

DRAFT

**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD (PZB) PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARY
WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2016
INGALLS PARK, 735 S.W. 1ST STREET
HALLANDALE BEACH, FLORIDA**

ATTENDANCE ROLL CALL:**2016 PZB Attendance**

Board Members	1/28	2/24	3/1	3/23	4/27	5/25	6/8	6/22	7/27	8/31	9/28	10/26	11/30	12/28
Sheryl Natelson - Chair	A	A	P	P	P	CANCELLED	P	CANCELLED	P					CANCELLED
Terri Dillard- Vice Chair	A	P	P	A	P		A		P					
Csaba Kulin	P	P	P	P	A		A		A					
Charles Wu	A	P	P	P	A		A		P					
Alexander Lewy	A	A	P	P	P		P		P					
Howard Garson	A	P	P	P	P		P		P					
Leslie Wynne	P	A	P	P	P		P							
Harriett Ginsberg- Alter	P	A	P	P	P		P		P					
Total Members Present	2	5	7	7	6		5		6					
Total Members Absent	6	3	1	1	2		3		1					

Present (P)

Absent: (A)

Tardy: (T)

 Un-appointed
 Special Meeting
Staff in Attendance:

Keven Klopp

Althea Jefferson

Christy Dominguez

Vanessa Leroy

Cindy Bardales

Christopher Saunders

1
2 **1. CALL TO ORDER**

3
4 ~~The Board Chair called the meeting to order at 6:37 P.M.~~
5

6
7 **2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
8

9 **3. ROLL CALL**
10

11 Mr. Kulin was absent.
12

13 Mr. Lewy arrived at 6:38 P.M.
14

15 **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
16

17 ~~MR. LEWY MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 22, 2016 PLANNING~~
18 ~~AND ZONING BOARD HEARING.~~
19

20 ~~MR. GARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.~~
21

22 ~~MOTION PASSED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE (6-0).~~
23

24 **5. NEW BUSINESS**
25

26 ~~Ms. Natelson: asked for a motion by the Board to move item 5.C Code Amendment Grey~~
27 ~~Hound Track second on the agenda.~~
28

29 ~~**MS. DILLARD MOTIONED TO AMEND THE AGENDA ITEM 5.C, CODE AMENDMENT**~~
30 ~~**RELATIVE TO THE GREYHOUND TRACK BE PLACED SECOND ON THE AGENDA.**~~
31

32 ~~**MR. LEWY SECONDED THE MOTION.**~~
33

34 ~~**MOTION PASSED BY A ROLL CALL VOTE (6-0).**~~
35

- 36 1. ~~Application # V-16-02645, by DACA Management LLC, requesting a variance from~~
37 ~~Section 32-143(d)(4) of the Zoning and Land Development Code, regarding the~~
38 ~~minimum required side yard setback for one of the two structures located at 640 SW~~
39 ~~2nd Street, which deficiencies would be resultant of a potential lot split intended to bring~~
40 ~~the subject property in compliance with the minimum lot size and lot width required in~~
41 ~~RS-7.~~

42
43 **Swearing in of Witnesses (Assistant City Attorney)**
44

45 The oath was administered by the Assistant City Attorney to all staff and public attendees
46 that would be speaking on the case.
47

~~Polling of Ex Parte Communications (Board Secretary)~~

~~Ms. Natelson advised that she had no Ex Parte Communications regarding this matter. She advised she would base her decision solely on the testimony being presented.~~

~~Ms. Dillard advised that she had no Ex Parte Communications regarding this matter. She advised she would base her decision solely on the testimony being presented.~~

~~Mr. Lewy advised that he had no Ex Parte Communications regarding this matter. He advised he would base his decision solely on the testimony being presented.~~

~~Mr. Wu advised that he had no Ex Parte Communications regarding this matter. He advised he would base his decision solely on the testimony being presented.~~

~~Mr. Garson advised that he had no Ex Parte Communications regarding this matter. He advised he would base his decision solely on the testimony being presented.~~

~~Ms. Ginsberg advised that she had no Ex Parte Communications regarding this matter. She advised she would base her decision solely on the testimony being presented.~~

Ms. Leroy provided a PowerPoint presentation and gave a brief summary of the item.

Mr. Wu: asked how long was a variance approval before expires?

Ms. Leroy: stated 6 months.

