

MINUTES

BROWARD COUNTY PLANNING COUNCIL

August 23, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Lamar Fisher, Chair
Commissioner Anne Castro, Vice Chair
Commissioner Lisa Mallozzi, Secretary
Tim Bascombe
Commissioner Claudette Bruck
Frederick Burton
Sara Case
Kenneth Fink
School Board Member Patricia Good
Mary D. Graham
Commissioner Sue Gunzburger
Dan Hobby
Commissioner Keith London
Commissioner Michael S. Long
Sharon P. Ragoonan
Louis Reinstein
Mayor Michael Udine

MEMBERS ABSENT: Commissioner Bobby DuBose
Commissioner Rita Mack

ALSO PRESENT: Barbara Blake Boy, Planning Council Executive Director
Andy Maurodis, Legal Counsel
Glenn Amoruso, Broward County Planning and Redevelopment
Division
Scott Stoudenmire, City of Coconut Creek, Deputy Director for
Sustainable Development
Nancy Cavender, The Laws Group

(A sign-in sheet reflecting those present is filed with the supplemental papers to the minutes of this meeting.)

A meeting of the Broward County Planning Council was held at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, August 23, 2012, in Room 422 of the Broward County Governmental Center, Fort Lauderdale, Florida

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Lamar Fisher called the meeting to order.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, if you'll take your seats, we're going to begin. I will now call to order the Pompano Beach – Pompano Beach.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: Does it look like Pompano Beach?

CHAIR FISHER: The Broward County Planning Council Meeting this August 23rd, 2012.

Please stand for the pledge led by Commissioner Anne Castro.

(THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE WAS LED BY COMMISSIONER ANNE CASTRO)

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Nancy, welcome again.

THE REPORTER: Thank you, sir.

ROLL CALL:

CHAIR FISHER: Please call the roll.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Tim Bascombe.

MR. BASCOMBE: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Claudette Bruck.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Frederick Burton.

MR. BURTON: Present.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Sara Case.

MS. CASE: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Anne Castro.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Bobby DuBose. Mr. Kenneth Fink.

MR. FINK: Present.

THE REPORTER: School Board Member Patricia Good.

MS. GOOD: Here.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Mary Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Sue Gunzburger.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: Present.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Dan Hobby.

MR. HOBBY: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Keith London.

COMMISSIONER LONDON: Present.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Michael Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Here.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Rita Mack. Commissioner Lisa Mallozzi.

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Sharon Ragoonan.

MS. RAGOONAN: Present.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Louis Reinstein.

MR. REINSTEIN: Here.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael Udine. Mayor Lamar Fisher.

CHAIR FISHER: Here. Thank you so much. A couple announcements before we do begin. First of all, I -- our bagel tin is starting to get low over here, I'm told. So if you can put some more dollars in there, we'd appreciate that as well. The second item is that we have a new microphone system. And -- as you can see in front of you. So Ms. Boy has asked me that -- my microphone's been on, but other ones, you can switch on and off; is that correct?

MS. BOY: You can turn it on and off as you're using it, as opposed to leaving it on, because it is -- the system will stay on. As it goes on, it'll pick up the first person kind of thing. So just -- just be aware of it when you're using it. And it's okay if you leave it on.

CHAIR FISHER: All right. I'm sure Commissioner Gunzburger knows how to do it all ready, and that's great.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: Just tell them to use the base.

MS. BOY: The base button will turn it on and off.

CHAIR FISHER: Very good. Everybody understand? Good. Okay.

CONSENT AGENDA

AGENDA ITEMS C-1 THROUGH C-4:

CHAIR FISHER: Our Consent Items C-1 through C-4. We are going to add to C-4, Commissioner Mack has an excused or requested absence. So is there a motion to approve the Consent?

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: So moved.

MAYOR UDINE: Second.

CHAIR FISHER: Moved and second. All in favor, say aye. All opposed? Motion carries. Let the record show Mayor Udine is now present with us today.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

REGULAR AGENDA

AGENDA ITEM R-1 – PERFORMANCE REVIEW PLANNING COUNCIL ATTORNEY:

CHAIR FISHER: On our Regular Agenda, R-1 is the performance review for our Planning Council attorney. And you'll see in your backup a letter of recommendation provided. It's really two parts.

Number one is that Mr. Maurodis has agreed to that we're going to remove his recommendation -- his evaluation to correspond with the Executive Director's on June 1st. So we're making that change. We won't coordinate, obviously, to provide a recommendation, as we talked about in the Executive Committee meeting today. As you begin to try to write something down, it's so difficult with Mr. Maurodis, because -- and I've been serving on the Council for almost seven, eight years now, and we've never had an issue. He's always been there. He works well with the staff. And to try to put it into words, you really can't.

And so -- but I did the best I could. And, Andy, really, from the Planning Council, I'm sure there's going to be some comments. Thank you. Thank you for all you do. We wish we could give you more dollars, but you again graciously --

MR. FINK: But we spent them on the microphones.

CHAIR FISHER: But you've been gracious to, you know, not even talking about that. So again, we really, really appreciate you, and we have for a long time. Anyone else want to make any comments? Is there a motion to --

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: So moved.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Second.

CHAIR FISHER: Moved and second. All in favor, say aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

MR. MAURODIS: Thank you very much.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM R-2 – COUNCIL'S REPORT:

CHAIR FISHER: R-2 is Counsel report.

MR. MAURODIS: Only to thank you for the very fine words. Thank you very much.

AGENDA ITEM R-3 – EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

CHAIR FISHER: All right. R-3. Ms. Boy, the Executive Director's report.

MS. BOY: Thank you. First, I'd like to mirror Mayor Fisher's comments about Andy. I know he's an excellent attorney, and it is -- it's a joy and privilege to work with him. So thank you, Andy. Second, the -- as a reminder, the September meeting was moved to September 20th. So that's a change. So make sure that's marked on your calendar. And I'll send out an email just to make sure that everyone's aware of that.

