

# Planning & Zoning Board Meeting

## Meeting Minutes

April 28, 2026, 7:00 PM

### A. Call To Order

MOLLY HOWSON confirmed that the recording was active and the meeting was ready to begin.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH called the meeting to order.

### B. Pledge Of Allegiance

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH invited BOB SCHANKWEILER to lead the Pledge of Allegiance, noting with light humor that she might accidentally hit him in the forehead. BOB SCHANKWEILER agreed and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH then asked those present to remain standing for a brief moment of silence for the United States of America, remarking that much was happening in the country that was beyond anyone's control. After the moment of silence, she thanked everyone and asked them to be seated, adding a personal aside that she hoped for God's help. MOLLY HOWSON responded warmly by saying "God bless America."

### C. Roll Call

MEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Ruth Roman Lynch, Board Chair	X	
Michelle Pinder, Board Vice Chair	X	
Aryeh Shender, Board Member	X	
Brent Lewis, Board Member	X	
Bob Schankweiler, Board Member	X	
Mary Smith, Board Member	X	
Troy Mohammed, Board Member	X	

\*Arrived Late

#### ALSO, PRESENT:

Hans Ottinot, Ottinot Law Firm

Michele Samaroo, Special Counsel

Daniel Keester-O'Mills, Director of Development Services

Molly Howson, City Planner

Nadine Fearon, Planner

Sarai Martin, Commissioner

## D. Proof Of Publication

MOTION TO APPROVE - Passed

MOLLY HOWSON presided over the motion for proof of publication.

MARY SMITH made the motion to approve the proof of publication.

BOB SCHANKWEILER seconded the motion.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH announced the motion carried.

## E. Approval Of Minutes – (March 31, 2026)

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH called for a motion to approve the minutes from March 31, 2026, noting that there were a couple of comments to address prior to the vote. She indicated that both she and BOB SCHANKWEILER had comments about the content of the minutes.

BOB SCHANKWEILER moved to approve the minutes on the condition that minor changes be made to reflect his comments accurately. RUTH ROMAN LYNCH confirmed the motion and the conditional nature of the second, then opened the floor for comment.

BOB SCHANKWEILER explained that the minutes incorrectly attributed a comment about a paint origin related to Lauderhill to a "Commissioner Garcia," a name that was never accurate. He clarified that it was Commissioner Mercy who had championed that particular effort and asked that the minutes be corrected accordingly. He then addressed a second inaccuracy, stating that the minutes did not correctly capture his comments about domes. He clarified that he had not said there were domes located at other permanent land-based locations, but rather that domes are found on ships — specifically on the Royal Caribbean Icon class vessels, which feature large domes with various attractions aboard. He emphasized that these domes are not permanent, land-based structures. He concluded by stating that aside from these two specific corrections, he found the minutes generally acceptable for approval.

MOTION TO APPROVE - Passed (conditional on minor corrections)

MOLLY HOWSON presided over the conditional approval of the minutes.

MARY SMITH made the motion to approve the minutes subject to the noted corrections.

BOB SCHANKWEILER seconded the motion.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH conducted roll call, with all seven members voting in the affirmative, and the motion carried unanimously.

## F. Planning Director's Remarks

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS addressed the board with a few housekeeping items. He reminded all attendees that the meeting was being recorded and asked everyone to use their microphones when speaking, both for the benefit of the live audience and for the accuracy of the transcription record. He also asked that speakers state their names before speaking so that the audio recording could be accurately transcribed for the minutes.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS then provided a brief overview of the evening's agenda. He noted that there were five items scheduled for consideration. The first was a rezoning application, which would be taken up immediately. Following that, there were three proposed amendments to the Land Development Regulations. The fifth item, he clarified, would not require any official action from the board that evening; rather, it would be the first in a series of presentations related to a possible comprehensive rewrite of the city's land development code. With those remarks, he concluded and indicated readiness to proceed to the first agenda item.

## G. Public Hearing (All Persons Must Be Sworn)

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH announced that all persons wishing to speak during the public hearing portion of the meeting would need to be sworn in. DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS asked that anyone who anticipated making a public comment that evening stand and raise their hand so that they could be sworn in collectively rather than individually at the time of speaking. MOLLY HOWSON administered the oath, asking all those standing to swear or affirm that they would tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Those standing confirmed the oath and were seated.

## 1. (25-RZ-002) An Amendment To The Zoning Designation For The Properties Located At 3840 And 4031 Inverrary Boulevard

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH read the item into the record, describing the request as an amendment to the zoning designation for properties located at 3840 and 4031 Inverrary Boulevard. She explained that the application sought to amend approximately 18.525 gross acres from a Commercial Recreation zoning district to a Planned Unit Development zoning district, identified as Pod 1, and to amend approximately 112.835 gross acres from Commercial Recreation and Open Space Recreation zoning to a Planned Unit Development zoning district for the property at 3840 Inverrary Boulevard, identified as Pods 2 through 6. She noted that the changes were intended to facilitate the development of a residential community permitting a maximum of 888 dwelling units and a public greenway and linear park.

HOPE CALHOUN, Land Use Counsel for the proposed developer, introduced herself and the project. She reminded the board that this property had come before them previously as part of a land use plan amendment, which she described as the very first application in the series that would allow for the redevelopment of the former Inverrary Golf Course. She clarified that the request before the board that evening was the rezoning of the property — the second application in the process — and that subsequent applications, including the site plan and the golf course application, were currently moving through the Development Review Committee stage with city staff. She commended staff for being thorough and dedicated throughout the review process.