Mr. Wu asked how was this lot split?

Mr. Daniel Gitlin, Applicant (640 SW 2nd Avenue Hallandale Beach Blvd., Hallandale Beach FL 33009): stated when he purchased the subject property they were in foreclosure. He added that Lot B does not have a final inspection.

Mr. Gitlin: further stated that he did not agree with the condition to replace the damaged 6-foot wood fence depicted on the existing survey and move it east two feet (2') onto Lot B to provide adequate space between both buildings and the fence, until such time that Building A is demolished and rebuilt.

Mr. Garson: asked on what lot was the existing fence?

Mr. Gitlin: stated the fence was located on Lot "B" by 5 inches.

Ms. Jefferson: stated that both Lot "A" and "B" met the minimum size requirement. She added that the fence was in disrepair and staff's main focus is the appearance of the property.

94
95 ~~Ms. Leroy: added that the purpose of not proposing to build the fence on the property line~~
96 ~~would result in encroachment to Lot "A".~~
97

98 ~~Ms. Leroy: further added that the mechanical equipment required a clearance of 3 feet~~
99 ~~from property line.~~
100

101 ~~Mr. Wu: stated that he agreed with staff recommendations based on the applicant's plans~~
102 ~~to split the lots making both lots conforming to Code (minimum dimension requirement),~~
103 ~~but did not agree with moving the fence further onto Lot B.~~
104

105 ~~Mr. Lewy: agreed to Mr. Wu's statement that it would be a burden on any future owners,~~
106 ~~which would have to deal with the fence not being on their property line and an air~~
107 ~~conditioner unit encroaching on their property.~~
108

109 ~~Mr. Gitlin: stated he did not have a problem fixing or moving the mechanical equipment.~~
110

111 ~~Ms. Dillard: pointed out how she currently lives in S.W. area of the City where many~~
112 ~~residents have voiced their frustration of a fence built inside their property line.~~
113

114 ~~Mr. Garson: asked would staff determine the owner of the fence based on where it's~~
115 ~~located on a property line?~~
116

117 ~~Ms. Jefferson: stated the owner of the fence would be determined by the person that~~
118 ~~applied for the permit or by the direction of the finished side of the fence.~~
119

120 ~~Ms. Natelson opened the Public Hearing.~~
121

122 ~~There were no speakers.~~
123

124 ~~Ms. Natelson closed the Public Hearing.~~
125

126 ~~**MR. LEWY MOTIONED BASED ON THE COMPETENT AND SUBSTANTIAL**~~
127 ~~**EVIDENCE PRESENTED TODAY THAT THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD**~~
128 ~~**APPROVE THE PROPOSED VARIANCE FOR APPLICATION #V-16-02645 SUBJECT**~~
129 ~~**TO THE CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED BY CITY ADMINISTRATION AND WITH THE**~~
130 ~~**FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS:**~~
131

- 132 ~~**1. REPLACING OF EXISTING FENCE AND RELOCATED ON PROPERTY LINE.**~~
133 ~~**2. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT TO BE REMOVED AND RELOCATED TO A**~~
134 ~~**LOCATION DEEMED APPROPRIATE BY STAFF.**~~
135

136 ~~MS. DILLARD SECONDED THE MOTION.~~
137

138 ~~MOTION PASSED BY ROLL CALL VOTE (5-0).~~
139

2. An Ordinance of the Mayor and City Commission of the City Of Hallandale Beach, Florida, Amending Chapter 32, Article III of the Zoning and Land Development code, Table 32-193(A), permitted uses to expand the uses that will be permitted by right and establishing additional use types; amending Section 32-200 Greyhound Track Subdistrict standards including lot size, building height, lot area, base density, max density, and frontage area; amending 32-205, approval processes to provide additional standards for future overlays and Planned Development Overlays; amending 32-8 to create definitions for family entertainment centers and unified control; providing for conflict; providing for severability; providing for codification; and providing an effective date.

Swearing in of Witnesses (Assistant City Attorney)

The oath was administered by the Assistant City Attorney to all staff and public attendees that would be speaking on the case.

Polling of Ex Parte Communications (Board Secretary)

Ms. Natelson advised that she had discussed with applicant's request to move item before the Chateau Square Project. She advised she would base her decision solely on the testimony being presented.

Ms. Dillard advised that she had no Ex-Parte Communications regarding this matter. She advised she would base her decision solely on the testimony being presented.