We'll also be polling the members for the combined November/December meeting date, which will either be November 29th or December 6th. So Ginette of our staff will send you an email, contacting you so you can tell her your preference.

I'll report that back at the September meeting, and then you can vote on that date at that time. The third thing I want to talk about just real quickly is, you know, since the change, since I became the Director, you know, we've made some changes to the Planning Council staff, and I just want to recognize that at the meeting.

We have a great staff. Deanne Von Stetina was promoted to the Director of Planning. Pete Schwarz was promoted to Planning Manager. And Gretchen Flores was promoted to Senior Planner. And with the promotion of Gretchen, I'd also like to announce that this is her last meeting, because she's actually getting married and relocating to New York City in about a week with her fiancé, soon-to-be husband. So we'll miss her. I just want to recognize her.

CHAIR FISHER: We will miss you, Gretchen.

MS. BOY: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: (Inaudible.) Thank you. Does that conclude your report?

MS. BOY: Yes, it does. Thank you.

PUBLIC HEARING

AGENDA ITEMS PH-1, PH-5, PH-6 AND PH-7

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. We are now on our Public Hearings, PH-1 through 7. Of course, PH-1 is quasi-judicial. I do want to make note that PH-5 and 6 was discussed at our Land Use/Trafficways committee meeting, and they were both recommended (inaudible) by the Committee to move those forward. So PH-1 through 7, anyone wish to pull an item? Ms. Case?

MS. CASE: 4.

CHAIR FISHER: 4.

MR. BURTON: 3.

CHAIR FISHER: 3? I'm hearing 3 and 4. Anyone else?

MR. REINSTEIN: 2, please.

CHAIR FISHER: Number 2. Mr. Burton,

MR. BURTON: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Burton, are you looking?

MR. BURTON: Yeah, 2, 3, and 4.

CHAIR FISHER: 2, 3, and 4. Anyone else? That leaves Item 1, 5, 6, and 7.

MAYOR UDINE: I'll move the balance of the Consent Agenda.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Second.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

CHAIR FISHER: Moved and second. Any further discussion? All in favor, say aye. Opposed? Motion does carry.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM PH-2 – RECERTIFICATION PCR 12-9

CHAIR FISHER: We are now under PH-2. Ms. Boy?

MS. BOY: PH-2 is recertification of the unincorporated Broward County Land Use Element with several updates. They added some language for mixed use categories, although not denoting a specific area but adding language into their plan.

As well, they deleted some -- some language in unused categories, added changes to public school concurrency, transit, health and urban development.

One thing I want to note about this is this takes into account actually several

text amendment changes that were done over the course of three or four years and just getting to us now for recertification.

Since some of it is repetitive in there and is replacing language that was amended maybe the time before that. Unincorporated area staff is here to answer any specific questions that you have.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Reinstein?

MR. REINSTEIN: Press the face button. A couple questions. On your Attachment 1 referencing Policy 2.1.2(1)(E), I see where E is crossed out, the section public school concurrency requirements.

And then a few pages later, page 1 of the Comprehensive Plan references Policy 2.1.2 again, part B. It's the same language.

MS. BOY: I believe that was because of the timing. They removed the language. (Inaudible) I'm going to let the unincorporated area staff address that particular issue.

MR. AMORUSO: Good afternoon, members of the board. Yes. That -- that was removed due to the first one of the element that was not effective, and then we adopted new (Inaudible) element in 2008, and then that was included to reflect that item as well.

MR. REINSTEIN: Does that mean that at one time it -- you thought you did need it and then later you realized you didn't?

MR. AMORUSO: Exactly.

MR. REINSTEIN: Okay.

MS. BOY: Changes in the State Statute add something concurrency.

MR. REINSTEIN: I have another question, if I may.

CHAIR FISHER: Please.

MR. REINSTEIN: Referring to Objective 2.9, which is at the bottom of page - - page 2-4 of the Comprehensive Plan. It's a proposed future unincorporated area land use element provisions. In graphic 2.9, that opening paragraph, where it refers to smart growth. I think it's great. Happy to see that language added in.

My question is towards the specific reference to -- to existing and future

electrical power generation and transmission systems.

Why electrical as opposed to just power generation and transmission systems, which would seem to limit it to electrical as opposed to any other potential power generation and transmission systems that may become available?

MR. AMORUSO: I think that was meant to be consistent with the Broward County Land Use Plan.

MR. REINSTEIN: (Inaudible) it's the same language that's in other locations?

MR. AMORUSO: Yes.

MR. REINSTEIN: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Further discussion? Mr. Burton.

MR. BURTON: Thank you. I have two questions. The first is on Policy 2.10.3 on page 2-3 where you're adding some land designation usages and eliminating some. And so my question is this also going to have an impact on property owners for property tax purposes with some of these changes?

MR. AMORUSO: No, I don't think that that's -- that was the purpose of the elimination of policies. It basically was those were land uses that were adopted into the Broward County Land Use Plan, and the elimination of the other land uses were because those are no longer in an unincorporated area.

MR. BURTON: So there currently are no properties that are rural ranches, rural estate, urban estate that are --

MR. AMORUSO: Unincorporated.

MR. BURTON: Okay. And of the ones that are going to be -- to become transit oriented corridor, transit oriented development, mixed use residential, you're saying that you don't think that that's going to have any impact on people's property taxes?

MR. AMORUSO: Well, those land use designations are in the plan, but they're not designated in the unincorporated area.

MR. BURTON: I have another. The other question I have is on page 2.1. It's Policy 2.3.2, and it's regarding the preservation and maintaining the housing stock in the unincorporated area.

And it talks about the -- Broward County's abandoned/vacant registration certificate program. Could you talk a little bit about that?

MR. AMORUSO: That was the program that was adopted by the County Commission in 2009 basically to prevent blight in the unincorporated area. And that was basically a program that lenders needed to go after these abandoned properties and register them and basically help them -- you know, it would prevent blight, basically. You want to look at these -- look at these properties and make sure that they're -- they're getting taken care of in terms of keeping lawns cut and so forth.