HOPE CALHOUN described the general scope of the project, noting that it involved approximately 130 gross acres, and that the rezoning sought was from Commercial Recreation and Open Space designations to a Planned Unit Development zoning district. She explained that the PUD designation was particularly appropriate for a property of this size because it provided the flexibility needed to address the variety of housing types and design elements being proposed. She outlined the sequence of applications in the approval process: the land use plan amendment came first, the rezoning was second, followed by the site plan, and then the golf course application. She indicated that the land use plan amendment had already gone through all required hearings at both the city and county levels and was anticipated to be adopted by the city commission the following month.

HOPE CALHOUN walked the board through the general layout of the proposed development. She described a conceptual master plan that depicted the areas proposed for residential development, represented in darker shading on the presentation map, and discussed the areas that would remain as a golf course, which were shown in a grayed-out section not subject to that night's application. She reiterated that the golf course portion was not before the board that evening.

HOPE CALHOUN then addressed the history of community outreach associated with the project. She explained that the owner and proposed developer had been engaging with the Inverrary community for approximately four years. She noted that when the project was first envisioned, the original concept simply proposed placing homes throughout the entire property, which was met with significant pushback from residents. As a result, the development team stepped back and re-engaged the community through a series of small, medium, and large group meetings over those four years to gather input about what residents wanted to see on the site. She described the outcome of those conversations as the basis for what was now being presented.

HOPE CALHOUN explained that the property is subject to a Declaration of Restrictive Covenants, which requires a majority vote of the Inverrary neighborhood residents in order to change the land use from recreational to another designation. She presented a map showing the status of voting across the various Inverrary communities, noting that two communities had already completed their votes and that the remaining communities had begun the process. She expressed optimism that the voting would be completed soon and acknowledged that the residents' vote was ultimately the deciding factor in whether the development could proceed.

HOPE CALHOUN briefly summarized the six criteria used to evaluate a PUD rezoning application. Regarding the first criterion — the character of the district and its suitability for particular uses — she argued that the large acreage of the parcel made the PUD designation the most logical and appropriate designation, as it provided the necessary flexibility for a project of this scale. On the second criterion — conservation of property values and

encouragement of the most appropriate use of land — she argued that the current state of the golf course, which had been closed for an extended period, was not the highest and best use of the property, and that the proposed residential development and golf course would transform an underutilized and unattractive property into something vibrant and highly utilized. She noted that the new buildings would increase property values in the area.

Regarding the third criterion — consistency with the city's comprehensive plan — HOPE CALHOUN stated that staff had confirmed the application complied with the comprehensive plan, including goals related to providing a variety of housing types and various other elements. She emphasized that the project was not creating any new residential units; rather, it was utilizing units already allocated within the broader Inverrary development framework, meaning that concurrency and capacity had already been evaluated through that existing allocation. On the fourth criterion — the need of the city for land areas to serve its population and economic activities — she argued that the project was directly responsive to the growing demand for housing in Florida and in Lauderhill specifically, and that it would deliver for-sale housing at a caliber not recently seen in the city. She expressed a desire for people to move to and remain in Lauderhill.

On the fifth criterion — whether there had been substantial changes in the character or development of the area — HOPE CALHOUN answered affirmatively, pointing out that the closure of the golf course itself represented a significant change. She suggested that nearby residents could attest better than she could to the decline of the property since the golf course closed, including the types of undesirable activities that had been occurring on the vacant land. She argued that the rezoning would allow for revitalization of the area. She noted that a golf course would ultimately be part of the redeveloped site, which would contribute positively to the neighborhood character.

On the final criterion — the facts and opinions presented at the public hearing — HOPE CALHOUN referenced both the written application and the staff report, both of which she indicated supported the rezoning. She explained that rezoning to PUD required the submission of a conceptual master plan, and she described the plan on screen as showing the general locations of the proposed residential areas. She noted that the housing units were intended to be for-sale single-family homes, both attached and detached, with additional detail to be provided at the site plan stage.

HOPE CALHOUN concluded her presentation by discussing the anticipated benefits of the project. She described the natural benefits that come with any infill redevelopment, including the transformation of a defunct property into a functional residential community with new homes, families, lighting, and a sense of community. She highlighted several additional benefits: the flexibility of the PUD zoning to create an efficient and unique design with meaningful open space; projected revenue to the city of approximately \$1.2 million from impact fees; planned improvements to impacted roadways based on ongoing conversations between the developer's traffic engineer and the city's traffic engineer; improvements to drainage facilities and rights-of-way; consistency with the city's comprehensive plan goals; a contribution toward the construction of a new fire station in the area; a commitment from the developer to partner with Motorola to create a safety system benefiting both new and existing Inverrary residents; and the eventual development of a Greg Norman signature golf course along with a linear park, pocket parks within the development, and other open spaces. She closed by asking the board to support the rezoning application and recommend approval, noting that she had team members present who could assist in answering questions, and that she would reserve time to respond to any public comments.

MOLLY HOWSON took the floor to present the staff analysis. She began by reiterating much of what the applicant's counsel had described, emphasizing that this repetition was beneficial for members of the public in attendance. She described the rezoning request as covering a portion of the existing Inverrary Golf Course, both east and west courses, for the development of up to 888 residential dwelling units split across six pods and proposed to be developed in phases over the next 15 years.

MOLLY HOWSON described the pod layout, noting that Pod 1 was the furthest left on the screen and that the pods worked counterclockwise: Pod 1 in the original color, Pod 2 in blue, Pod 3 in red, Pod 4 in light blue along Rock Island Road, Pod 5 in green along 44th Street, and Pod 6 in pink at the top. She stated that the basic development plan called for the pods to be built in numerical order.