Mr. Lewy advised that he had no Ex-Parte Communications regarding this matter. He advised he would base her decision solely on the testimony being presented.

Mr. Wu advised that he had no Ex-Parte Communications regarding this matter. He advised he would base her decision solely on the testimony being presented.

Mr. Garson advised that he had no Ex-Parte Communications regarding this matter. He advised he would base her decision solely on the testimony being presented.

Ms. Ginsberg advised that she had no Ex-Parte Communications regarding this matter. She advised she would base her decision solely on the testimony being presented.

Ms. Jefferson provided a PowerPoint presentation and gave a brief summary of the item.

Mr. Lewy: stated that he has a neighbor in Fashion Art District (FAD) Sub-district and believed that warehouse storage use and vehicular use does not fit the City's vision for the area.

Ms. Jefferson: stated that warehouse storage use and vehicular use were uses previously allowed and they had no intent to remove at this time. She added staff was not recommending an amendment to this regulation.

Mr. Saunders: stated that amendment put in place are the result of a settlement but will take into consideration.

Mr. Wu: stated that he did not find it necessary to remove retail and add commercial since retail would be permitted under commercial use.

- *Purpose and Intent. The Greyhound Track Subdistrict is intended to be a unique, lively arts mixed use and commerce area accommodating a wide range of uses including commercial, residential, ~~retail~~, and some industrial uses.*

Mr. Wu asked why staff was removing the requirement related to lot and block standards.

Mr. Saunders: interjected and asked staff not to answer the question, should response be related to the terms of settlement agreement.

Mr. Wu: stated that line item that mentioned parking fees should be at the City's discretion.

Ms. Jefferson: stated that the City is currently working on a parking study and rates for public parking garages in the City.

Mr. Wu: asked to remove duplicated language on proposed Ordinance that stated: The main entrance(s) to ground story lobbies or commercial space(s) shall be directly from and face a public right-of-way or civic open space. Doors allowing public access shall occur at intervals no greater than 75 feet.

Ms. Natelson opened the Public Hearing.

Debbie Orshefsky, Holland & Knight Partner (515 East Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 1200 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301): gave a brief introduction of the applicant. She added that after the RAC regulation were set in place applicant sued to address his concerns.

Ms. Orshefsky: recommended not removing warehouse storage use and vehicular use. She urged the Board to consider current land use trends.

Ms. Orshefsky: stated that the following language on lines 206 thru 210 contradicts Form-Based Code.

- Provide at least 15% of the project's residential units as workforce housing or contribute to the City's affordable housing fund; and
- Provide at least 10% more parking than the amount required, accessible to the general public on an hourly or daily basis, with a fee to be determined by the

Ms. Orshefsky: recommended that the amendment be approved as proposed.

Bill Spencer, Property Owner (1325 Ponce De Leon Fort Lauderdale, FL): introduced himself and acknowledged staff for their hard work. He advised that the subject property was family owned for 60 years.

Ms. Natelson closed the Public Hearing

MR. LEWY MOVED THAT THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING TABLE 32-193A AND THE TEXT OF CHAPTER 32, ARTICLE III TO CREATE DEFINITIONS, ESTABLISH ADDITIONAL USES IN THE GREYHOUND TRACK SUBDISTRICT, AND INCLUDE CHANGES TO APPROVAL PROCESSES FOR FUTURE OVERLAYS AND INCLUDE ALL CHANGES MENTIONED BY MR. WU, EXCLUDING THE PARKING RECOMMENDATIONS.

MS. DILLARD SECONDED THE MOTION.

MOTION PASSED BY ROLL CALL VOTE (4-1). MR. WU- NO

~~3. Applications DB-2015-0092, Z-2015-0108, and P-2016-00969 by Chateau Square, LLC, requesting the following approvals for the Chateau Square Project for construction of a mixed use development consisting of 690 high-rise residential units, 36 work/live units, 280 room hotel with 14,102 square feet of accessory use, 137,384 gross leasable area of commercial space and 99,569 square feet of office space at the property located at 600 East Hallandale Beach Boulevard:~~