So it was basically a policy that was added to be consistent with the program added by Broward County Commission and prevent blight in the unincorporated areas.

MR. BURTON: So this is -- this is solely for lenders to maintain properties that were taken back or are in foreclosure, or does this also include property owners themselves that would be considered quote/unquote behind?

MR. AMORUSO: It's -- it was primarily for the -- the lenders on those. I mean, I'm not -- I didn't create the program, but from my understanding, it's for the lenders basically to go out these properties and make sure that they are registered and make sure that the properties are maintained while they're in the foreclosure process.

MR. BURTON: And what -- what if they're not? What happens? Does the property at some point start getting fines, or does it get reverted to the County or -- or how does that -- how does the process work?

MR. AMORUSO: Yeah, I -- unfortunately, I'm not -- I didn't work on the creation of the program, so I don't know all the specific details of it.

MR. BURTON: But my understanding is that that was the general purpose of the policy being added.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Burton, you're correct. That's the intent of the process.

MR. BURTON: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Any further discussion? Mr. Fink.

MR. FINK: I'm sorry. Caffeine hasn't kicked in yet. Can we go back -- can we go back to Louis's question --

CHAIR FISHER: Sure.

MR. FINK: -- because I'm somewhat confused. Are we saying that the unincorporated land will have to meet the currency requirements of the school board or they will not?

MR. AMORUSO: I'm sorry?

MR. FINK: They will have to?

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: They will.

CHAIR FISHER: They will. Anybody else? Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Move it.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: Second.

CHAIR FISHER: Moved and second. All in favor, say aye. Opposed? Motion carries unanimously. Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM PH-3 – AMENDMENT 12-5

CHAIR FISHER: PH-3, Ms. Boy.

MS. BOY: PH-3 is a proposed Land Use Plan Amendment in the City of Coconut Creek. It's approximately one and a half gross acres. The proposed change is from Recreation/Open Space to Community Facilities. Both of those uses are within a dashed line area.

There is sufficient public facilities and services available to serve the site. But, further, since this amendment would be removing park acreage to the City, we need to address policy, the open space policy of the Broward County Land Use Plan. And to do that, the City has actually acquired a piece of property on the east side of the park, which is approximately the same net acreage that will be replacing that acreage.

So considering the sufficient public facilities and services, the sufficient park acreage they're replacing, park acreage for mitigation, Planning Council staff is recommending approval of the proposed amendment.

I think one natural resources kind of thing to note about this is that there is an

area to the south of the park which is approximately 350 feet away from the amendment site, and we have received confirmation from the City that they will, you know, be maintaining and ensuring that that area remains protected in coordination with the County.

The City of Coconut Creek staff is available if you have a specific question for them about the amendment.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Any discussion? Mr. Burton.

MR. BURTON: Thank you. Good morning. My questions revolved mostly around the finances of this project.

MS. BOY: Scott Stoudenmire, the Deputy Director of Sustainable –

MR. STOUDENMIRE: Sustainable Development.

MS. BOY: -- Sustainable Development Department.

MR. STOUDENMIRE: Scott Stoudenmire.

MR. BURTON: Thank you. My questions are the -- the building of this new facility, what is the cost of doing this versus upgrading any other facilities, the location of the closest other facility, how many responders, and the budget for construction, the budget for maintenance, the -- you know, kind of the cost analysis you've determined.

MR. STOUDENMIRE: And I did not come here today with, you know, the budget for the new station. You know, it is -- the money is programmed. There has been analysis. The south end of the City response time is lacking, according to our police chief, which is backed up by numerous reports.

So there was never an evaluation of upgrading the existing facilities. However, a number of alternative sites were evaluated for a new station. The decision was made there is a need for a new station. There were multiple sites evaluated, and this came up to the top of the list.

MR. BURTON: Okay. So there's no information on the financing the cost of the structure –

CHAIR FISHER: That -- that -- Mr. Burton, that is not part of the land use issue. That would be more of a City question. Maybe they could provide that.

MR. STOUDENMIRE: I'd be happy to provide that. I'm sure that -- that I can

get that in very short order. However I did not bring that information with me today. I apologize.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Commissioner Mallozzi.

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: Just in reference to the preservation that you were referring to. Do we have that in writing?

MS. BOY: Yes. Actually, the City –

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: I don't remember seeing that.

MS. BOY: Actually, it was -- well, Attachment 10 is -- is the map, and that indicates the area. And Attachment 9 outlines the -- the specific protection of the additional one acre, the addition to the park, on the east side of the property.

And then also Attachment -- I believe it's 6 -- yes, is also a letter from the City of Coconut Creek saying that even though it's not directly adjacent to the natural resource area in the park, that they will do work with the County to support that.

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Hobby.

MR. HOBBY: I think this is -- acquiring that one acre more than makes up for losing the -- that site. It really finishes off the park with access from the east. The question I had -- and, I mean, I support this no matter what, but why was -- can you tell me about the decision to locate it where it is rather than just south of the entrance and the existing parking area?

MR. STOUDENMIRE: It had to do primarily with turning movements and the ability to get another opening on Lyons Road for a -- for a one way through movement for emergency vehicles –

MR. HOBBY: Okay.

MR. STOUDENMIRE: -- on the other side, not lending itself to that type of maneuver.

MR. HOBBY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: The acquisition of the (inaudible) property is just a perfect fit for this.

MR. STOUDEMIRE: Yes.

CHAIR FISHER: It will work very well. Any further discussion? Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mayor. Just one question for the record, thank you. Does the decision to approve this today carry to any municipalities that might want to take or swap parkland for fire stations?

And I'm specifically speaking about Hardy Park in southeast Fort Lauderdale, and a discussion for the last two years by city leaders to take one acre from the park for a fire station under the -- this decision that the response times need a station to be located in a certain geographic area.

