm persuaded by much of what my friend Richard Grosso said, but I also have questions. For example, if we were to -- if we were to follow his logic -- and I'm not sure he's intending that. There's some element of --

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- then -- then there would never be compatibility

between multi-family and single-family. But maybe it's a question of extent. Wouldn't surprise me to hear that clarification. To what extent? How do you measure that? Because we have -- we have residential in different shapes and sizes and heights all over the -- all over the -- all over the County, even as -- even in communities like -- like the Mayor's in Weston. You've got high rise, and you've got single-family living in -- in harmony. Isn't that a great song?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It is.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: And -- but in other places, it seems to be an issue. And you've been the attorney here for a long time. Hasn't this been written about by you all - in -- in opinions? Can you --

MR. MAURODIS: We could --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- sort of recirculate --

MR. MAURODIS: We -- we could look at --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- what the heck compatibility means?

MR. MAURODIS: -- we've done -- we've done opinions on it, and, you know, it's interesting, and when you get into land -- the area of land use, especially this Council. This Council's based on a broader, more -- very often more legislative, because Land Use Plan amendments are considered legislative in nature, on a policy-oriented basis. There are times in the land use field -- and Mr. Grosso could -- would attest to it -- where there is a requirement that you approve or disapprove -- it's very clear -- if you haven't met a requirement you have.

The compatibility -- and -- and so sometimes that's very frustrating. You want to approve something, but it doesn't meet a code, and you can't and -- and you're bound by it. The compatibility is not just the opposite, but it -- it's significantly different in that it calls -- calls for a judgment. And when we draft legal documents, obviously, and legislative and things to provide guidance, we try to be as specific as possible. And I've had to draft compatibility definitions for land development codes and things of that sort, and it becomes --

MAYOR STERMER: This is what I'm going to say.

MR. MAURODIS: -- there's only so far you can get towards providing a definition of what compatibility is.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I -- I agree.

MR. MAURODIS: It's part science.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I agree, but it shouldn't -- it shouldn't feel like you've got two feet firmly placed in mid-air.

CHAIR STERMER: No, no, but I -- Commissioner, I think we -- I think those of us that -- and we all deal with this every day, I think there's an objective standard of you do simple metrics, slide rule, does it meet the chart. Compatibility is one of those subjective --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: -- issues, which is why it's a case by case basis and isn't just an objective standard. Meet the box. If it meets the box, go. If it doesn't meet the box, stop.

Compatibility becomes one of those -- which is why it's a case by case basis, and, honestly, is one of those that, as we know as elected officials, sometimes the less said the better for records and reasons you say things or don't say things. We know that. But that is -- that is -- compatibility is one of those subjective standards based in the eye of the decision-maker in their view of what they view best for what may happen. Public may agree, public may disagree. People sitting next to you may agree or disagree. That's why that -- compatibility is one of those subjective findings.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I find -- I find that very helpful.

MR. MAURODIS: But we -- if we --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Still, if you could recirculate whatever materials historically have been done, I would like to -- I would like to brush up on what we have historically on this board --

MR. MAURODIS: (Inaudible.)

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: -- claimed to be compatible.

MS. BOY: So since there is no September meeting, I was just saying to Andy -- sorry, I just hopped in.

CHAIR STERMER: Please.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: It gives you something to do in September.

MS. BOY: Since there's no September meeting we can take the --

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Castillo will be here.

MS. BOY: -- the historical memos and -- you know, and --

MR. MAURODIS: And we can update that.

MS. BOY: -- and we'll see if there -- if there's an update that can happen --

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yeah.

MS. BOY: -- to those memos. And then we can distribute them for the October meeting, if that's okay.

MR. MAURODIS: Yeah, sure. I think it's helpful, and I think it's good to talk about it, and it's good to understand that that's something that you are applying here. You are -- on a more macro level than you would in a site plan compatibility provision or sometimes site plan requirements that are absent compatibility. You're doing it on a much more macro level, but you still should use it as a guide.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: I appreciate Commissioner bringing it up. I agree with -- with what I heard. I think that it's important to understand it is a subjective thing.

CHAIR STERMER: I know you do.

MR. GROSSO: It doesn't mean that single-family and multi-family are categorically incompatible. I think those compatibility issues at -- at a macro level, you have to consider them, size and scale and land use and density, as opposed to just shrubbery and buffers. I think that's a really important concept for us to get. But I think you use the shrubbery, the buffers, that kind of thing when you are putting next to each other different types of land uses.

I don't think that could be used to overcome huge differences in size and scale. I'm not trying to revisit the vote we just took, but just for future reference, the size and the scale and the type of uses have to, I think, be inherently compatible. You make up for small differences with -- with the window dressing site plan kinds of things.

I'd like us to not -- to always understand that and not just defer it to just buffers and landscaping and that kind of thing. I think the way Andy articulated it, to me, as a land use lawyer, is pretty consistent with the law. Thank you.

REGULAR AGENDA:

AGENDA ITEM R-1 - CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE DOWNTOWN ACTIVITY CENTER AND CITYWIDE AFFORDABLE HOUSING

CHAIR STERMER: The folks from Fort Lauderdale here?

MS. BOY: Yes. Mr. Hetzel is here, and he has an overview. So we're moving to the

Regular Agenda?

CHAIR STERMER: Yeah, we are.

MS. BOY: Okay. Pete is going to get the presentation for me.

CHAIR STERMER: Because if we don't hear from him, Commissioner Blattner's going to throw a brick at my head.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: I'll be joined by Commissioner Rich.

CHAIR STERMER: I'm well aware of that.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: What are we doing now?

CHAIR STERMER: Fort Lauderdale.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Oh.

MS. BOY: City of Fort Lauderdale --

CHAIR STERMER: This is their update on the --

MS. BOY: -- the -- the activity center, the Downtown Activity --

CHAIR STERMER: -- the activity center.

MS. BOY: -- Center.

MR. HETZEL: Good morning. Jim Hetzel, Principal Planner with the City of Fort Lauderdale's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning, Jim.