~~The applications are as follows:~~

- ~~a) Application Z-2015-0108 by Chateau Square, LLC requesting approval to apply the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) District to the subject parcel.~~
- ~~b) Application P-2016-00969 by Chateau Square, LLC requesting approval for a Plat Note Amendment to amend the existing note on the Promenade at Hallandale Plat to allow the residential use, and modifying the Non-Vehicular Access Lines within the Plat.~~
- ~~c) Application DB-2015-0092 by Chateau Square, LLC requesting approval for Major Development Review approval pursuant to Section 32-782 of the Zoning and Land Development Code in order to construct the proposed mixed use development consisting of 726 residential units, a total of 137,384 GLA/ 309,890 GFA of commercial space, 99,569 square feet Gross Floor Area of Office Use, 280 room hotel, with 14,102 square feet of accessory hotel uses and associated parking garage.~~

~~Polling of Ex Parte Communications (Board Secretary)~~

Board Secretary polled the Planning and Zoning Board regarding Ex-Parte Communications:

~~Ms. Natelson advised that she had no Ex-Parte Communications regarding this matter. She advised she would base her decision solely on the testimony being presented.~~

~~Ms. Dillard advised that she had received a message from the applicant but had no concern regarding the item and did not return the call. She advised she would base her decision solely on the testimony being presented.~~

~~Mr. Lewy advised that he had discussion with residents, applicant's attorney and attended community meeting. He advised he would base his decision solely on the testimony being presented.~~

~~Mr. Wu advised that he had no Ex-Parte Communications regarding this matter. He advised he would base his decision solely on the testimony being presented.~~

~~Mr. Garson stated he spoken to the applicant's attorney regarding the item. He advised he would base his decision solely on the testimony being presented.~~

~~Ms. Ginsberg advised that she had no Ex-Parte Communications regarding this matter. She advised she would base her decision solely on the testimony being presented.~~

Swearing in of Witnesses (Assistant City Attorney)

~~The oath was administered by the Assistant City Attorney to all staff and public attendees that would be speaking on the case.~~

~~Mr. Klopp gave an introduction and asked the Board to focus on traffic, compatibility and market when considering this project.~~

~~Ms. Dominguez provided a presentation and gave a brief summary of the item.~~

~~Ms. Dominguez noted that the project detail on the gross floor area is 309,898/GFA. She clarified that required parking is 3,161 spaces, with the proposed number of spaces, there is a 1,366 space deficiency.~~

~~Mr. Zach Clark, City Traffic Consultant: expanded on the traffic analysis.~~

~~Ms. Dillard: asked during what month was the traffic study put in place and did the study have an overview of change throughout seasons?~~

~~Mr. Clark: stated that the traffic study data was collected during the month of January through April.~~

~~Mr. Garson: asked if the traffic study took in consideration the projects that have been approved.~~

Mr. Clark: stated that the traffic study included Beachwalk, 7th Avenue Village, Hallandale Oasis and Artsquare Project.

Mr. Garson: pointed out how Hallandale Beach Blvd has long school zones. He asked if staff had any knowledge of changes being made to the current school district moving the location to improve traffic.

Mr. Clark: stated he was not aware of any changes being proposed.

Mr. Garson: stated that most residents living in Hallandale Beach for a while manage to maneuver around and avoid traffic by cutting through residential roads and backstreets. He asked if the traffic study factors in those roads.

Mr. Clark: clarified that the study does not assume shortcuts. It focuses on main streets such as Hallandale Beach Boulevard.

Mr. Lewy: asked if the north bound right dedicated turning lane towards East Hallandale Beach Boulevard without a stop on a four lane merge would be feasible? (constant free-flow turn lane)

Mr. Lewy: suggested to design a new lane on Hallandale Beach Boulevard or an acceleration lane to accommodate the east bound traffic on 8th Avenue; otherwise, there will be a conflict with the flow of traffic due to the turn.

Mr. Clark: stated that he would take Mr. Lewy's point into consideration, which he agreed would allow a better traffic flow but would not be pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Wu: stated the triple lane turn egress on 8th Avenue points right and left and Sage Plaza exits also with 8th Avenue; how would that be?

Mr. Clark: stated any answer would be speculation.

Mr. Garson: asked if any action can be taken before approval of Hibiscus or would approval need to be taken.

Mr. Klopp: clarified that it can be part of the Board's recommendation. However, acquisition of property that belongs to a different entity, is a condition the applicant might not be able to accomplish.