CHAIR FISHER: Ms. Boy can answer that.

MS. BOY: Every land use plan amendment would be evaluated on its own merits. And, in addition, any city that proposes to remove park space is subject -- any city or developer that proposes to remove park space is subject to the open space policies, and either quantifying or qualifying how they're going to have adequate space available.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you. I just want that on the record, because if that comes back and I'm no longer here, I just want the Council to be aware of that. Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Any further discussion?

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Move to approve PH-3.

MR. HOBBY: Second.

CHAIR FISHER: Been moved and second. All in favor, say aye. Opposed? Motion does carry. Thank you.

VOTE PASSES UNANIMOUSLY.

AGENDA ITEM PH-4 – AMENDMENT PC 12-6

CHAIR FISHER: Now PH-4.

MS. BOY: PH-4 is a small scale land use plan amendment also located in the City of Coconut Creek. It's approximately 5.4 acres and it's located on the south side of Hillsboro Boulevard and State Road 7. The proposed change is from Office Park to Low-Medium (10) Residential. Planning Council staff

analysis finds sufficient facilities and services available to service this site for this land use.

As well, since it is going to residential land use, the impacts to public schools were evaluated, and it was found that the 15 or so public school students projected to be generated, there is sufficient capacity available to serve them in the public schools. There is -- Planning Council staff recommends approval of the proposed land use change.

CHAIR FISHER: Any discussion? Ms. Case.

MS. CASE: I -- I just have a question or -- a concern here. The land use directly to the south is industrial, and it's vacant now, so it's nice and green. But putting housing next to an industrial site raises some concern with me. But then I also read in the backup here that there are approximately six known hazardous material facilities in proximity to the boundaries of this proposed amendment.

And so it just raised in my mind what kind of a healthy environment they're creating here for these families.

CHAIR FISHER: Ms. Boy?

MS. BOY: In regard to the -- the adjacent industrial land use to the -- to the south of the property, we did take that into consideration, and our staff coordinated with the Department of Sustainable Development staff for the City of Coconut Creek, and their codes and their buffering requirements, we felt a comfort level that it would be addressed through that manner as far as setback requirements and the types of uses that would be permitted in that industrial zoning land use.

MS. CASE: And what about the six hazardous material sites?

MS. BOY: Within a quarter mile? We get these reports from the Environmental Department for each land use plan amendment, and very often -- these are often dry cleaners, HVAC cleaners, gas stations, so that unless it's something that they feel would pose a -- would be a harm to the public, they would -- you know, it's just an identification for planning -- planning purposes.

MS. CASE: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Hobby.

MR. HOBBY: Is anybody representing the applicants?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, okay.

MS. BOY: No, we just have the City of Coconut Creek here.

MR. HOBBY: Okay. Well, that -- that will do.

MS. BOY: That'll do? We have Scott.

MR. SToudenMIRE: Scott Stoudenmire here.

MR. HOBBY: Since it was brought up in the application about pedestrian access to Kohl's and Wal-Mart and other facilities, could you discuss what the -- what pedestrian infrastructure there is --

MR. SToudenMIRE: Yes.

MR. HOBBY: -- in that area?

MR. SToudenMIRE: The -- the property, along with most of the properties along Hillsboro Boulevard there, back up to the right of way of 69th Street, which runs from Lyons Road all the way to State Road 7. The City has constructed a greenway within that right of way, the full length of that.

It was separated by a canal which was part of the County's preservation site. The County recently dropped the bridge end, so now you've got full connection of greenway from Lyons Road all the way basically to the back of Carl's Furniture that fronts on State Road 7. So we actually think that putting some residents on this greenway is a good thing and a compatible one.

MR. HOBBY: How about along Hillsboro Boulevard?

MR. SToudenMIRE: Well, there's pedestrian access on both sides, standard pedestrian five-foot sidewalks. However, once you cross over onto the north side of Hillsboro, we have an entire greenway network up there, as well. We have a greenway that wraps the Wal-Mart. We have a greenway connection that is being put in right now by a new residential developer adjacent to the Wal-Mart, which will add connectivity on the other side.

MR. HOBBY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Any further discussion? Mr. Fink.

MR. FINK: Going back to the hazardous sites -- oh, I'm sorry. Going back to the hazardous sites, I believe I understood you to say that usually these may

be dry cleaners or something like that?

MS. BOY: I –

MR. FINK: Are you saying by saying, usually, you don't know what those six sites are?

MS. BOY: -- I don't think that they specifically list the sites in here. I can certainly get more information on those sites for the next meeting.

We don't have a -- the environmental staff isn't here at the meeting for you to query about that, but I'd be happy to find out that information.

MR. FINK: My concern would be the liability that the City and County might be exposed to if one of those sites was something more hazardous than a dry cleaner or something like that. And if you brought in 54 residents, which is what I see, it's going to be (inaudible).

MS. BOY: Right. It's not on the property. It's in proximity to the property, so –

MR. FINK: But it's within a quarter acre –

MS. BOY: I –

MR. FINK: -- quarter mile.

MS. BOY: -- a quarter mile. I'll get the information on that.

CHAIR FISHER: Commissioner Castro.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Just out of curiosity, the other person (inaudible) is there any kind of -- is this any kind of flex area or something, or is this just this one spot where (inaudible) –

MR. STOUDENMIRE: Just this -- this one spot.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: You have no concerns assurances for the flexible zoning in that whole area that any of this other area will follow suit to become more compatible with the residential component there?

MR. STOUDENMIRE: At this time, no.

CHAIR FISHER: Any further discussion? Commissioner Mallozzi.

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: Not necessarily to this item, but just something to bring to the attention, we have approximately 54 homes that are going to be here, correct?

MS. BOY: That are permitted.

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: Right. That will generate 15 students. Does anyone see the error in that math? And -- and I don't fault the School Board, but this has been a bone of contention of mine from the -- literally before I was elected. We constantly have development and, in my opinion, they underestimate the amount of students that are going --

MR. FINK: Grossly.