MR. HETZEL: -- Urban Design and Planning Division. The Council may recall that a letter was provided back in May that provided a summary of where we are as a city with our Downtown Regional Activity Center and its unit allocation, including affordable housing. So today I'm here kind of to give a presentation as a follow up to that letter.

Just a little bit of context and history. Obviously, the city has a Downtown Master Plan that was adopted in 2004 to guide the future of the downtown in the city. It includes mixed use development focus, multimodal connections, and, obviously, per our Comp Plan, it's a Regional Activity Center, which has density and permitted uses established in our Comp Plan as well as the County's Land Use Plan.

Just to kind of put it in perspective, here's a map of our downtown area, including the

PLANNING COUNCIL

AUGUST 23, 2018

dh/NC

projects that are under review, approved, and built. As you can see from the yellow line, that is the boundary of the Regional Activity Center. As you can see from the left side, there's a lot going on. Our city has a lot going through the review process, a lot that we've approved through the site plan approval process.

Our City Commission has the ability to call all of these projects up and review them. For the most part, that has gone through the process pretty smoothly. But they do have the ability to do so. Most recently, they're doing it looking at compatibility, which is an interesting topic that's been brought up today, as well as the affordable housing component of our downtown.

So from a land use perspective, what does the Regional Activity Center have in its permitted uses, focusing on the residential, obviously. Back in 1989 when it was established, there was a 5100 original residential unit established with that. In 2003, the city combined its flex and reserve units, adding another 2960 residential units. 2006, we added 3,000 units to the RAC entitlement process. And in 2016, which is most recently, we added 5,000 units to the pool, with a requirement for 15 percent of that being affordable housing. Which gives you a total of about 16060, 16,060 permitted units in our Downtown Regional Activity Center.

So a snapshot. This was -- this was provided in the letter back in May. I'll kind of walk through each line to kind of understand what we're having here. Obviously, the first line is the permitted uses of 16,060 units. The assigned RAC units, which is coming from the pool of units, 13,865. That is what the city has to -- has allocated to date out of the RAC entitlements. Of the flex units, because we dipped into our flex units, you have 3299 as far as what's been allocated there, giving you a total of 17,164. On the right-hand side I'm going to walk through the affordable housing units. Looking at the total, it just has N/A there, but I'm going to walk through how many per the RAC and the flex. You can see 384, 105, totaling 489 units total, what's been allocated for affordable housing. That includes what's been built, and also some that are pending right now under review. So that gives you a total, including affordable plus the other market rate units, of 17,653. The affordable housing units, obviously, 489 there.

The next line down incorporates an approach that was outlined in the letter where we've engaged Colliers International to look at the 5,000 units, only, of what we anticipate that the market rate will come in at on a moderate income level. What that means is those units that are going to come on line, are they going to be meeting an income and monthly rental rate that falls on that moderate income bracket only. So based on anticipated numbers, that's 856 of the ones that we have approved so far out of the 5,000 units that are going to hit that mark. It gives you a total of affordable housing of 1,345.

The little footnote down underneath the table tells you a requirement that was in the 2006 land use amendment to have 450 residential units that were affordable. And then most recently, again, the 5,000 units having a 15 percent requirement to have 750 units, would equal 1,200 units. So you can see with that last line there total affordable housing

units, what we anticipate also coming on line, 1,345. That number is higher than the 1200.

Do you have any questions on that? I know I kind of went through -- I figure I might stop on this slide and take questions.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: I have a voice.

MR. HETZEL: Sure.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Couple things. Most important to me is that when the city committed to build 750 affordable housing units in that 5,000 envelope, you could skip all this, and just show me that, and I'd be happy with that.

MR. HETZEL: So right now --

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: So can you do that?

MR. HETZEL: -- so right now, we -- of that 750, there are none being allocated. So --

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: How many -- how many of the 5,000 have already been built?

MR. HETZEL: None.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: None. Okay.

MR. HETZEL: We have not exhausted the 5,000.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Then, actually, we could stop the meeting now, for me, because my question was where are you on the 5,000 units, and if you -- wherever you are, because what we're asking to do is stop at 2500, and tell us how many of the -- of them are affordable.

MR. HETZEL: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: If you haven't built any, you don't need to be here. Except information, did we really need to see this?

CHAIR STERMER: Is that a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: No.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: So here's -- here's a couple of questions. Here's a

couple of questions. I don't know who (inaudible)—

MAYOR STERMER: And you know I'm kidding.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Would you give me a few minutes, Mayor?

MAYOR STERMER: You can have as many as you need.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Thank you. I don't understand why the affordable housing units are in addition to the market rate units that you've shown there. Why would that not be a deduction from the number of units? In other words, you have 489 out of the 17,164. Shouldn't that be a deduction from the 17,194?

MR. HETZEL: So this is just a snapshot. If you look at some of the tables that I submitted to the Planning Council staff, it gives you a more breakdown analysis of it. This is just a snapshot. You are correct. Those numbers come out of the pool.

So what I don't have here, because it's a very extensive, very detailed table that I submitted to the Planning Council staff that I'm sure Barbara and her team could share with you, it breaks it down in the manner that you're asking. So it says and shows where the affordable housing units are coming out of each pool of land use approval process.

For instance in 2006, how many of those market rate units, how many of those affordable housing units come out of that total per that land use approval. Same thing with the 5,000. That table is quite extensive. It's very difficult to put it up on the screen. This is just a snapshot.

So, again, I would ask that the Planning Council staff share with you that table if they haven't done so already, to answer your question, and you'll see the breakdown of where that comes from.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Okay.

MR. HETZEL: This is just a snapshot.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: So I -- I may make a motion to adjourn. Bear with me.

MS. BOY: Wait one second.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: And that is this --

CHAIR STERMER: We have another presentation.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: -- if --

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Grosso (inaudible).