Debbie Orshefsky, Holland & Knight Partner (515 East Las Olas Boulevard, Suite 1200 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301): gave a brief presentation on the project and advised how concern on the flow of traffic on Hallandale Beach Boulevard should not be imposed on the applicant. She added that Broward County and the City would need to deal with the congestion.

Jordan Trachtenberg, UNStudio (6310 NW 2nd Ave. Miami, FL): gave a brief overview of the history of the developer and the interior design of the building.

Richard Cannone, Calvin, Giordano & Associates, Inc. (1800 Eller Drive, Suite 600 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316): presented information on the City's Comprehensive Land Use Plan and how the Chateau project incorporates the City view for the future.

Mr. Cannone: added that the parking standards have a 10% reduction for transit. He further added they have surplus of 47 parking spaces at Sage Plaza and 20 spaces on Hibiscus Street totaling 67 public parking spaces.

Joaquin Vargas, the applicant's traffic engineer (8400 N. University Dr., Suite 309 Tamarac, FL 33321): addressed traffic analysis and provided information on nine additional mitigation measures proposed to minimize traffic.

Mr. Wu: asked if Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) approved mitigation?

Mr. Vargas: stated that approval by FDOT was not a requirement.

Mr. Wu: stated that plans show stacking and was certain that would need approval of FDOT prior to approval.

Mr. Vargas: stated that the Traffic Operational Team would review the study and see is reasonable request since south bound left turn was designed for future development, the extension west bound towards S. Federal Hwy and the north bound left turning median would be needed for analysis and accommodation.

Ms. Orshefsky: stated the applicant agrees to all staff's conditions except the following:

- ~~8.) The applicant will be required to pay towards upgrades to the affected lift stations in the amount of \$3,421,438.10.~~
- ~~10.) The applicant agrees that no leases exceeding the 137,384 Gross Leasable Area (GLA) reflected on the site plan will be executed. The Leasable area shall be restricted to the 137,384 specified on the site plan and utilized for traffic analysis purposes. In other words, no entity is to be authorized via an agreement with the property owner to utilize any of the remaining 199,518 square feet of non-leasable space for retail kiosks or other similar uses that were not included in the impact analyses.~~
- ~~12.) Dedication of SE 8th Avenue to a public street.~~
- ~~13b.) Prior to the issuance of the first permit for vertical construction the applicant shall assist the City in preparing a conceptual plan for a fixed route, dedicated line, urban mobility mass transit system with stops, in addition to its own, at North Beach Park, the Diplomat, Mardi Gras, the Hepburn Center, I-95 at Hallandale Beach Blvd., the Coastal Link Station location at the FEC tracks' intersection with SE/SW 3rd St.,~~

~~Optima Plaza/Aventura Hospital, and City Hall/Gulfstream Park. Prior to the first certificate of occupancy for a principal structure at the project site, the applicant shall update the conceptual plan for the urban mobility system referenced herein, including the identification of constraints to accomplishing such a system.~~

- ~~▪ 14.) Execution of traffic impact mitigation-TSM and TDM measures including: Angle parking locations be amended to reduce the conflict of reversing vehicles, with those entering/exiting garages and loading zones.~~

~~Mr. Wu: asked about the timing on approval of more RAC units from Broward County, since the applicant has requested 345 units be assigned at this time. However, during (Phase 2) of the project 381 units be assigned from a future pool of units if approved by Broward County.~~

~~Ms. Orshefsky: stated more RAC units are being requested by the City; the number of units to the project is achievable but the amount left is low.~~

~~Mr. Klopp: pointed out, with the phase allocation scenario, the City Commission would have to grant the units in the future, not now. The applicant is requesting to allocate 726 units total. Approving all 726 units would essentially deplete the units available until the City has received approval from the County for more.~~

~~Ms. Orshefsky: stated she agreed to pre-allocation but it should be treated as a vested right.~~

~~Mr. Saunders: stated that the City Attorney's Office was still reviewing this matter.~~

~~Mr. Wu: addressed his concern of the two floors of retail space. They wouldn't like to see the project failed due to not finding two floors of retail space being filled.~~

~~Mr. Wu: suggested that applicant provide a retail market study or hire a marketing consultant. He stated not doing so, can result in the project failing similar to what happened to Cocowalk, Sunset Place and Riverwalk.~~

