

**City of Lauderdale
 Planning & Zoning Board Meeting
 Tuesday, June 24, 2025
 City Commission Chambers
 5581 West Oakland Park Boulevard
 Lauderdale, Florida 33313**

MINUTES

A. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Pinder called the meeting to order at 7:07pm

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Vice Chairperson Pinder led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. ROLL CALL

Ms. Fearon called the roll:

MEMBERS	PRESENT	ABSENT
Chairperson Ruth Roman-Lynch		X-Excused
Clyde Grey	X	
Brent Lewis	X	
Vice Chairperson Michelle Pinder	X	
Troy Mohammed	X	
Bob Schankweiler	X	
Aryeh Shender	X	

***Arrived Late**

A quorum was declared.

ALSO, PRESENT:

Sean Henderson, Interim Assistant City Manager/Finance Director/Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) Director
 Daniel Keester O’Mills, Director, Development Services Department, (DSD)
 Craig Pinder, Calvin Giordanno (Consultant)
 Hans Ottinot, City Attorney (Ottinot Law Firm)

Pamela Ryan, City Attorney, Ottinot Law Firm
Nadine Fearon, Associate Planner, DSD

D. PROOF OF PUBLICATION:

MOTION by Mr. Schankweiler,

To accept the Proof of Publication,

SECOND by Mr. Shender.

The motion passed 6-0

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- **May 27, 2025**

MOTION by Mr. Schankweiler,

To table the minutes of May 27, 2025,
to the next as presented meeting,

SECOND by Mr. Mohammed.

The motion passed 6-0

F. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REMARKS:

Mr. Keester-O'Mills reminded attendees to always state their name when speaking, and to speak clearly, so the meeting's dialog could be accurately reflected in the minutes.

G. PUBLIC HEARING

All persons wishing to speak on the items G. 1, 2 and 3 were collectively sworn in.

- 1. AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA, ADOPTING A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AMENDMENT FOR A +/- 131.36 GROSS ACRE SITE GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF NW 44TH STREET, WEST OF ROCK ISLAND ROAD, NORTH OF THE MIDDLE RIVER, AND EAST OF INVERRARY BLVD WEST (KNOWN AS A PORTION OF THE INVERRARY GOLF COURSE); LOCATED WITHIN A RESIDENTIAL DASHED LINE, AMENDING THE FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION FROM "COMMERCIAL RECREATION" TO "RESIDENTIAL IRREGULAR" TO ALLOW 888 DWELLING UNITS; DETERMINATION THAT A LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY HEARING WILL BE HELD ON JUNE 24, 2025; PROVIDING THAT A TRANSMITTAL AND ADOPTION PUBLIC HEARING WILL BE HELD; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

Vice Chairperson Pinder read the title of the subject application.

The Applicant was represented by Greg Pinder, the project planner of record; Hope Calhoun, land use attorney.

Mr. Pinder explained that he was tasked with reviewing the applicant's project plans with city staff. He went on to review the proposed amendment, as detailed in the backup, highlighting the following:

- The proposed amendment would allow the applicant to develop portions of the Inverrary golf course from recreational to residential
- The addition of the subject residential units that would be facilitated by the proposed amendment would not increase Broward County's already approved intensity
- After the present P&Z Board meeting, the subject amendment would be presented to the City Commission for first reading, after which the matter would go to the Broward County Planning Council, then on to the Broward County Commission for review, then sent to the State of Florida; after review by the State, the matter returned to the County Commission, and then the amendment would return to the City Commission for second reading; if approved, the amendment would be sent to the State
- The proposed project was only for a portion of the Inverrary golf course property to be developed into residential
- Regarding public schools, the School Consistency Report stated there was sufficient capacity to meet the anticipated number of students
- No new trips would be generated, per what was already approved by the County
- The proposed development was consistent with surrounding residential land uses
- The applicant demonstrated there was sufficient available capacity regarding all public facilities, as detailed in the documents submitted, including the City's water, and water treatment plant
- The applicant's proposed development would preserve open space via the maintenance of the golf course that was over 100 acres, with multiple housing types, and trails throughout the residential products that connected to existing public walkways
- The applicant recommends board approval to move the proposed amendment to the City Commission with a recommendation for approval due to the applicant demonstrating compliance with all the City's and County's Land Use Plan amendment procedures.