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: Excuse me?

MR. FINK: Grossly underestimate.

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: Oh, grossly. Yes. They -- they underestimate the amount of students that are projected to come out of these homes. And I believe, in all sincerity, that this partially leads to the overcrowding in some areas, because you've had more development in the west than you've had in the east, and it has been -- the student population has been under -- underestimated.

And the schools are facing overcrowding or -- excuse me -- or are already overcrowded, and it is an enormous cluster of -- of just something that needs to be addressed. I don't know if this is something that we can address on the Planning Council, but looking at flexibility and moving and everything else, I have to tell you that this is something that adversely affects every single municipality in not only Broward, but throughout the entire State.

And this is something that needs to be addressed. And the sooner, as far as I'm concerned, the better, because we are not getting the monies that are needed from developers in order to put into the schools in order to properly house and educate the children that are generated from those homes. And if this is something that we can bring up and -- and deal with on this level, then I would love to see it happen tomorrow.

CHAIR FISHER: Commissioner Gunzburger.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: First of all, let me answer that question. I've been fighting this battle before school concurrency was even in the -- what you had to consider when you allowed a land use change. I went to Tallahassee when they were fighting us then.

And I know that every time that we've taken -- about four or five years ago, we took a very hard look, because we felt the same thing that you feel, that the numbers are crazy.

And, evidently, through some mechanism, they decided that they were not. And -- I mean, we went through this exercise more than once just a few years ago, and couldn't come up with a better answer. They must have a magician that, you know, pulls schools out of the hat instead of rabbits. I don't know what.

But I want to just say something that strikes me, looking at this particular land use change. It seems so incompatible to the surrounding areas. In my head, and I don't know if it's anyone else's, it just doesn't make sense.

You have no other residential nearby. You've got a religious institution on one side, offices on the other. And -- and it's -- as Commissioner Castro said, industrial to the south.

I mean, I've always had a saying and it's a brief one that I'm going to copyright one day. Things that don't make sense don't. And this doesn't. But I'm --when I look at our rules, there's no way we can vote no. But this absolutely, from all the things I've seen recently, makes no sense.

CHAIR FISHER: I'm going to go to Ms. Good first, and then Mr. Fink.

MS. GOOD: Yes, thank you. I appreciate Commissioner Mallozzi's concern about schools as well as Commissioner Gunzburger. I'd be happy to have the School Board come in and provide this -- this committee with the information that's utilized.

I will just share with you that concurrency's very complicated in the sense that I will just share that those on this committee, if you all live in a home, I could go around and say that some of you have children, some of you don't. So when you look at a -- a proposed development, sometimes the way that people view it is that you assume that they'll have multiple children in every house in a statistical area.

Well, it doesn't happen that way. It's -- it's a formula. It's based on -- on data. We can't pull information out of a hat as Commissioner Gunzburger said. So I would be happy to have staff provide additional information. I know that the oversight committee is also looking at this data to make sure that our numbers are as exact as possible because I, like everyone else, want to make sure that the district is getting the dollars necessary to -- to deal with that school impact. And certainly that's my -- my priority.

So anything that we can do to coordinate with staff to provide additional information in order that they can demonstrate how this is calculated.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. I remember it was four -- Commissioner was talking about, Commissioner Gunzburger, the Planning Council did deal with it. We did discuss it multiple times about four or five years ago, was it?

MS. BOY: Right. And then there was an update that came forward about 18 months ago. The consultant gave you a presentation about the revised, or potential revised student generation rates to see if they were in line or needed to be adjusted from five or six years ago. Actually, it was 2007, I believe, when they were first adopted. So (inaudible) they said they were going to check that every few years to make sure that they're consistent with what -- the development and growth policy.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Mr. Fink.

MR. FINK: I'm going to move to table this for the next meeting for three reasons.

Number one, we don't know what those hazardous six sites are. Number two, I would like, since it's been five years, if I understood you, how we -- or from the School Board as to how they calculate the generation of students formula. I would like to know how that's done.

And I think part and parcel of that is also price range that this parcel is going to generate. Because I believe Patricia is partly correct in terms of you don't know exactly how many children will be generated per household. But I think there are statistics that do show that depending upon the socioeconomic strata of the price ranges of the houses, what type of families or kind of families or the level of the families that are going to be here, whether or not they will generate more or less children, because \$400,000 units may be empty nesters. If it's 175,000 units, then they may be families that have more children.

CHAIR FISHER: There's a motion on the floor to table, and Mr. Reinstein says he's going to second that motion.

MR. REINSTEIN: I do second that.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So there's no discussion on the table. So now, all in favor, say aye. Opposed.

MR. HOBBY: No.

MR. BASCOMBE: Opposed.

CHAIR FISHER: We have two opposed?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Three.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Three, I think.

CHAIR FISHER: Four? We're just going to call the roll. Okay. The motion is to table this until next month.

MR. BURTON: Before we do that –

CHAIR FISHER: I cannot. That's the motion. It's been moved to table. It's been seconded. There cannot be any discussion.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Table.

CHAIR FISHER: Please call the roll. Yes is for table and no is to not table.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Tim Bascombe.

MR. BASCOMBE: No.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Claudette Bruck.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: No.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Frederick Burton.

MR. BURTON: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Sara Case.

MS. CASE: No.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Anne Castro.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Kenneth Fink.

MR. FINK: Yes.

THE REPORTER: School Board member Patricia Good.

MS. GOOD: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Mary Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Sue Gunzburger.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Dan Hobby.

MR. HOBBY: No.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Keith London.

COMMISSIONER LONDON: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Michael Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: No.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner -- Commissioner Lisa Mallozzi.

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: No.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Sharon Ragoonan.

MS. RAGOONAN: No.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Louis Reinstein.

MR. REINSTEIN: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael Udine.

MAYOR UDINE: No.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Lamar Fisher.

CHAIR FISHER: No. The motion fails.
(Inaudible.)