MOLLY HOWSON described the purpose and intent of a Planned Unit Development designation, echoing the applicant's explanation that a PUD is intended for land under unified control that is planned and developed as a whole, either in a single operation or a series of approved development phases. She affirmed that the PUD designation was particularly suitable for this location given the size of the property.

MOLLY HOWSON then addressed the broader Inverrary planning framework, explaining that the entire area — everything east of Inverrary West, south of 44th Street, and north of Oakland Park Boulevard — has been planned for decades as part of the Inverrary dashed-line PUD overlay, which permitted a maximum of nine dwelling units per acre. She noted that the proposed development, at just under seven dwelling units per acre, fell within that overall programmed density for the area.

MOLLY HOWSON stated that staff was generally supportive of the application based on the established criteria, but she qualified that support by noting there were still several outstanding items and areas where staff and the developer had not yet fully aligned. She proceeded to outline each of these items in detail.

MOLLY HOWSON addressed the first outstanding item — the community vote to release the restrictive covenant — by clarifying that while this was not a specific concern but rather a pending requirement, it remained a condition of approval. She noted that the developer had been consistent in providing updates on the voting progress at each public hearing, and that all communities were actively engaged in the process, but that a completed vote releasing the covenant had not yet been received.

MOLLY HOWSON addressed the second outstanding item — a specific site donation or financial contribution equal to five percent of the value of the overall land area being rezoned. She explained that this was a standard PUD requirement and that those calculations and negotiations were still ongoing. She described this as an important piece for staff to see resolved to the satisfaction of both the city and the residents, noting that one potential use of the funds or land had been the development of a new fire station. She explained that the developer had worked with staff to identify a potential one-acre site along Rock Island Road, but that the fire department determined this location was less than ideal given that Rock Island Road only allows southbound travel, while Inverrary proper was the area most in need of improved fire coverage. She indicated that a fee-in-lieu arrangement was being discussed so the city could acquire a more suitable parcel and construct a fire station to serve the area.

MOLLY HOWSON addressed the third and most emphasized outstanding item — traffic. She stated emphatically that traffic was her foremost concern, and she expected it to be raised by members of the public as well. She described six intersections of concern that had been identified in the traffic analysis, all of which were rated either D or F in the city's traffic wayfinding plan. These intersections were: Inverrary West and Oakland Park Boulevard; Inverrary West and 44th Street; 44th Street and Inverrary Boulevard; 44th Street and Inverrary Drive; and 44th Street and Rock Island Road. She explained that the city's comprehensive plan required that these intersections be maintained at a minimum level of service, and that the addition of new residents would generate additional traffic volume at those already-stressed intersections. She described ongoing meetings between the developer's traffic engineer and the city's traffic engineers and consultants to identify the best approaches to addressing these concerns, and emphasized that the developer would need to make significant contributions toward intersection improvements.

MOLLY HOWSON then addressed the fourth area of concern — lot sizes — and took care to clarify the mix of unit types proposed in the development. She noted that while the applicant described the units as single-family homes, that characterization depended on how one defined "single family." She explained that of the approximately 800 to 888 units proposed, only 74 were detached single-family homes. The remainder were attached units — what she described as duplexes or attached single-family homes, and townhomes. She stated she wanted to be transparent about this distinction so that the neighborhood boards voting on the restrictive covenant change fully understood what was being proposed. She noted that the 74 detached single-family units were all planned for Pod 1, which would also benefit from golf course views. Of those 74 homes, 10 were designated as "estate homes" — the largest and most luxurious models — with average lot sizes of approximately 8,000 to 12,500 square feet. She noted that while the developer promoted these as estate homes, their lot sizes were comparable to the average single-family home lots found in areas like the Vermena section of Inverrary or Cypress Hollow, and did not rise to the size of lots typically found in Forest Lakes Estates, which were in the 10,000 to 12,000 square foot range.

MOLLY HOWSON then addressed the fifth area of concern — sidewalk widths and pedestrian connectivity. She explained that the developer was proposing five-foot sidewalks throughout the development, and that in the majority of pods, those sidewalks were proposed on only one side of the street rather than both sides as is typically required. She stated that staff was requesting that the PUD ordinance require a minimum of seven-foot wide sidewalks, particularly in areas where only one-sided sidewalks were proposed. She argued that walkability was a key component of the public benefit being offered in exchange for the PUD flexibility, and that residents should be able to comfortably walk their dogs, push strollers, and have children ride bikes without being forced into single file.

MOLLY HOWSON then discussed the sixth area — the phasing plan for the development. She explained that the developer had already applied for a site plan for the first two pods, referred to as Phase A. The phasing plan included a primary recreational amenity area to be situated between Pod 2 and Pod 3, which would serve the entire development with a clubhouse, swimming pool, play structure, and large open space area. She noted that the programming level of this area was yet to be determined. She also described that each individual pod would include a playground, shade structures, and site furniture — additions the developer had agreed to at the city's request in order to provide recreational opportunities closer to each residential cluster.

MOLLY HOWSON acknowledged that the phasing plan was still being finalized and sought clarification from DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS on the most recent agreement regarding thresholds for recreational amenity construction relative to residential CO issuances.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS clarified that the recent agreement reached at the DRC level required the developer to apply for a building permit for the primary recreational area at or before the time they requested CO issuance for 25 percent of the units in the first phase. He further explained that no more than 75 percent of the certificates of occupancy for the first phase could be issued if the primary recreational area was not complete. He noted that this translated to roughly 100 homes out of the total 800 proposed in the development, and that these thresholds were designed to ensure the recreational amenities were started and completed in conjunction with the first phase of residential construction.

MOLLY HOWSON thanked DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS for the clarification and noted that it had been a recent development and she wanted it stated correctly on the record. She also confirmed that the 100-home figure corresponded to the percentage thresholds applied specifically to Pods 1 and 2, which constituted Phase A.