Ms. Calhoun indicated that along with the applicant's project team, there were other supporters of the project from the public in attendance at the present meeting. Her presentation was similar to that of Mr. Pinder's, noting the subject amendment was the first in a multi-step process, and if granted approval at the present meeting, it was unlikely the process would not be completed until sometime in mid to late 2026. The approval of the proposed application would facilitate the applicant's ability to submit any other applications for the subject project. She remarked that any reference to the residential products for the proposed development was in the very conceptual phase at the present point in time, and there could be numerous adjustments before all elements of the project were finalized; the 888 number of dwelling units was the maximum possible that could be built. The applicant was not asking the board to approve the construction of 888 units, it was just a statement that this would be the most number of units that could be built; impacts related to traffic, schools, water, sewer, etc. were not addressed at this preliminary stage of the development process, but it was worth noting that they were previously calculated in the impacts for the 1,142 units that were part of the Inverrary dashed-line area; the applicant sought a maximum of 888 units of the 1,142 units

for their proposed development. Ms. Calhoun indicated, upon final approval from the Commission at second reading, that the board would be presented with the proposed project at each of its development stages, including the plat, site plan, etc. City staff recommended approval of the proposed amendment, and the applicant, city staff, and the residents worked together for years to come to the present point; the applicant would continue working with the community and city staff, meeting with anyone who wished to meet with the applicant's team to discuss the proposed development.

Mr. Schankweiler commented that the subject property was deed restricted.

Ms. Calhoun affirmed there was, but great news was that it was a private document, so the decision on the use of the property was determined by the residential property owners of Inverrary. The applicant acknowledged the risk of proceeding with the subject development, but the proposed land use amendment was the first step.

Mr. Schankweiler questioned if the applicant had the endorsement of the Inverrary Association for the proposed project.

Ms. Calhoun mentioned there were Inverrary Association representatives present who would speak on their own behalf, but she affirmed they approved of the proposed project. The applicant recognized they had a long way to go, but without the subject amendment, no residential project could proceed further, leaving the Inverrary golf course land brown, and undeveloped.

Mr. Shender sought clarification on the history of the dashed-line area; that is, how it was created, and how the numbers were derived.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills explained that when the Land Use Plan was originally created in the 1980s, a certain number of residential units were calculated for the City of Lauderdale based on the City's infrastructure. When doing residential density for land use planning, there were two options: either via a dashed-line with a finite number of units, placing a cap on the number of units, or a gross acreage, with a maximum number of dwelling units per acre. He stated, based off the size of the total area in acres, including the golf course, the total density was relatively low, as it was a lot of open space; as stated by the applicant, the latter's plan was not to increase the number of dwelling units permitted in the existing dashed line, but to utilize some of those units.

Mr. Schankweiler wished to know if there was a commercial equivalent to the number of residential units allowed in the subject area.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills responded that with the Land Use Plan, there were areas designated as residential, commercial, and commercial recreation; the latter was the current designation within the dashed-line area, and the board was being asked to approve an amendment, as residential units were not permitted in a commercial recreation space. The applicant sought an amendment to the City's Land Use Plan to enable a change of a portion of the Inverrary golf course area zoned commercial recreation to residential with no increase to the existing number of residential units in the dashed-line area.

Mr. Schankweiler questioned if there were any burrowing owls on the subject site.

Ms. Calhoun replied there were none at present, and as with any other property where they were found, addressing that would be a site plan concern when environmental issues were addressed.

Mr. Grey asked about the applicant's plans to improve the drainage and other infrastructure of the subject site if the proposed development were to proceed.

Ms. Calhoun understood the concern as to how drainage of a site affected surrounding properties, but as the applicant was only asking to utilize existing units allowed in the dashed-line area, at the subject stage the applicant was not required to do any impact studies, or make any agreements to that end. Again, capacity was already accounted for with the number of allowed residential units for the site, and the evaluation for such things as drainage, sewer, water, etc. was already determined as sufficient for existing infrastructure. When it came to time for the applicant to additional applications, including zoning, plat, site plan, etc., the board and the public would have ample opportunities to ask such specific questions. She stressed that the board's approval of the proposed Land Use Plan amendment was by no means a yes to anything else concerning the proposed development; every application the applicant presented to city boards, committees, and the Commission had to stand on its own merit. The more applications presented to staff, the board and the City Commission, the more specific questions as to impacts, etc. could and should be, and the applicant would be prepared to answer every inquiry at that time. Ms. Calhoun pointed out a site plan had yet to be created that would generate such inquiries; the applicant knew only that there was capacity for a certain number of units, a threshold for which the applicant's request fell well below.

Mr. Grey mentioned that the applicant's proposed development could affect the value of the existing homes, particularly owners wishing to sell, asking if any consideration was given to the future pricing of the proposed dwelling units.

Ms. Calhoun replied that property values was not one of the criterion being considered with the Land Use Plan amendment. It was important to know that, based on previous studies, that when new development came into an area, all property values in that area increased.