VOTE DOES NOT PASS.

CHAIR FISHER: Any discussion?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Now you can ask your question.

MR. BURTON: Sorry.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Burton.

MR. BURTON: My question is any of this development either funded or helped by any public dollars, or this is 100 percent private funded acquisition, construction, development?

MR. SToudenMIRE: Yes, Scott Stoudenmire. I truly wish that the applicant were here today. I do not know where Mr. Coker is. However, I'm not prepared to answer specifics about the price point or things like that.

I will tell you, so far we've had no indication that there would be, you know, public assistance or any type of federal funding related to this project. In fact, and this is the first step in a very long process. There is a re-zoning that needs to occur on the site. There is a site plan that needs to be processed on the site. Both are in the works, but we just -- we're in the initial stages of that process.

MR. BURTON: Understood. But there's no -- there's no City or County funding or benefits to this development for this site for development?

MR. SToudenMIRE: No, sir.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. Ms. Good, Commissioner Mallozzi, and Mayor Udine.

MS. GOOD: Again, I just wanted to state for the record there is an attachment from school board staff regarding this application, and I would just caution that we make determinations of what we think these developments will generate.

You know, again, I -- I appreciate the -- the concern over schools. This particular development, the schools are under enrolled. And, clearly, there is a whole list of issues that come into play. Staff has reviewed these applications and considered and considered them using the appropriate formulas to do that.

So, again, we all come with our own feelings regarding what we feel should

be in -- in (inaudible) home dwelling units. I would ask that we caution coming up with those types of detailed analysis on this dais.

CHAIR FISHER: Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: Just something that I want to remind everyone, and Commissioner Gunzburger had brought it up. It's not whether we like a development or we think it has enough housing or it does not.

The bottom line is it meets the criteria, and, as Planning Council, that's what we have to decide. Does it meet the criteria? Who funds it, public funds or not, whether or not there's school concurrency, all of that -- or at least the school concurrency is in your backup material.

I know that there's -- that there is -- that the student generation that is expected is met and can be handled in the schools. It's in the backup.

Whether I approve of that or not is a completely separate entity that I just wanted to voice to people.

But the bottom line is we have a certain criteria of reasons that something cannot pass Planning Council, and then we have a criteria that if Subject A meets A, B, and C, and it meets all of -- everything that it needs to meet, whether I like it or not, I'm bound to pass it, because it meets the -- the standards that -- that -- that we have to follow.

So I just want to -- you know, usually, you know, in the past, Commissioner Castillo would be the one to say this -- this to everyone to bring everyone back. He's not here, so I guess just pretend I'm him now.

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: -- I haven't washed that gray right out of my hair. But this is basically what you are looking at. It's -- does it meet everything that we are entrusted to the guidelines that we are entrusted to uphold? Yes. If it does not, no. And that's all I wanted to reiterate.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Mayor?

MAYOR UDINE: Just a comment about school concurrency. I think that the comments that have been made, I think everyone up here would agree that the concurrency levels of certain areas of the County don't make sense, but their numbers and, you know, this may or may not comply with it. Obviously, the backup says it does.

We've been fighting the same fight in Parkland for a number of years because regardless of the pricing of the homes, we're finding that whatever

the bedroom amounts are, that more kids are coming into the -- the schools located in Parkland and northwest Broward and Cooper City, and it depends on the -- the, you know, the location and the area and the schools in that area.

I -- I do kind of concur with what Commissioner Mallozzi says. The reason I voted no against tabling it is there's no applicant even here that's presenting it, and one of our things that we can do is send something to the Broward County Commission with no recommendation. I didn't see the need to table this. I -- I personally know the area. I don't think it's really compatible with the area myself, as to what Commissioner Gunzburger said. So I'll make a motion, put it on the floor, so we can vote on it and go from there. I believe I can make a motion and then vote no against the motion.

MR. MAURODIS: And there's a point where -- the Executive Director had a good point. There's a little special classification because it's a small scale amendment.

MS. BOY: Right. It's a small scale amendment, so normally -- so these do come to you for two Public Hearings before your recommendation as far as the County Commission. So if you -- you choose to table it or defer it this month, it would come back September/October, or, you know, September --

CHAIR FISHER: Well, we've already gone through the table issue. We're talking about whether we're going to vote yes or (inaudible) --

MS. BOY: You're going to hear it again.

MAYOR UDINE: So -- so I'll move the item.

COMMISSIONER LONDON: Second.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Second.

CHAIR FISHER: All right. Moved and seconded. We still have some folks that want to speak. Mr. Burton, and then Commissioner Castro.

MR. BURTON: Thank you. I'm looking at this, and I'm thinking that, you know, if this is a private piece of property that there's no public funding coming into, the developer has, you know, put their own neck on the line to develop it.

As for concurrency, you know, we see a lot of redevelopment, and there's office and mixed use spaces. I don't see a difference between nextdoor versus above.

If this person has crossed all of the T's and dotted all of their I's in order to develop this, and they've gone through that process, and the things that are holding it up are things that aren't necessarily specific to this one development, but very specific to Broward County as a whole, I don't think that it's fair to hold up this developer who is putting their time and resources into improving the property. I would vote yes.

CHAIR FISHER: Thank you. Commissioner Castro.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Just out of curiosity, isn't it our purview to determine, staff recommendation aside, whether something appears to be -- have a land use change. That is what I consider to be our charge.

MR. MAURODIS: That -- that is part of the determination you would make. I would make one point with regard to the -- the school generation rates, and, correct, this is something that the Council has worked with the School Board on a number of occasions.

We can't look at a microscope and see whether it works on one section. And they've worked and reworked the formula, and, frankly, it's been tested and it's been surprisingly accurate, even though there are concerns raised on individual cases.