MOLLY HOWSON concluded her staff report by summarizing the key areas still under discussion, while reaffirming that staff supported the application and looked forward to continuing to work with the developer to resolve these outstanding items. She expressed confidence that the project was in line with the standards for rezoning and that it represented the highest and best use of the existing land in Inverrary.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH asked for clarification that the board's action that evening was limited to a vote on the rezoning and that a site plan would need to come back before the board separately. MOLLY HOWSON confirmed this was correct.

HOPE CALHOUN briefly returned to the podium to acknowledge the outstanding items identified by staff. She asked the board to note that all of those items were the subject of active, ongoing conversations with city staff, and that the developer was not being resistant but rather was working collaboratively. She asked that the board move forward with a recommendation of approval so that the project could continue progressing, with the understanding that the open items would continue to be worked through with staff. She also reserved time to respond to any public comments.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH opened the floor to public comment, inviting anyone who wished to speak to approach the podium, state their name and address, and offer their remarks. She noted that no one initially came forward.

MOLLY HOWSON stated for the record that staff had received one email in support of the application and one email in opposition, the latter of which had arrived after the backup materials had been distributed to the board. She began passing the emails to board members for review.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH was preparing to close public comment when TROY MOHAMMED interjected with a question.

TROY MOHAMMED asked for clarification about the five percent land donation or cash contribution requirement, specifically inquiring whether a developer could provide the five percent cash contribution and then use the retained land area to add more units beyond what was currently proposed.

MOLLY HOWSON responded that at no point could the developer build more than 888 units, as that was the maximum established in the adopted land use plan amendment and was a firm ceiling. She acknowledged that the current proposal was for approximately 800 units, which was below the maximum, but clarified that the land use plan cap was not something that could be circumvented through any other mechanism.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH indicated she was closing the item to the public, as no additional public speakers had come forward, and invited board members to comment.

ARYEH SHENDER asked for clarification regarding the restrictive covenants still associated with the property and what specific hurdles remained for the developer to obtain the release of those restrictions, particularly in relation to the rezoning action being requested.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH, noticing a member of the public approaching the podium, paused the board discussion and re-opened the floor to public comment.

MARCELLA ROBINSON approached the podium and identified herself as a resident at 4160 Inverrary. She expressed concern about the impact of new development on the surrounding roads and sidewalks, asking whether streets within the new community would be one-way or two-way and whether the development would generate additional noise affecting existing residents. She also raised concerns about the proposed fire station, asking whether the sound of fire trucks responding to calls would affect the quality of life for nearby residents. She inquired whether speed limits within the community would be reduced to 25 miles per hour, noting that the area has a significant senior population for whom traffic safety is especially important.

MOLLY HOWSON responded to each concern in turn. She clarified that none of the proposed pods were designed with one-way streets; all internal roadways were proposed as two-way. She also explained that each pod would have its own gated entrance requiring a fob for residents and a separate process for guests to gain entry, meaning the streets would not be openly accessible to through traffic. Regarding the fire station, she acknowledged that the city and the developer had discussed a potential one-acre site along Rock Island Road, but that the fire department had found that location less than ideal given that Rock Island Road only permits southbound travel, limiting emergency response routes within Inverrary. She reiterated that a fee-in-lieu arrangement was being pursued to give the city funds to find a better-suited location. On the question of noise from new residents, she acknowledged that any new residential development would introduce some additional noise but argued that the density proposed was consistent with what the area had been planned for under the long-standing Inverrary PUD framework and did not include mid-rise or high-rise construction — only townhomes and single-family homes — so the noise impact was not expected to exceed what one would anticipate from any standard residential development.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH closed public comment again and returned to board discussion.

ARYEH SHENDER returned to his earlier question about the restrictive covenants. He asked MOLLY HOWSON to clarify what effect, if any, the rezoning approval would have on the status of the restrictive covenants and what process the residents would still need to go through.

MOLLY HOWSON explained that for the entirety of her more than 20 years in Lauderhill, the restrictive covenant had required that all land on the Inverrary East and West golf courses remain Commercial Recreation. That covenant required a majority vote of the neighborhood to release it. She clarified that the rezoning action itself did not directly address or release the restrictive covenant; rather, the release of the covenant — which could only be accomplished through a successful neighborhood vote — was a required condition that would need to be satisfied before any site plan could be approved or any development order issued for construction to commence. She deferred to HOPE CALHOUN for any additional legal clarification on the topic.

ARYEH SHENDER raised a concern about the width of the internal roadways within the proposed development, drawing a comparison to issues he had observed in other communities such as the Woodlands in Tamarac, where roads were narrow and creating problems with the development of approximately 400 homes. He asked for assurance that the roads within the Inverrary PUD would be designed wide enough to accommodate parked cars, school buses, and general residential traffic, noting that these would be newly created roads built for a residential community rather than repurposed golf course paths.

MOLLY HOWSON directed the board's attention to a traffic flow map on screen, noting that roadways shown in blue were existing and would remain public rights-of-way, while those shown in red were newly proposed interior private roadways. She explained that one of the flexibility items requested as part of the PUD was a reduction in standard street widths, with a 50-foot right-of-way proposed for one pod and a 40-foot right-of-way proposed for the remaining pods.

ARYEH SHENDER asked whether on-street parking would be accommodated within the development.

MOLLY HOWSON stated that on-street parking was not a component of the current PUD proposal. She explained that the developer had met and slightly exceeded the minimum parking requirements based on unit count and guest count, but acknowledged with candor that she had never been involved in a residential development where she did not harbor some concern about parking adequacy.