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: -- if the 5,000 units, if no construction has begun on those 5,000 units, then the question that I asked has been answered, and I'm satisfied with that. Others may have a more global interest in this discussion, which I'd be really interested in hearing.

But I -- I did want to make sure that -- that if construction has already begun on 2500 and none of them were affordable, we won't give you permission to build the next 2500.

MR. HETZEL: So, to answer your question, there -- construction has begun on some of the 5,000 units, and that is why we've engaged Colliers International to do the data for us that we can't, as a staff, have the capacity to do, is look at how those ones that are under construction are going to meet the affordable housing income bracket. That's why if you look at the screen, the very last line, it kind of starts pulling that data. Again, this is a summary slide. This is not the detailed analysis.

Colliers reached out to those construction, to those developers and said of what's under construction, which is of the 5,000, how are you going to meet the moderate income level monthly rental charges so we can say we're meeting our affordable housing requirements, as you're pointing out. That's anticipated. These -- these items are under construction. These projects are under construction. But on -- based on the pro formas, this is the number that the Colliers was able to gain from them. So as you can see, that's higher than 750 units. It's at 856.

Now, again, this is what's anticipated. And we've committed, as a city, to provide that information on an annual basis when the market -- when the units become on the market. Are they still at that income -- sorry, excuse me -- are they still at that rental amount as indicated to get us to this 856? If not, then we provide that data and information to you on an annual basis.

COMMISSIONER BLATTNER: Thank you.

MR. HETZEL: You're welcome.

CHAIR STERMER: Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you, Chair Stermer. Just real quick, please. We approved this central business district, or however they refer to it, back in 2016; is -- is that what you understand, before the Planning Council?

MR. HETZEL: The RAC is the -- we did a Land Use Plan amendment that was --

MS. GRAHAM: Right. In 2016.

MR. HETZEL: -- approved in 2016, correct.

PLANNING COUNCIL
AUGUST 23, 2018
dh/NC

MS. GRAHAM: Any development that's come before the city since then has not fallen in with units within the 5,000?

MR. HETZEL: So of the --

MS. GRAHAM: No, just -- just because I don't want to delay this any longer --

MR. HETZEL: Sure.

MS. GRAHAM: -- because there's another presentation. Yes or no, or you aren't aware of that.

MR. HETZEL: So can you repeat the question? I'm sorry.

MS. GRAHAM: Again, have any of the new developments that have been approved by DRC, Planning and Zoning, and the City Commission since 2016, have any of those 5,000 units been used yet?

MR. HETZEL: No.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. Is there anything that would prohibit the city from approving those developments if they didn't have any affordable housing units in them because we did not stipulate that they had to be concurrent with each development? In other words, the Broward Planning Council said we couldn't levy -- we couldn't leverage the requirement for the housing units concurrent with the development.

CHAIR STERMER: Let's remember -- let's remember, -- the County Commission's the one that gaveled this, and their agreement is with the County Commission. Folks, let's remember --

MS. GRAHAM: Right, but we did not. Broward --

CHAIR STERMER: -- but -- but I just want to be clear. If they don't do something, it doesn't come back here. It goes back to the folks that sit here on that Tuesday meeting --

MS. GRAHAM: Right.

CHAIR STERMER: -- not us.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. The reason why I'm asking this is because some of the Planning Council current members were not here in 2016. But, again, I know we did not put that in. We had no leverage to do it. It was not a condition or anything like that when Broward Planning Council approved the 5,000 units. I voted for that.

CHAIR STERMER: Wait a second. We did, actually. We said by halfway time, they had to meet half the --

MS. GRAHAM: Well, we didn't --

CHAIR STERMER: -- there was a condition. There was.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, and -- and you're absolutely right.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MS. GRAHAM: What is -- what is the penalty if they didn't?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

CHAIR STERMER: They don't get the second 2500 units. If they don't meet --

MS. BOY: They have to present a plan.

CHAIR STERMER: Correct.

MS. BOY: At 2501, if they haven't demonstrated --

CHAIR STERMER: Correct.

MS. BOY: -- that 375 (inaudible).

MS. GRAHAM: Right. So if they haven't -- if they haven't included any affordable units at the midway point, 2500 units already under construction or approved, we would review it at that time, Broward Planning Council.

MS. BOY: Right, so that's why they committed to the annual --

MS. GRAHAM: Right.

MS. BOY: -- report.

MS. GRAHAM: But at that point --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So --

MS. GRAHAM: -- there -- it would be nothing agreed upon by Broward Planning Council to halt any future developments because, as Chair Stermer just said, that comes before the Broward County Commission.

MR. HETZEL: So if I -- yeah, if I could back up for one second, because I believe I answered your question incorrectly when you said, used. We have allocated out of the 5,000 units two new projects. So, yes, we have begun allocating approvals for residential construction out the 5,000. What happens --

MS. GRAHAM: Do they have permits yet?

MR. HETZEL: -- they have permits.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. HETZEL: And then what happens --

MS. GRAHAM: Have they -- have they broken ground?

MR. HETZEL: They have broken ground on some of them.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. So they're going to come on line with a Certificate of Occupancy either 2018, 2019, or 2020?

MR. HETZEL: Possibly, yes.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay.

MR. HETZEL: Yeah, so and the other factor that I think -- and we've been working with the staff, the Planning Council staff, is you have to understand that affordable housing, which I'm sure you all do, the affordable housing definition in both the County's Land Use Plan and the City's Land Use Plan includes a moderate income bracket. It does not -- does not necessarily require a developer to go through the process of deed restricting or going through the process of getting incentives or tax credits and so forth. That is a whole segment that's not being accounted for because they're not going through that process. However, it falls within the definition of affordable housing, which, again, is that moderate income, 80 to 120 percent, that we're really not looking as -- as a community as getting credit for, because they do come in that moderate income level.