But I think as far as the data we rely on, we must rely on the expert input from School Board on that. But you are correct, you have a generalized public policy ability to make certain decisions.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: And, to be honest with you, I'm with Commissioner Gunzburger. The school generation and traffic generation rates, we've beat to death -- to death -- over and over the last seven years I've been on this Council. And the traffic numbers and school generations rates, you put your finger in the wind and just see where it comes out.

And I applaud the County for trying to get ahead of that, but I feel bad for the School Board, because you're always playing catch up, because you don't really know what's going to happen.

Just because somebody says they're developing something, you don't know if it's going to be rental. You don't know if it's going to be family, and it's a challenge. You just have to go with the flow.

And that's why before we talked about making more flexible sites for schools. Instead of a fifteen acre model, they'll have to choose something a little different so the school can be scaled.

So that's something where you all need to go. But I just want to bring that up. I just didn't want to get the impression I had to vote for this, and I'll tell you why. And I -- and I don't want to use the term spot zoning, because this is a land use change.

But that's why I asked you the question about is this a trend in that area. It -- it just doesn't make sense to me, along with Commissioner Gunzburger, I think. This seems like an incompatible place to put residents alongside.

And I -- if you had told me that you have -- and I don't mean you -- you personally, so please don't -- but it's the City and everybody else, and I'm a strong believer in peoples' property rights. I mean, really, really, really.

But I also think, you know, you have to have a little common sense about where people are going. You know, I almost wanted to ask you is this some sort of Habitat for Humanity or something coming in there, because that's what they've done in Dania Beach, they stuck them along the new runway that's coming in. C'est la vie. You know, they're just going to have to live with it.

So I -- I was a little worried of what was happening. But I really feel that this is an incompatible use in this area. And for that reason, I'm going to vote no against it. And, you know, I'm usually pretty -- probably one of the most flexible people, you know, around about people doing what they want with their property, but this doesn't make any sense. It doesn't make any sense for this location, and I can't get over it. So maybe you can add something and I can get over it.

MR. SToudenMIRE: I do have something to add --

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Okay.

CHAIR FISHER: Please.

MR. SToudenMIRE: -- if it's appropriate at this time.

CHAIR FISHER: Please.

MR. SToudenMIRE: Certainly the land use plan map indicates industrial. I will tell you that the adjacent industrial properties already have zoning on them. They have PCD zoning on them, and the uses there are -- are restricted.

I don't know if anyone -- the Mayor from Parkland said he's familiar with the

Planning Council

8/23/12

LG/NC

area. If -- if you are familiar with the area and you've driven through Lyons Technology Center, it is a light industrial park.

One of the biggest users is American Twisters, which is a gymnastics center. The heavy industrial uses have not been included in either of these PCD zonings, these planned commerce zoning districts.

So, you know, it's difficult to say, but sometimes staff knows their City better even than maybe County staff. You know, we've looked at the adjacent zonings, not just the adjacent land uses, and we feel that what is permitted on these adjacent properties is compatible. I'm sure when you sit there and you see an industrial land use, you think heavy manufacturing, potential for. There is not a potential for it, because they have been prohibited with a more restrictive zoning category. All of this property is already zoned adjacent to this site. In fact --

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: That helps me a lot. Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Commissioner Bruck.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: I'm concerned about (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is your mic on?

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Press the face. I'm concerned about the questioning of the student generation data. In order for us to make decisions here, we have to have data that we rely upon. We're not going to go out and do a traffic count or an environmental study.

So if we have a question with regards to the data being provided, then we need to look into those issues independent of this petition. But if this is the source that is being used, I have to speak in favor of this petition.

But I do question going into each of these areas and questioning. We're not going to do those things ourselves. If we're not going to get reliable information, we'll have to change that.

CHAIR FISHER: Any further discussion? Commissioner Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Yeah. If we really look at the aerial photograph map 1 and we talk about what's compatible and what's not, if you look at it, you do see a lot of, you know, conservation areas, a religious institution, a very large body of land. It's probably about ten acres is my guess, or more, that has conservation on that. We're talking a lot of green space. And we -- I heard (inaudible) where it says, vacant. That's being developed, as well, for

residential?

MS. BOY: It's residential area.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Residential area. So, I mean, it's not as far off as what we think as an ideal spot. I wouldn't say it's ideal just because West Hillsboro Boulevard is a high traffic area. But I think when we look at really what we're trying to do and what we're taxed to do, I would support this because we're not the person who's driving the economic engine of development here. We are just saying if -- if they want to do what they're going to be doing, it does fit what our criteria is. It's next to a church. It has conservation areas across the street, around it. You've got pedestrian greenways. You have easy access to shopping. A lot of people consider that a very positive development, so I would support this.

CHAIR FISHER: Ms. Graham and then Mr. Hobby.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you. The fact that the deceleration lane is there already, and it looks like it's fairly recent, shows me that there had been some development planned for, perhaps under the prior land use designation. I don't know that area real well, but when I want to get to those shops in the malls on the corner of 441 and Hillsboro, I actually approach it going west on Hillsboro.

It looks like there's only one way in and out of the site. Again, five acres and change, 54 units. You did state that it still had to go through, I guess your equivalent DRC and site plan review planning and zoning. It's got a plat amendment that needs to be made.

Chances are there may be more units put on that property as it's going through your City approvals. We don't know that. It's just that church on a religious designated site just to the east of it actually looks like an old holdout Ranch Burger house from the '60s or the '70s that maybe was part of a farm and now they use it for church gatherings.

I mean, when I look at driving down the highway at 45 miles an hour and it's like a 4/3 Ranch Burger house that the City owned what used to be a horse farm. I remember the horse farms on Lyons Road back in the '80s. Again, I'm not here to hold up your development. I don't live in Coral -- in Coconut Creek.

But over the time that I've been on this Board, I recall -- and especially Mr. Fink pointing out to us various land use changes along corridors that originally had been commercial development that then went to residential, which seemed to be a response to the market.

Planning Council
8/23/12
LG/NC

So whatever market is driving the developments in Coconut Creek to want more residential and -- and less of something else, I -- I will probably vote no on this only because no one is even here from the applicant. So that kind of demonstrates to me that they just thought this thing was going to breeze through.