HOPE CALHOUN added a brief clarifying comment, acknowledging that the applicant had been intentional about designing the community with both future and existing residents in mind. She noted that while there were a few places where engineering and planning standards created some tension, the developer's position was that the proposed roadways were consistent with engineering standards. She expressed confidence that continued discussions with staff would lead to a mutually agreeable outcome before the site plan stage.

BOB SCHANKWEILER asked whether the standard engineering requirements for five-foot sidewalks on both sides of the street plus swales were applicable to this project and, if not, how the developer was being allowed to deviate from those standards.

MOLLY HOWSON explained that the creation of a PUD was precisely the mechanism by which a developer could seek deviations from standard code requirements. She noted that in exchange for those deviations, the developer was expected to provide a substantial public benefit, which in this case included the golf course, the linear park, the greenway, and other amenities. She acknowledged that the specific question of swales and drainage was still being worked through but indicated that the goal of zero runoff from the site was understood and being addressed.

BOB SCHANKWEILER asked whether the linear park would extend all the way to Oakland Park Boulevard.

MOLLY HOWSON explained that the linear park did not extend to Oakland Park Boulevard but rather ended at Canal C. She added that DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS was working to pull up a better visual representation of the greenway loop around the Manors and the Falls of Inverrary. She described a semi-public greenway that would loop around those existing communities, creating a recreational corridor that would buffer new construction from existing townhomes while also providing walking and exercise opportunities for both new and existing Inverrary residents. The greenway was described as having site furniture and landscaping throughout.

HOPE CALHOUN added that the linear park was interior to the development and would be shielded from Rock Island Road. She reiterated that the PUD was establishing guidelines, not final construction specifications, and that the site plan stage would provide the detailed information that several board members were requesting.

BOB SCHANKWEILER asked whether the rock island road realignment would occur south of the canal associated with the proposed new entrance.

MOLLY HOWSON confirmed that assessment and described the relationship between the linear park easement and Rock Island Road, noting that there was more than 500 feet between the linear park trail and the roadway, meaning that residents walking the trail would not see or be directly affected by Rock Island Road traffic. She explained that an existing easement running parallel to Rock Island Road was being utilized as the linear park corridor, with landscaping planned to provide shade and a pleasant walking environment.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH, noting that she would need to depart the meeting early, apologized to those present and indicated that Board Vice Chair Michelle Pinder would take over the remainder of the meeting. She expressed confidence in Vice Chair Pinder's abilities and thanked everyone in attendance before stepping away.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH confirmed there were no further board questions and called for a motion.

MOTION TO APPROVE - Passed

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH asked for a motion to approve the rezoning recommendation.

ARYEH SHENDER made the motion to recommend approval of the rezoning.

MARY SMITH seconded the motion.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH conducted roll call, with all seven members present voting in the affirmative, and announced that the motion carried.

HOPE CALHOUN acknowledged the vote and briefly thanked the board, noting that her client had been present for the entire hearing and had heard the proceedings directly.

## **2. (26-TA-007) An Amendment To The Land Development Regulations (LDR) To Add "Hookah Lounge/Bar Use" To General Commercial (CG) Zoning District**

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH read the item into the record, describing it as an amendment to the Land Development Regulations to add the Hookah Lounge/Bar use to the General Commercial zoning district.

NADINE FEARON presented the staff report. She explained that this text amendment was staff-initiated and citywide in scope, proposing to add the hookah lounge/bar use as a permitted use within the General Commercial zoning district. She defined a hookah lounge as a commercial establishment where patrons smoke flavored tobacco — commonly referred to as shisha — using a water pipe device known as a hookah. She provided cultural context, noting that the practice originated in Middle Eastern culture and has grown significantly in popularity in the United States over the past two decades, particularly as a social activity among young adults.

NADINE FEARON described how these establishments typically function as social gathering spaces, operating similarly to cafes and lounges, and are generally located within commercial or entertainment-oriented areas. She noted that the majority of the General Commercial zoning district in Lauderhill is situated along the city's main thoroughfares, including Commercial Boulevard, University Drive, Oakland Park Boulevard, Northwest 441, Northwest 31st Avenue, and portions of Broward Boulevard.

NADINE FEARON provided the regulatory history for context. She explained that as part of a 2023 amendment to the Land Development Regulations, hookah lounges and cigar bars had been permitted within the Community Commercial zoning district, the Commercial Warehouse zoning district, and the Commercial Entertainment zoning district. However, the General Commercial zoning district was not included in that 2023 amendment and therefore did not currently permit these uses. She described the current proposal as correcting that omission by extending the same permission to the General Commercial district, directing such uses to commercial areas where they are compatible with surrounding development patterns and intensity.

NADINE FEARON concluded by recommending that the board enter into the record the development review report and all other substantial competent evidence presented at the hearing, adopt the record, and forward the proposed ordinance to the city commission with a recommendation for adoption.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH opened the floor to public comment. No members of the public came forward, and she closed the public comment period.

BOB SCHANKWEILER offered a comment in support of the amendment, stating that it was long overdue to bring the city's land development regulations in line with what was socially accepted today. He expressed enthusiasm for the amendment.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH offered a note of caution, acknowledging the social acceptance of hookah lounges while also raising the question of whether such establishments were the best fit for Lauderhill given the city's demographics and the types of activities the city was trying to discourage. She stated she wanted to place that perspective on the record.

MOTION TO APPROVE - Passed

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH asked for a motion to approve the amendment.

TROY MOHAMMED made the motion to approve the text amendment.