However, it's not tied to any deed restrictions. So what we're trying to do as a city is how do we monitor that. If there's not a process of deed restrictions or tax credits or letters from the County on these projects, we need to make it more realistic and say, okay, these units are coming in at that income bracket. They are meeting the affordable housing definition, per the County and the city's Land Use Plan. And I think that's a -- a hole in the system that we're trying to address as a city through this new approach of counting them through a market rate analysis that's done by Colliers, which is what you see in the table today.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. And Colliers is your consultant because they were given the contract as the real estate consultant to the city, and it's a three-year contract.

MR. HETZEL: They have the capacity that staff doesn't in collecting the data and reporting it, so they're --

MS. GRAHAM: Right. There --

MR. HETZEL: -- (inaudible).

MS. GRAHAM: -- was an RFP for that, and there was two -- two firms, Collier and CBRE --

MR. HETZEL: RE.

MS. GRAHAM: -- who had the prior contract, and Colliers got it this time.

MR. HETZEL: Yeah, and that's through the city manager's office.

MS. GRAHAM: Okay. No, no. I just want that on the record.

MR. HETZEL: Yeah.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you very much.

MR. HETZEL: Yeah.

CHAIR STERMER: Anybody have anything else?

MR. DIGIORGIO: I just have one simple question.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. DiGiorgio.

MR. DIGIORGIO: You corrected yourself, and I appreciate you doing that. Thank you. Can you tell us the number of units that have been allocated --

MR. HETZEL: I believe --

MR. DIGIORGIO: -- of the 5,000?

MR. HETZEL: -- I believe there's only about 400 remaining out of the 5,000. So there's a difference between what's been allocated, because we allocate at time of site plan approval, versus what's been allocated that's under construction. So there's a lot of projects that have come in seeking allocation agreements, but only two or three are under construction, out of the pool.

MR. DIGIORGIO: So what is the time limit? Is there an 18-month time limit that if you've allocated units to a project and then they haven't been used, they come back into the pool?

MR. HETZEL: So there's two factors to that. One, yes, there is the city process of a timeline for approval, which is the 18 months to submit a building permit, 24 months to obtain the building permit. And then there's the state level extensions that have been granted, which is out of our control as a community and even the County, that if the state approves extensions and somebody files for it, they get those extensions automatically, and we have no say as a city. We have to follow state statute. So some of those projects have come in filing under state provisions, and we have to provide the extension per state.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Okay. So 4600 have been allocated of the 5,000.

MR. HETZEL: Yes.

MR. DIGIORGIO: There's 400 left. And but the -- all of them have not started construction yet or have building permits at this point.

MR. HETZEL: Correct.

MR. DIGIORGIO: When we get to -- closer to that 2500 mark, you're going to come back in and talk about the plan for affordable housing.

MR. HETZEL: Correct. And --

MR. DIGIORGIO: Thank you.

MR. HETZEL: -- through the analysis through Colliers, we'll do it.

MR. DIGIORGIO: Yeah.

CHAIR STERMER: Anything else? Thank you, sir.

MR. HETZEL: You're welcome. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Appreciate it. So you can tell Mr. Feldman it wasn't that painful.

AGENDA ITEM R-2 - BEACH EROSION AND SEA LEVEL RISE RESILIENCE

MS. BOY: The next presentation is Dr. Sam Danchuk from the Climate Resiliency -- Environmental Planning and Community Resiliency Division.

(Laughter.)

DR. DANCHUK: I'll just take it from here. Thank you. Thank you for having me. Really appreciate it.

CHAIR STERMER: Sorry it's so late.

PLANNING COUNCIL
AUGUST 23, 2018
dh/NC

DR. DANCHUK: I will be brief, because, you know, pregnant women and lunch, I'm ready to go.

(Laughter.)

DR. DANCHUK: But I really do appreciate it. Thank you for the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

DR. DANCHUK: -- invitation. And today I just want to give you an overview of the resilience initiatives that the County has been working on for about a decade now, as well as, at the end, make sure I give you information about the water recharge calculations, because that was my understanding was the request. So clickety-click? Yes?

MS. BOY: Okay.

DR. DANCHUK: Okay. Perfect. So hopefully you're familiar with the Priority Planning Area Map that is part of our Land Use Plan. This identifies the areas that we expect to be inundated by sea level rise, meaning there's flooding at the surface above ground, by 2060, with about two feet of sea level rise.

So this is relevant because not only is it the map where the Adaptation Action Areas are designated -- these can be designated both at the city and the County level. At the moment, the County only has one designating the Port Everglades sand bypass project area as areas where we want to make sure we're investing in resilience because we know that they're vulnerable to sea level rise, and we know that we need to make adaptation measures in those areas as much of a priority as possible.

So, again, the reason this map is relevant is because during the Land Use Plan amendment review, if a site is within the area of inundation, it triggers another level of review to make sure that it's meeting resilience criteria. So an example of this would be if we had maybe a waterfront community, we knew that sea level rise was going to be flooding that area, we would want to make sure that we understood what the developer was putting forward as far as maybe the sea wall height, how the storm water calculations were being done -- and I'll talk a bit in a moment, but we actually require that they design for future conditions, not just historic conditions. We would want to make sure that they're meeting the base flood elevation requirements. We would want to know from the city that the city is committing to invest in roads and the flood -- and the drainage protection within that area so the site doesn't just become an island of resilience, but that that whole neighborhood is going to be maintained into the long term.

We've only had a few of these applications so far, but, essentially, from the city, we're requiring a letter and requiring them to meet with us so that we understand that they're working with the developer on each of these sites. The only tricky part here is sometimes when you're applying for a Land Use Plan amendment, you may not have all

of the site plan details; right? We've been fortunate enough in the few that have come forward we were able to -- to get that insight. But, either way, we put the requirement on them that, you know, we're going to expect you to meet this resilience criteria as you move through the site plan process.

Talking a little bit about groundwater-wise. So within our groundwater wells, we have noticed that -- especially in the coastal area, we've already seen that groundwater is rising over time with sea level rise. We have done extensive modeling to show that by 2060, for every foot that the ocean rises, the groundwater table is rising a foot.