And if I had something this significant, even if it was just five acres, I'd be here just in case someone had a question. Thanks.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Hobby.

MR. HOBBY: Yeah. Staff, where is the nearest parks to this area?

MR. STOUDEMIRE: Parks?

MR. HOBBY: Parks.

MR. STOUDEMIRE: Active or passive? I will tell you that along the Hillsboro corridor, the City certainly supported the bond program back in 2000. Over 40 acres along the Hillsboro corridor within the City limits has been purchased for preservation purposes.

We've been working with the County staff for the last ten years in terms of doing the elevated walkways through some of these areas. But it's all -- that's all passive. You can see it, if this map -- if this aerial map went a little further to the east, you'd see more sites where there is passive recreation. The closest active park you'll see has -- has the shared facilities at Trade Winds. And, of course, our biggest park is probably at Sabal Pines.

MR. HOBBY: Sabal Pines?

MR. STOUDEMIRE: Yes.

MR. HOBBY: So that would be the -- that would be the closest park that would have playgrounds and recreation.

MR. STOUDEMIRE: True.

MR. HOBBY: So are there any plans for that -- because that requires crossing several streets, is there any plans that the City has for more active parks in that northwest -- the northwest section, say north of Johnson and east -- west of Lyons?

MR. STOUDEMIRE: The City does have a parcel north up near North

Broward Prep School. The City does have a parcel that is programmed for some activities, volleyball, playground activity.

MR. HOBBY: No ball fields?

MR. STOUDEMIRE: That is something that's in the capital improvement budget, but it's not –

MR. HOBBY: Okay.

MR. STOUDEMIRE: -- within the next two years. It's within the next five years.

MR. HOBBY: Thank you.

CHAIR FISHER: Mr. Burton.

MR. BURTON: Thank you. I could be wrong, but I think -- didn't we approve a residential development site just east of here on Hillsborough Boulevard on the north side of Hillsborough?

MS. BOY: It's a site that was directly south of the site –

MR. BURTON: North.

MS. BOY: -- I'm sorry, north of the site. Thank you. Directly north of the site that was approved (inaudible).

MR. BURTON: Yeah. So we already approved some. Okay.

MR. STOUDEMIRE: It's under construction.

CHAIR FISHER: Any further discussion? Sir, I would hope that -- obviously, we -- whether we vote yes or no today, I would hope that you can give the developer – I would have liked him here today.

MS. BOY: We'll also make sure of that.

CHAIR FISHER: And -- and also that he or she reads the minutes and is prepared to answer the questions or concerns the Chairman has.

MR. STOUDEMIRE: Absolutely. I'll take care of that.

CHAIR FISHER: Any further discussion?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Motion.

CHAIR FISHER: Motion's already been made and seconded. Okay. It's moved and seconded. Let's call the roll.

THE REPORTER: So we're calling the roll again, sir?

CHAIR FISHER: Yes.

MR. BURTON: Wait. This roll is in favor –

CHAIR FISHER: Yes. The motion is to approve. You either vote yes or no.

MR. BURTON: Okay.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Tim Bascombe.

MR. BASCOMBE: No.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Claudette Bruck.

COMMISSIONER BRUCK: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Frederick Burton.

MR. BURTON: Approve.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Sara Case.

MS. CASE: No.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Anne Castro.

COMMISSIONER CASTRO: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Kenneth Fink.

MR. FINK: No.

THE REPORTER: School Board member Patricia Good.

MS. GOOD: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Mary Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: No.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Sue Gunzburger.

COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER: No.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Dan Hobby.

MR. HOBBY: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Keith London.

COMMISSIONER LONDON: No.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Michael Long.

COMMISSIONER LONG: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Commissioner Lisa Mallozzi.

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Sharon Ragoonan.

MS. RAGOONAN: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Louis Reinstein.

MR. REINSTEIN: No.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Michael Udine.

MAYOR UDINE: No.

THE REPORTER: Mayor Lamar Fisher.

CHAIR FISHER: Yes. So, again I will look at my vote very carefully next month.

MR. STOUDENMIRE: Understood.

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. So motion is approved.

MR. BURTON: That was exciting.

CHAIR FISHER: That moves forward.

**VOTE PASSES 9 TO 8 WITH MR. BASCOMBE, MS. CASE, MR. MR. FINK, MS. GRAHAM, COMMISSIONER GUNZBURGER, COMMISSIONER LONDON, MR. REINSTEIN, AND MAYOR UDINE VOTING NO.
OTHER BUSINESS**

CHAIR FISHER: Okay. That concludes our agenda, I think. But I think Commissioner London wants to make an announcement first.

COMMISSIONER LONDON: Thank you, Chair. Not to diminish Gretchen leaving the Planning Council, because I acknowledge that is a big loss and we'll miss you, I also notified Barbara -- I'm sorry, the Executive Director -- that my -- I'm sorry, the director of development services resigned last Friday. So I'm not trying to steal anybody's development director, but there's a job opening in the City of Hallandale for the Development Director.

So Barbara's -- I'm sorry, if the Executive Director is out there looking for people, I can forward her -- I forwarded her the criteria, which can be seen at our website, or can you contact me, and I'll be more than happy to see that the director has the application.

So there's a -- there's a lot of musical chairs, and as the Chair said earlier, Gretchen will be missed, but there are bigger and better things for certain people.

**NEXT REGULAR SCHEDULED PLANNING COUNCIL MEETING-
SEPTEMBER 20, 2012.**

CHAIR FISHER: It's been a great meeting, great -- great day and thank you to the Planning Council. Again, just remember, September 20th next month, so make your calendar notes.

COMMISSIONER MALLOZZI: I'm sure we'll have another email or two coming.

ADJOURNMENT:

CHAIR FISHER: All right. This meeting is adjourned.

(The meeting concluded at 11:15 a.m.)