BOB SCHANKWEILER seconded the motion.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH conducted roll call: Michelle Pinder voted no; Aryeh Shender voted yes; Bob Schankweiler voted yes; Mary Smith voted no; Troy Mohammed voted yes; and Brent Lewis voted yes, after his name was initially missed and subsequently called. The motion carried with four affirmative votes and two negative votes.

### **3. (26-TA-008) An Amendment To The Land Development Regulations (LDR) To Allow DIY ("do-it-yourself") Candle-Making Workshops Within The RMH-50 Zoning District At The Chateau Mar Golf Resort & Hotel As An Accessory Use To The Hotel**

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH read the item into the record, describing it as an amendment to allow DIY candle-making workshops within the RMH-50 zoning district at the Chateau Mar Golf Resort and Hotel as an accessory use to the hotel.

MOLLY HOWSON presented the staff analysis. She explained that this proposed text amendment originated from a need brought to staff by an accessory business operating at the Chateau Mar. She noted that whenever a specific property brings a code change request to staff, it is staff's responsibility to evaluate how the proposed change would apply not only to the requesting property but citywide.

MOLLY HOWSON described the existing code language for educational and instructional uses, which defined that category as uses intended to impart specific knowledge or skills through short, intensive, direct instruction from an expert to a student, either individually or in groups. She cited examples already covered under this category, including fine arts instruction, dance, sports, martial arts, and cheerleading — effectively any use such as a karate school, a dance studio, or a DIY craft shop. She noted that this use category was already permitted in the General Commercial and Community Commercial zoning districts and that it had simply never been added to hotel zoning districts.

MOLLY HOWSON explained that the specific catalyst for the amendment was a small nonprofit organization called "Sensability," which provides candle-making DIY instruction and operates within the Chateau Mar. She described the nonprofit as employing special needs adults, providing them with jobs, social interaction, and meaningful activity after they age out of the public school system at age 21. She noted that the nonprofit was currently permitted to sell candles at the hotel, but that the existing code did not allow it to conduct the candle-making workshops or instruction on site.

MOLLY HOWSON argued that the proposed amendment would be beneficial not just to this one nonprofit and this one hotel, but to the hotel zoning district generally, as it would open the door for other hotels in the city to offer yoga instruction, DIY creative arts classes, or similar educational and recreational experiences to their guests. She stated that staff supported the amendment and proposed to allow the existing educational and instructional use category to be permitted within the RMH-50 zoning district.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH opened the floor to public comment. No members of the public came forward, and she closed public comment.

TROY MOHAMMED raised a concern about potential unintended consequences of the amendment. He questioned what would prevent a financially struggling hotel from taking advantage of the broader accessory use permission to incorporate many different small businesses into its rooms, effectively turning hotel space into a collection of commercial tenancies. He acknowledged that the concept behind the amendment was positive but asked whether safeguards could be established to limit the extent of accessory uses and prevent the hotel from becoming something other than a hotel.

MOLLY HOWSON responded, noting that TROY MOHAMMED had raised an exceptionally thoughtful point. She explained that the existing code already contained a safeguard: any accessory use associated with a primary permitted use could not constitute more than 15 percent of the total floor area of the primary use. She described how staff could conduct a floor area analysis to evaluate all accessory businesses in a hotel, their combined square footage, and the total square footage of the hotel to ensure compliance with that limitation.

TROY MOHAMMED appreciated the response and added that it would also be valuable to specify the types of businesses that would be appropriate as hotel accessory uses — ideally those oriented toward serving guests and the community rather than purely commercial operations.

MOLLY HOWSON agreed and explained that the existing code already enumerated what types of uses were considered appropriate accessories to a hotel. She gave examples: a hair salon would be considered appropriate given that hotel guests might want to get their hair done before going out, whereas a tax preparation office would not be considered compatible with hotel use and would be denied by staff. She confirmed that any proposed accessory use would require a zoning review from staff before a business license could be issued, giving the city meaningful oversight over what would actually be permitted.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH offered a clarification for the record, noting that the accessory use spaces being discussed were conference rooms and common areas, not individual hotel rooms.

MOLLY HOWSON confirmed this interpretation, further noting that the code requires accessory businesses to not have their own separate outside entrances, meaning that any accessory use would need to be accessed through the hotel's main lobby and would primarily serve hotel guests.

MOTION TO APPROVE - Passed

MOLLY HOWSON confirmed the board was ready to vote.

ARYEH SHENDER made the motion to approve the text amendment.

MARY SMITH seconded the motion.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH conducted roll call, with all members present voting in the affirmative, and the motion carried unanimously.

#### 4. (26-TA-006) An Amendment To The Land Development Regulations (LDR) Regarding Site Plan Processing, Platting, And Special Exceptions