So the groundwater table is like when you're at the beach and you dig a hole and you hit water, you know, you've hit the groundwater table. So it does fluctuate over time, but, overall, that's what's going to happen. Those areas in red are going to rise about a foot for every foot of sea level rise. The areas in yellow, it's closer to like half a foot, it's a little reduced. And then it's further reduced out west.

But this is an opportunity to talk to all of our communities, because there are changes happening across the entire County. What we have done is integrated this within our code so that all drainage across the County will now need to be designed for future conditions, meaning that you're not designing to the water table of yesterday, which is what was happening, but you're designing to the water table -- what it will be in 2060, 2070. We hope that this is a simple way for developers and contractors to make small changes that maybe only cost ten percent more to the project, build in what they need to today, and ensure that that development will last its full lifetime as opposed to, you know, having drainage that fails within the first ten years, once the water table has changed.

The other piece to think about is, you know, essentially what we rely on in order to keep our properties dry is that the rainfall is percolating into the ground and it goes away. When the water table is so close to the surface, as it will be in many of our coastal cities, and especially the coastal areas, essentially no rainfall is getting into the ground. That means that areas like water retention areas are not going to be dry. They're going to be wet all the time. It means that you may need to build bigger trenches. You may need to have active pumping to pump the water into the ground as opposed to gravity, letting it pull it in. So it changes the way that we need to design these projects.

These are just three examples of how we'll do that. So we just picked three random sites to kind of evaluate the costs of -- of some of these -- the implications of the changes of the code, what could be done at these sites. And, again, just like I said, it may be adding pumps to drainage wells. It may be extending the trenches. It may be actually adding stem walls so that you're preventing property flooding.

I'm sure you're all super interested in this, but it is very relevant. So the other piece of it. You may have heard that in our Intercoastal Waterway properties, we're actually -- when the King Tides are occurring, so in September, October, November, December, we have -- the ocean is actually overtopping the sea walls and flooding the streets,

flooding the neighborhoods.

In addition, like I mentioned, so the water is coming under sea walls and is coming up through the ground, right, or maybe it's coming up through our stormwater infrastructure, and, again, we're getting the flooding in the streets, people are chasing their garbage cans down the road. You know, and it's right now happening maybe, you know, ten to 15 days of the year. We're anticipating that by 2045, it's going to be closer to, you know, 50 days a year. By 2060, it could be 200 days a year.

Granted, it's in the -- retained in those coastal waterfront property areas, but that becomes something that people aren't going to tolerate; right? They -- they want to make sure that we're investing in the adaptation today so that we can avoid some of those impacts. And that's what we're looking at.

Just to -- before I get to that step, I just want to highlight that Broward County, as well as the four counties that we work with through the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact, Miami-Dade, Palm Beach County, and Monroe County, all of us have adopted what's called the Unified Sea Level Rise Projection. So we're no longer designing to different standards. We're all saying we're designing to these curves, which is about planning for about two feet by 2060. There's also a more critical curve. So if you're going to build a nuclear power plant, if you're going to build a wastewater treatment plant right on the coast, things like that, we even have a higher curve to design to.

So we tried to leave flexibility within these curves so that engineers can make, you know, cost/benefit decisions and say, if I'm building something that's only going to last five years, maybe I build to the lower curve. If I'm building something that's going to last 50 years, maybe I want to build in a little more factor of safety.

Okay. So we are wrapping up a study that we hope will inform a regional seawall resilience standard elevation for the County. We hope to share results on September 10th through a public workshop. We've been working with the Army Corps of Engineers through our Planning Assistance for States project opportunity.

So we're really looking forward to this, because, essentially, we've done storm surge modeling with King Tide modeling with sea level rise projections so that we can really say what we think those future conditions will look like in those coastal areas, and try to identify what the infrastructure height level should be. On top of that has been some economic risk modeling, working with Risk Management Solutions, which is the foremost modeler for the reinsurance agencies, so that we can not just talk about what investments need to be made, but what are the actual benefits of those investments.

So now you're comparing costs of projects to actual avoided damage costs, which makes the conversation much more relevant. Also to emphasize, so we've talked about, you know, seawalls, we're talking about kind of the -- the infrastructure on the ground, but we also need to consider what we want building heights to be.

So Broward County has always had what is a hundred-year community flood map in addition to the flood insurance rate map; okay? So FEMA regulates the flood insurance rate map, and it tells you what your base flood elevation is, and you should build your finished floor to that elevation; right? That map previously had been updated every 30 years, maybe every ten years, if you were lucky.

We just had an inland update in 2014. The coastal area is going to be updated maybe by 2020. It's in progress. It's in the -- in the final process there. Broward County simultaneously is projecting what sea level rise will be and including that in modeling. So our hundred-year community flood map will include future conditions, which the FEMA flood map does not. And the reason this is important is because it allows us to, over time, slowly build to a higher, more resilient level so that people are avoiding shocks to their insurance premiums. Because what happens every time FEMA changes their map is someone either gets put in a flood zone, or maybe they get put -- you know, their base flood elevation raises, and now all of a sudden, their insurance is twice what it used to be. We would try -- we like to try to avoid that for our residents.

We've had a hundred-year community flood map for 30 years now. We used to do it because we knew land use was going to change, density was going to change, and we knew that -- you know, that there'd be less permeable surfaces in -- you know, across the County. So we planned for that. That's what it was about previously. Now it's about sea level rise, planning for our future water table conditions.

So, again, just to emphasize, this is one example of, you know, once a structure is built, you know, the flood -- flood zone essentially is changing around them. So in this case, you know, the -- the project was just finished, then the FEMA map came out, and essentially, they were, fortunately, just above base flood elevation because they had designed to the hundred-year community flood map, and so they avoided what could have been a potential -- potential doubling of their insurance premium.

So we find that these tools are very, very effective at saving our residents money. I brought with me our Climate Action Plan, just the -- kind of the highlights. So we have, not only at the County level, but working at that four-county region, a Climate Action Plan that has, you know, well over a hundred actions addressing issues beyond what I've talked about today.