~~Ms. Orshefsky: stated there was no requirement for a retail market study be provided. She added that given the mix of uses, restaurants and outdoor dining, there will be a purpose an event to support the retail component.~~

~~Discussion ensued.~~

~~Ms. Ginsberg left the meeting at 10:30 P.M.~~

~~Ms. Natelson opened the Public Hearing.~~

~~There were no speakers.~~

~~Ms. Natelson closed the Public Hearing.~~

~~MR. GARSON MOVED BASED ON THE COMPETENT AND SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE PRESENTED, THAT THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY (PDO) DESIGNATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION FOR APPLICATION #2015-0108-Z.~~

~~MS. DILLARD SECONDED THE MOTION.~~

~~MOTION PASSED BY ROLL CALL VOTE (4-1). MR. WU- NO~~

~~MS. DILLARD MOVED BASED ON THE COMPETENT AND SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE PRESENTED, THAT THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COMMISSION OF APPLICATION 2015-0092-DB FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPROVAL PURSUANT TO SECTION 32-782 OF THE HALLANDALE BEACH ZONING AND LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE IN ORDER TO BUILD THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 600 EAST HALLANDALE BEACH BOULEVARD SUBJECT TO THE TERMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AS MAY BE FINALIZED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION.~~

~~MR. GARSON SECONDED THE MOTION WITH A FRIENDLY AMENDMENT THAT CITY OBTAINING HIBISCUS STREET TO 14TH AVENUE.~~

~~MOTION FAILED BY ROLL CALL VOTE (3-2). MS. NATELSON, MR. WU & MR. LEWY- NO~~

~~Ms. Dillard: requested to open for discussion and asked what members' concerns were?~~

~~Mr. Lewy: stated traffic.~~

~~Mr. Wu: stated retail market study and the City's vision for Hallandale Beach Boulevard.~~

~~MR. WU MOVED TO RECOMMEND DENIAL TO THE CITY COMMISSION OF APPLICATION 2016-0012-DB FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPROVAL PURSUANT TO SECTION 32-782 OF THE HALLANDALE BEACH ZONING AND LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE IN ORDER TO BUILD THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 600 EAST HALLANDALE BEACH BOULEVARD AND FIND THAT THE EVIDENCE PRESENTED DOES NOT SUPPORT THE APPROVAL IN THAT IT WOULD CAUSE OR RESULT IN THE VIOLATION OF THE STANDARDS ESTABLISHED IN CHAPTER 32, OTHER APPLICABLE LAWS, ORDINANCES, OR REGULATIONS.~~

~~MR. LEWY SECONDED THE MOTION.~~

~~MOTION FAILED BY ROLL CALL VOTE (3-2). MR. GARSON, MS. DILLARD AND MS. NATELSON - NO~~

~~Discussion ensue between the Board and Assistant City Attorney.~~

~~MR. LEWY MOVED BASED ON THE COMPETENT AND SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE PRESENTED, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE CITY COMMISSION OF APPLICATION 2015-0092-DB AT 100 SOUTH FEDERAL HIGHWAY FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPROVAL PURSUANT TO SECTION 32-782 OF THE HALLANDALE BEACH ZONING AND LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE IN ORDER TO BUILD THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT 600 EAST HALLANDALE BEACH BOULEVARD SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED BY CITY ADMINISTRATION AND THE TERMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AS MAY BE FINALIZED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION, AND WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS:~~

- ~~1) DRASTIC REDUCTION TO TRAFFIC IMPACTS ON HALLANDALE BEACH BOULEVARD.~~

~~MR. GARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.~~

~~MOTION PASSED BY ROLL CALL VOTE (4-1). MR. WU - NO~~

6. REMARKS AS REQUESTED BY THE CHAIR

~~Ms. Natelson asked for a motion to cancel the Planning and Zoning Board Meeting for December 28, 2016, due to the holidays.~~

~~MOTION PASSED BY ROLL CALL VOTE (5-0)~~

7. NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING

~~August 31, 2016~~

Meeting adjourned at 11:06 P.M.

A Recording of this meeting can be made available to any member of the public upon request. Requests to hear a taping of the Planning and Zoning Board meeting, summarized above, should be submitted to the Planning & Zoning Division at ajefferson@hallandalebeachfl.gov or can be mailed to 400 South Federal Highway, Attn. Althea P. Jefferson, Hallandale Beach, Florida 33009.