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH read the item into the record, describing it as an amendment to the Land Development Regulations regarding site plan processing, platting, and special exceptions. She summarized the item as largely procedural and organizational in nature, aimed at modernizing the development review process, establishing clearer decision-making authority, introducing objective review thresholds, and enhancing administrative efficiency while maintaining appropriate oversight for more complex applications.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS presented the staff analysis. He explained that the text amendment touched on three distinct areas: special exceptions, platting, and the site plan review process. He indicated he would address the platting and special exception changes briefly before spending more time on the site plan process changes, which he described as the most significant component.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS addressed special exceptions first. He explained that under current code, all special exception applications were reviewed and approved exclusively by the city commission. He noted that a large volume of special exception uses existed in the code, many of which were relatively straightforward after staff analysis and tended to be approved without significant controversy at the commission level. The proposal was to delegate authority over certain special exception applications to the Planning and Zoning Board, while keeping others at the city commission level. He identified medical offices — specifically those where a doctor is authorized to prescribe controlled substances — as a prime example of the type of special exception that could appropriately be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Board, as these applications tended to move through the commission without difficulty after staff had reviewed the applicant's licensing status and disciplinary history.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS explained the proposed workflow for the delegated special exception path: the applicant would meet with staff, potentially hold a neighborhood meeting depending on the use type, post required advertisements, and then appear before the Planning and Zoning Board. If the board approved the application by a super majority, it would not need to advance to the city commission and could proceed to the next steps in the business licensing or site plan process. If, however, the board did not approve by a super majority — indicating some level of concern or disagreement among board members — the application would be elevated to the city commission for final determination. He noted that this split-vote escalation mechanism was intended to ensure that genuinely contentious applications received full commission review.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS explained that certain categories of special exception uses would not be routed through the Planning and Zoning Board at all and would continue to go directly to the city commission. These were enumerated uses in Section 4-10 of the code, described as "convenience uses," including pawn shops, junkyards, bars, nightclubs, and lounges — uses that by their nature warranted continued commission-level scrutiny.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS noted one significant practical benefit of the proposed delegation: the Planning and Zoning Board meets monthly throughout the entire calendar year, including during periods when the city commission is in recess. This would result in a more consistent and predictable timeline for business owners seeking special exception approvals, particularly during the summer months when commission recesses could cause delays.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS then addressed the platting changes. He explained that these changes were driven directly by state statute rather than by staff preference. The Florida Legislature had mandated that plat applications must be approved administratively and could no longer go through elected or appointed board review processes. As a result, the proposed amendment struck out references to both the Planning and Zoning Board and the city commission from the platting review process, replacing them with a purely administrative approval pathway. He noted that this was separate from the code rewrite being presented later in the agenda and that the language in the comprehensive rewrite document had not yet been updated to reflect this change, as the amendments were still being processed.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS then addressed the most substantive component of the amendment — the reorganization and expansion of the site plan review process. He described the current code as recognizing only two types of site plan review: administrative review and major review. He explained that the administrative

review category covered very minor items — fences and walls, statues and sculptures, and certain modifications to existing site plans — while major review covered everything else and required the full public hearing process through the Development Review Committee, neighborhood meeting, Planning and Zoning Board, and city commission.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS explained that one of the primary motivations for restructuring this process was the city's recent approval of a General Obligation bond, which would fund improvements to existing city facilities, parks, and public spaces. He noted that many of those projects would involve significant dollar values but would not meaningfully change the function, programming, or use of the properties being improved. Under the current code, the dollar value threshold triggered a major review requirement even for straightforward rehabilitation projects, creating an unnecessarily burdensome process for city-initiated improvements that did not warrant full commission oversight.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS described the proposed three-tier review structure. The first tier — administrative review — would cover the most minor items that could be handled entirely at the staff level, such as fences, walls, landscaping, and minor alterations to existing developed properties that did not increase building size or require significant modifications to parking, landscaping, or circulation. The second tier — minor site plan review — would cover slightly more complex applications that still did not rise to the level of full public hearing. This tier would involve professional review by city staff across relevant disciplines including engineering, fire marshal, and planning, but would not require a public hearing before the Planning and Zoning Board or city commission. The third tier — major site plan review — would cover all significant new development, defined as residential projects of five or more units and commercial projects of 5,000 square feet or more.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS described the proposed super majority mechanism for major site plan reviews, mirroring the structure he had described for special exceptions. If the Planning and Zoning Board approved a major site plan application by a super majority of five, six, or seven out of seven members, it would not be required to advance to the city commission. A split vote or simple majority would trigger escalation to the commission, reflecting the principle that divided board opinion indicated sufficient complexity or public concern to warrant elected official review.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS acknowledged a correction that needed to be made in the draft ordinance: the draft had placed the development of three- and four-family dwellings in the administrative review category, when in fact that should be classified as a minor site plan. He indicated that correction would be made before the ordinance was presented to the city commission.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS briefly presented a comparative analysis of how several neighboring municipalities structured their site plan review processes. He noted that Fort Lauderdale maintained six different levels of site plan review. Tamarac and Sunrise used a simpler major/minor structure similar to what was being proposed. Oakland Park Beach used a similar structure but also had an architectural appearance review board serving as an additional advisory layer between staff and the Planning and Zoning Board. Deerfield Beach and Hollywood also employed community appearance boards. Plantation maintained multiple distinct application types with different review pathways.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH asked DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS to return to the portion of his presentation where he had described applications that would not come before the Planning and Zoning Board at all, seeking clarification about which body would handle those applications.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS confirmed that special exception applications currently did not come before the Planning and Zoning Board at all — they went directly to the city commission. He clarified that under the new proposal, certain delegated special exceptions would come to the Planning and Zoning Board for the first time. He used the medical office/prescribing physician example again to illustrate a use that would transition from commission-only review to potential Planning and Zoning Board approval under the proposed framework.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH asked about the platting changes, seeking to understand the distinction from the new item being presented.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS clarified that the platting changes were distinct from the special exception changes and were mandated by the state. He explained that under current practice, plat applications came before the Planning and Zoning Board and then the city commission before going to the Broward County Commission. The state legislature had changed this process to require administrative approval, which was why the references to both the Planning and Zoning Board and the city commission were being struck from the platting section.

BOB SCHANKWEILER raised a question about terminology in the backup materials. He asked whether the reference to a "planning and development board" in parts of the report was a typographical error and whether it was intended to refer to the Planning and Zoning Board, since he wanted to confirm that no new board was being created.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS confirmed that the reference was indeed a typographical error and that the Planning and Zoning Board was the intended body — no new board was being created.