So dealing with water supply, ensuring that we have water for the next 40 years -- woohoo, right? So that's really good. You know, ensuring that we're working with the community energy supply, as well as our natural systems. So if you are interested in trying to figure out how you can relate to all of these actions, I've brought some extra copies here. You can see what actions we have at the County level. Excellent. And then also if you go to the rcap2.org -- yeah. [Rcap2.org](http://rcap2.org) is the Regional Climate Action Plan, and you can actually customize it.

So you can say, I am an elected official. I am interested in water resources, and it'll essentially, you know, detail all the actions that are relevant to you, and implementation

steps that might be helpful. All right. Just breezing through this. So the other point that I want to make, which is becoming a very prominent part of the discussion is that we -- this needs to make economic sense for us, right, so investing in -- in resilience.

Already today and really in the short-term, we're losing about ten cents of every dollar of our gross domestic product to climate and weather events. We know that we can address about 40 percent of our risk just by changing the physical infrastructure of our environment, and it will only cost us about ten percent to 15 to 20 percent on our projects today to be able to, you know, avoid damage costs and makes sure that we are actually, you know, investing in our future.

If you have to go back in and retrofit something, so something that's already built and it's failing, it is a lot more costly to dig up or -- or expand or all these kind of things. So, really, it makes sense to do it at the time of redevelopment. I'll also emphasize that the return on investment, this was come -- coming from a recent study, has stated that we get about \$6 of avoided damage for every dollar invested in a resilience measure. And for every dollar that's spent on natural infrastructure, so our mangroves, our beaches, our reefs and, you know, even landscape buffers if it's -- if it's in a surge-prone area, you get a return on investment of about \$20. So really, really great.

The other part of this is that we're working with the different business forums across our region. This has become a priority for them. We have formed an MOU agreement through the Compact and -- and the different Chambers across the region not only to focus on resilience planning, make sure we have consistent messaging, elevate, you know, certain legislative priorities, but then also encouraging them to consider in their own business contingency planning being ready for these kinds of hurricanes, these other kinds of -- sea level rise and these other kinds of flooding risks.

And now we're starting a conversation about post-disaster redevelopment planning, because we acknowledge that while we have a plan in place, it doesn't have the details of what we would really do if our community got wiped off the map and we had an opportunity to -- to rebuild, right, what would we do at that point. So they're very interested in that conversation.

Okay. So now to the example for today. So I was asked to share the details of the calculation for how water recharge impacts are calculated as part of the Land Use Plan amendment review process. So hopefully this doesn't, you know, seem too overwhelming. It took me a minute, but now I -- I've got it.

So you start with an assignment of each of the -- so for each land use designation or classification, there is an assigned percentage of imperviousness. So imperviousness of zero means that essentially, you've got water going directly into the ground; there's no obstruction. Okay? If you've got imperviousness of a hundred percent, no water is getting into the ground. So that's the scale.

I would just acknowledge that with the Broward Next updates there were some changes

to the classifications, so that process of kind of making sure that each classification has a number associated with it is -- is being updated.

And then the next step is to calculate the change between the proposed site and the existing site of this imperviousness. Okay? If the change is less than 30 percent, it's considered minor. If it's between 31 and 69, it's considered moderate. If it's greater than 70 percent, it's major.

Then you calculate the impact in acres. And so that's really simply whatever percentage you just found, you multiply it by the total number of acres, and that's the number of acres that are impacted. So you'll note here there are larger numbers, so major impact would be you've lost essentially 2,000 acres of what used to be recharge area. Okay? Moderate would be 1,000 to 2,000. Minor would be 60 to 1,000. And insignificant would be less than 50 -- 59.

So I have an example here. So if we had a hundred acres of single-family units, four units per acre, that would have an assigned percentage of imperviousness of 38 percent. If you propose to change that to commercial retail, the imperviousness goes up, because there's less water getting into the ground because there's more -- assumed to be, you know, more grey infrastructure on the property, it goes up to 85 percent.

So the difference between those two is 47 percent. That's considered a moderate change on the scale. And then you multiply that by the total number of acres, and you found that 47 acres of what used to be area where water could recharge into the ground has been lost.

Now, according to the scale, this is insignificant. So just to scale that up for you, as you're thinking through it, what if we were talking about a thousand-acre site? Same calculation. It would go up to 470 acres. It would still be considered minor. If we went up to 3,000 acres total, then you'd have about 1400 acres impacted. It becomes a moderate scale of impact. If we had 10,000 acres being redeveloped and densified, this would go up to 4700 acres, and that finally would become a major impact to recharge.

I just want to acknowledge as well so that's -- while this is one level of review, also during the Land Use Plan amendment review process is -- is acknowledgment that many of the -- many of the kind of design review happens from our surface water permitting team, right, and they're looking specifically at the site, how they're managing drainage on the site, whether it's retention ponds, BS (phonetic) filtration trenches, the future conditions of the water table. All those things need to happen, because essentially, they're responsible for retaining on site, you know, first good bit of rainfall. I forget if it's eight to 12 inches, but that fall has to be retained on site.

So you've got to think of that while you're thinking about recharge. And I'll just say that a lot of the information that I talked about today, we tried to make it really simple and accessible for everyone, so if you go to broward.org slash climate. I'll also just point out that the regional media publications have been publishing articles nearly daily on a lot of our -- our climate efforts, climate risks stories at invadingsea.com. So they're really

good. And then I'm extending an invitation to our leadership summit on October 24th and 25th. This is hosted by the Southeast Florida Regional Climate Change Compact. And this year it's being hosted by Miami Beach and Miami-Dade. And I'll take any questions.

CHAIR STERMER: Thank you. Barbara's going to hand out a quiz first. Everyone has to take a quiz.

(Laughter.)

MS. BOY: I will send everything -- I will send out an email with everything attached, though.

CHAIR STERMER: Mr. Grosso.

MR. GROSSO: Thank you. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Absolutely.