BOB SCHANKWEILER then drew attention to Section 6.3 of the backup materials, where language related to a board's role in the platting process appeared to have been struck through but was potentially confusing given that the Planning and Zoning Board was still referenced elsewhere in the document in connection with platting.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS explained that in Section 6, all references to "the board" in connection with platting were indeed referring to the Planning and Zoning Board, and all such references were being struck through as part of the state-mandated administrative platting process change. He acknowledged that some inconsistency existed between this ordinance and the comprehensive code rewrite being presented later in the agenda, because the two documents had been drafted at different points in time. He explained that as each article of the code rewrite was finalized and adopted, all subsequently adopted ordinances — including the hookah lounge amendment adopted by the commission the previous Monday and the food pantry amendment from the prior month — would need to be incorporated into the rewrite.

BOB SCHANKWEILER noted that the plat review process, in the planning context, had historically been a Broward County application that the city was required to endorse, and he sought confirmation that this arrangement was changing.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS confirmed that the current code reflected the city's endorsement role in the platting process and that those provisions were being updated to comply with the changes made at the state legislative level.

MOTION TO APPROVE - Passed

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH confirmed the board was ready to vote and asked for a motion.

ARYEH SHENDER made the motion to approve the amendment.

TROY MOHAMMED seconded the motion.

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH conducted roll call: Michelle Pinder voted yes; Aryeh Shender voted yes; Brent Lewis voted yes; Bob Schankweiler voted yes; Mary Smith voted yes; and Troy Mohammed voted yes. The motion carried unanimously.

## **5. (26-LDR-001) An Amendment To Articles 1, 2, And 3 Of The Land Development Regulations (LDR)**

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH read the item into the record, describing it as the first installment of a comprehensive rewrite of the city's Land Development Regulations encompassing over 200 pages and primarily focused on improving the organization and usability of the existing code.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS addressed the board, noting that he would not attempt to walk through every page of the document but wanted to provide context and framing for the rewrite effort. He explained that staff had been working diligently on updating, rewriting, and reorganizing the Land Development Regulations, and that it had been many years — he noted he would need to do additional research to pinpoint the exact number — since the city had undertaken any sort of large-scale comprehensive review of the code. Over those years, numerous individual one-off amendments had been made, and in the process, some inconsistencies had been introduced. Staff titles and roles had changed, state statutes had been amended without always being incorporated into the local code, and some zoning districts lacked clear, consolidated descriptions of their applicable standards and rules.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS described the overall goals of the rewrite effort. The first goal was to restructure the code to make it easier and more navigable for both staff and developers. He gave as an example the General Commercial zoning district, which affected a significant amount of land area in the city but currently required staff to piece together its rules from multiple different sections of the code rather than finding everything consolidated in one place. The second goal was to address gaps and inconsistencies. He acknowledged that some code amendments had created conflicts with other existing provisions, and that staff may have

inadvertently overlooked those conflicts during the amendment process. The third goal was to reconcile internal contradictions in the code. The fourth goal was to ensure compliance with current state statutes, incorporating changes that had been made at the state level but not yet reflected in the local code.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS described the structure of the rewrite, noting that Article 1 and Article 2 addressed administrative and procedural matters — specifically, all of the various application types the city processes, including site plans, plats, rezonings, and others. For each application type, the rewrite aimed to clearly define which body was responsible for review and approval, what public notice requirements applied, whether mailed notices, posted signs, or public meeting advertisements were required, and in what sequence those requirements had to be met. He noted that these were questions staff often had to work through internally and that the rewrite was intended to eliminate that ambiguity.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS described Article 3 as covering all zoning districts, with the goal of ensuring that each district had its purpose clearly stated and all relevant standards consolidated in one accessible location. He noted that the document before the board was the first of a series of installments and that Articles 4, 5, and 6 would be presented at the next meeting.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS emphasized that the rewrite was primarily a reorganization and clarification effort, not an opportunity to inject new policy positions or best practices. He acknowledged that there were many best practices the city might eventually want to adopt — improved landscaping standards, lighting requirements, and the like — but that attempting to address all of those simultaneously would create information overload and make it extremely difficult for the board and commission to distinguish between what was genuinely new policy versus what was simply being reorganized. He indicated the intention was to complete the rewrite with as few substantive changes as possible, so that the city could represent with confidence that the new code contained largely the same content as the old code, just presented more clearly. After the rewrite was complete, staff would continue bringing forward focused, individual amendments on specific policy topics.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS confirmed that no vote was required from the board that evening on this item, but he encouraged members to read through the materials, flag any inconsistencies or concerns, and let staff know if there were particular items they would like addressed at this stage or in a future review cycle.

BOB SCHANKWEILER commented that the document was, as he put it, a lot of words, though he noted with some humor that it appeared to represent an improvement over the previous state of the code.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS confirmed that the current installment was indeed just the first batch and that Articles 4, 5, and 6 would be presented to the board the following month, with questions and discussion welcomed at that time.

BOB SCHANKWEILER acknowledged the value of the consolidation effort, noting that it had previously been necessary to locate information scattered across 17 different sections of the code, and that bringing everything into one organized place was a meaningful improvement.

DANIEL KEESTER-O'MILLS agreed, confirming that consolidation and clarity were the primary objectives.

## H. Unfinished Business

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH asked if there was any unfinished business. No board members raised any items.

## I. Next Meeting – May 26, 2026

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH announced that the next meeting would be held on May 26, 2026. She initially questioned whether that date might fall on or near Memorial Day, but it was quickly clarified that Memorial Day falls on May 25th and that the 26th was the day after. There was brief confirmation among board members that the May 26th date was correct and that it did not conflict with the holiday.

## J. Adjournment

RUTH ROMAN LYNCH declared the meeting adjourned at 8:38 PM.