MR. GROSSO: Thank you. Excellent --

CHAIR STERMER: You're going to hear this from all of us.

MR. GROSSO: -- presentation, and, again, I commend the work that our division does. To me, the question became then if trying to combat sea level rise, reduce flooding, make sure we've got a water supply, if that requires maintaining our recharge functions -

DR. DANCHUK: Uh-huh.

MR. GROSSO: -- then how is it acceptable, insignificant, when we have a net reduction at all? Is our scale appropriate, still, given what we're trying to do, or alternatively, should we not require no net loss of recharge functions at all? Because every drop of water that's not recharging is a drop of water that's not going into a well field, and it's, instead, a drop of water that's adding, I'm assuming, to a flood -- a flooding problem.

DR. DANCHUK: Uh-huh.

MR. GROSSO: So do we need to be overhauling this?

DR. DANCHUK: So I did flag for Barbara that if -- if we were going to get to that level of the discussion, I think it would be smart to bring in someone from the Surface Water Permitting team, an engineer, so they are explaining when we're pumping water into the ground, how effective that is at draining it from the surface and recharging. I think we should bring in someone from the Water Management District, so we have an appreciation of when we're adding the water into the canals as part of our main drainage strategy, how much is actually infiltrating there, so that we know if it's

technically a loss or is it just part of our grander system.

CHAIR STERMER: I have a great idea. We're now going to have a meeting in September, just on this. Enjoy it.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR STERMER: I'm kidding.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. GROSSO: I got all excited there.

(Laughter.)

CHAIR STERMER: Did you see anybody else move?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

MR. GROSSO: If I could just follow up. Then are you saying that you're confident we don't have a problem, or you're saying those are valid questions that we should bring in --

DR. DANCHUK: I think --

MR. GROSSO: -- the technical folk?

DR. DANCHUK: -- it's a valid question. I think we have some of the models and tools available to have the discussion. You know, in addition to our groundwater and surface water modeling that's been done, we also have a study that was done with the Rand Institute to look at future land use changes on top of our groundwater modeling. So I think there are tools that could be investigated, but I'm not at the planning level to be able to inform how you would interpret that into policy.

MR. GROSSO: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I would like to do that in the future but --

CHAIR STERMER: Understood.

MR. GROSSO: -- not September, but thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Rich.

MR. GROSSO: Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: I was just wondering if you wanted to just close the County for business and we're done, since nothing's acceptable. I'm kidding.

COMMISSIONER RICH: What?

CHAIR STERMER: I'm kidding.

COMMISSIONER RICH: He's not -- don't say that about him.

CHAIR STERMER: I -- I'm kidding. I said I'm -- I said kidding.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKERS: (Inaudible.)

COMMISSIONER RICH: So -- so I -- I just --

MR. GROSSO: I misunderstood.

COMMISSIONER RICH: -- I just want to say how fortunate we are here in Broward County to have both Samantha, who is the Assistant Director of the Environmental Planning and Community Resilience Division, and Dr. Jennifer Jurado, who is the Director, Executive Director. And I have the privilege of chairing the Climate Change Task Force, so, yeah, I could take the test, because I've been tutored by both of them, so.

But it is amazing, really, what we're doing. And when you look at this chart, I really hope you take the time to look at it, because it's amazing what we're doing now. And we're changing -- we've -- we're in the middle of changing the makeup of the Climate Change Task Force to include more municipalities, because we feel it's extremely important that we all work together, the County and the municipalities, to push forward on a lot of these initiatives, particularly with sea level rise and climate change issues.

So I would like to just ask the question, and maybe it's for you, Barbara, about how does -- or is it appropriate for us to look at incorporating some of this into the Broward Next plan.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It is.

MS. BOY: The Climate Action Plan is adopted by reference in BrowardNext, so the policy's in that. So we -- I mean, it is adopted by reference, because that's, when we were going through the process, how important we thought it was and part of the strategies. So it is part of the plan as it exists today.

CHAIR STERMER: And Commissioner Rich, so --

COMMISSIONER RICH: But the question --

CHAIR STERMER: -- Commissioner, just so you know, the project that came forth in Wilton Manors --

COMMISSIONER RICH: Yeah.

CHAIR STERMER: -- before you got here --

COMMISSIONER RICH: Yeah.

CHAIR STERMER: -- was built to the new standard, specifically --

COMMISSIONER RICH: Yeah.

CHAIR STERMER: -- because of it.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Right. Okay.

MS. BOY: Right. That was one of the commitments that was made during the project, because it hadn't yet gone to the County Commission, and the applicant was able to work with --

CHAIR STERMER: Yeah.

MS. BOY: -- Dr. Danchuk's division and establish that that's --

COMMISSIONER RICH: Right.

MS. BOY: -- how they were going to construct the development.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Okay. So if there is anything that comes along that we see as a result of, you know, what we're doing here, though, that -- would it be necessary to go beyond just, you know, the plan to incorporate something specific about sea level rise or something that's going on? Would it be appropriate to put that into the plan, itself, is what I'm asking.

MS. BOY: More detail, I guess you're asking more detail than has been. I think that would be something -- it would have to be something initiated by either the Planning Council or County Commission for consideration --

COMMISSIONER RICH: Okay.

MS. BOY: -- and review through the process that they go through for an amendment if there was something that was desired to be more detailed in the plan.

COMMISSIONER RICH: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Castillo.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I'm for not being flooded.

PLANNING COUNCIL
AUGUST 23, 2018
dh/NC

MAYOR STERMER: Really? Good.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: And -- because I don't think that's compatible.

(Laughter.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I knew that was coming.

CHAIR STERMER: Just put a wall between you and the guy next to you.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Well, I was about to ask what are we doing to not get flooded? I want to get to the bottom line of that.

DR. DANCHUK: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Because it doesn't look like we have a great deal of time. Your young one will have to deal with this.

DR. DANCHUK: I know. I care more now; right? No.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I'll be gone. But, you know, I'm not looking forward to Pembroke Pines being a beach community. What are we doing in terms of best practices to keep the water out of here? What are we doing? Because we can come up with new construction standards, but we're pretty much built out, so that basically -- that basically condemns every property that's currently existing. I'm not sure that that's - what are we doing to keep this from happening? That's my question.

DR. DANCHUK: So I think -- I think you're right. We need to address all the flood risks. So we're considering rainfall flooding. We're considering surge for the coastal communities, and we're considering tidal flooding for the coastal communities. And we're considering that our groundwater table is rising. And what we're hoping is we're providing the resilience standards for what structures should be built to if it's new construction.

The groundwater table drainage design requirements also apply to major redevelopment, but, again, we're missing a certain section of, maybe, historic single-family homes, things like that where, you know, we really need to work with the cities to figure out what -- what's affordable and what makes the most sense, as far as, you know, repurposing maybe some open space to be able to store water temporarily.

We have these different visioning workshops where we try to talk about what a resilient design looks like so that we can actually store water temporarily and then release it when there's an opportunity.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Yeah, I think -- I think all that -- all that helps, but is there any -- is there any sort of discussion about major public works projects in the ocean to

keep ocean water from coming in like other places do, Venice, and other places? Locks, that kind of thing.

DR. DANCHUK: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Has there been any -- any discussion about that? Has there -- has there been any discussion about how, you know, perhaps piers, like they have in places like -- like California and that kind of thing, might help to preserve the sand on the beaches that we could begin to amass some significant amount of dollars that are currently being used for beach nourishment to tackle a project of that magnitude?

What are we doing to keep the water out is what -- is, I guess, what my question is. Do we have concrete plans like that? Are there discussions at that level? Is the Army Corps involved in that? What are we doing to -- you know, because otherwise I'm buying boots.

DR. DANCHUK: No. Well, boots are good anyways. But just to specifically address that, we had put in a request with the Army Corps of Engineers for the southeast Florida -- our flood control system to be reevaluated, given that it was designed in the '30s and has been maintained by the district, but already is reaching the point where water is coming -- is equal to where the water is -- should be going out at those flood gates already. So that's the inland area that's protected through those flood control structures. The request, we had thought, would -- was appropriated, but we have found out recently that it's not going to be included as part of that study.

There is another opportunity for the Corps to reevaluate that flood control system. The details have not really been formally put together yet. They're still in the scoping phase. But we have elevated that request to the -- to the federal level. That was actually part of the summit that we hosted last year, because we -- we actually brought, you know, federal representatives to us to make sure that they heard that we really need help in designing from the watershed scale and from the regional scale a flood control system that not only addresses inland flooding, but that will address the coastal flooding. So right on point.

CHAIR STERMER: You good? Mr. Rosenzweig.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: I'm buying boots.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Yeah, just a question. I know about two or three months ago, Miami-Dade County brought in somebody from the Netherlands to look at our situation here. And I'm curious if he came back with any recommendations or any thoughts about how we can control our water rise in this area.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.)

DR. DANCHUK: So I -- the South Florida Water Management District has had an ongoing agreement to work with a couple institutions in the Netherlands. They were specifically concerned about some of their canals down south have already either reached the banks, the pumps are over capacity, or, you know, the flood gates essentially are not serving the purpose that they were designed for.

And so they had looked at different modeling scenarios to figure out, you know, how they could address more water. I have not fully reviewed that project, but my understanding is they're proposing to deepen the canals, expand the pump capacity, and consider changing possibly some of the land use immediately adjacent to the canals, because they're just so low. Fortunately, we're a little higher elevation. Little.

MR. ROSENZWEIG: Little.

CHAIR STERMER: Commissioner Gomez.

VICE MAYOR GOMEZ: I won't take too much of your time. I do have a question, though, as it pertains to the canals. Some of our cities out west --

DR. DANCHUK: Uh-huh.

VICE MAYOR GOMEZ: -- have a lot of canals.

DR. DANCHUK: Right.

VICE MAYOR GOMEZ: And a lot of homeowners do not realize those canals need to be maintained by the homeowner. So they're failing. Or there's issues going on. So with the water level rising, what can we do for the communities out west that have a lot of canal walls, to educate them? Because I'm presuming -- and maybe you can help me not presume, then, that this water rise is going to affect these areas, as well.

DR. DANCHUK: Right. So the groundwater table is rising across the County, you know, and it's less to the west. They -- you know, as we expect rainfall to increase, they're going to have more flooding and floodwaters to deal with, so it's really important that they maintain those canals. I don't know that there's a specific strategy that I can recommend today. I will highlight that at the mayors' climate roundtable that was just held in May and co-led by Senator Rich, to your left there, we had asked what types of projects each city was interested in in moving forward at their -- you know, as a resilience initiative. Many of them were canal retrofits, which I didn't realize was such an issue. So absolutely.

VICE MAYOR GOMEZ: Appreciate that. And I guess for some of it, as well, and I'm possibly in the wrong forum for this, but with our water going through the canals, and it has dumped from the western cities that are not -- are some on gravity versus them being on pump?

DR. DANCHUK: Uh-huh.

VICE MAYOR GOMEZ: We have trouble where we need to make sure we don't flood our sister cities that are a little lower on the water table level. So, hopefully, within this process that you're working on, that is being taken care of as well.

DR. DANCHUK: That's -- you're exactly right. That's why we need to look from the watershed scale and the regional scale, because essentially just moving water, you know, you no longer can just discharge water to the ocean and expect it to disappear, because now the ocean levels are too high, so.

VICE MAYOR GOMEZ: And that is coming up over our streets, and people are getting concerned it's going to go into their homes, so. Thank you.

OTHER BUSINESS:

CHAIR STERMER: Anything else before the Planning Council this afternoon? We stand adjourned. See everybody in October.

COMMISSIONER CASTILLO: Thank you.

MAYOR STERMER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: See you in October.

(The meeting concluded at 12:26 p.m.)