Vice Chairperson Pinder asked if the dwelling units would be single-family or multifamily units.

Ms. Calhoun reminded the board that the units were currently conceptual, but the applicant proposed building single-family homes that might be attached or detached; though the number of units did not physically exist, they were accounted for in the Land Use Plan.

Vice Chairperson Pinder opened the discussion to the public.

Tom Harney, Lauderhill resident, stated he was the president of the Inverrary Association, noting the applicant approached the Inverrary Association about two years ago, trying to come up with a plan to revive the golf course property, devising a redevelopment plan that worked for the community. Over time, there was a lot of discussion, and numerous tweaks to the plan, and the plans, the community amenities and benefits had evolved, with significant community feedback, and implemented into any golf course redevelopment proposal. He affirmed, as the applicant's team had, that the redevelopment plan would continue to evolve as the process progressed. The proposed plan for the subject portion of the golf course was still at a very early stage, but the community was very much in favor of having the proposed amendment move forward, so the community could vote on whatever the applicant proposed, understanding that whatever the applicant presented to the community at every stage of the

development would be subjected to a community vote. Mr. Harney said the community felt that the proposed project was worthy of coming forward to the community to vote on. Again, the Inverrary Association board was in favor of approving the proposed Land Development Use amendment to move forward to the Commission, knowing there were numerous steps that had to move forward, but the community needed to get this historical golf course back, and revive the image of the City. He remarked there were so many benefits to having the proposed development, so the community needed to take this opportunity to get the golf course back in the Inverrary community.

Carolyn Brogdon, Lauderhill resident of International Village, expressed opposition to the proposed residential development, particularly along Inverrary Drive, stating the residents valued their greenspace, and the beauty of the area, and abundance of wildlife, including many nesting birds on the golf course properties. The golf course was the reason she purchased her condominium 22 years. She thought an ideal scenario for the community would be to convert the east golf course into a public park with walking paths, the restoration of natural habitat, and other recreational activities that benefited residents of the area. Perhaps the west golf course could be restored in a similar fashion, but it seemed there was a plan for the golf course to proceed, and she felt sure many members of the Inverrary community supported this path also. Ms. Brogdon said it would be wonderful to have a nature preserve in their neighborhood, with public access, and walking trails, and the executive course would be a permanent place to do this. However, if a compromise was necessary, this was where residential/commercial development should happen, as some infrastructure was already in place there.

Barbara Herman, Lauderhill resident of Environ Boulevard, stated she was a proud resident of Lauderhill for 51 years in Inverrary, so she witnessed the days of Jackie Gleason, and the numerous celebrities and dignitaries who once played on the Inverrary golf courses, and the glory that the Inverrary golf course brought to the City of Lauderhill; she, too, witnessed the results in the City when the Inverrary golf course shut down. She admitted to being skeptical when the applicant approached the Inverrary Association in 2023 with their redevelopment plan, and she attended several meetings the developer hosted to provide details of their proposed residential project, and where residents were invited to speak. Ms. Herman mentioned being beyond pleased to know they listened to the community's concerns, and continually adjusted their development proposals to provide Inverrary with a new championship golf course, and state-of-the-art supporting amenities. She wished to see Inverrary in the City of Lauderhill redeveloped into the destination place it once was, bringing revenue into the City; she was 100 percent in support of the new Inverrary golf course new development project, and ask the board and City Commission to vote in support of the project.

Douglas Meyers, Lauderhill resident, said he was a resident of International Village since 1976. He waited decades for a quality, comprehensive development, such as that being presented by the applicant; it was a godsend for the Inverrary community. He spoke recently to numerous voters in his development alone; they were the largest HOA in Broward County numbering 832, of which he spoke to some 300 voters, all of whom expressed complete support for the proposed development. The item before the board was just the first step in the process, and as issues arose through the process, the applicant, staff, and the community would deal with them accordingly. He, too, believed that the proposed development would increase the value of surrounding residential properties, as would the overall quality of the Inverrary community; this was a blessing for the whole community, as it would increase the City's revenue, and the ability for Lauderhill's schools to benefit.

Ina Wishnia, Lauderhill resident, stated she lived in International Village for 33 years, and while property values went up, so did property taxes. She asked where the traffic generated by

the proposed development would go, as Inverrary Drive could not handle the traffic it currently had; the same applied to schools' ability to handle the increase in the number of students. Adequate drainage was another issue to be considered, and she did not want to wait to discuss this later, as she was already tired of the flooding on NW 44th Street. She felt many factors needed to be addressed before proceedings.

Omar Davis, Lauderhill resident in the Manors of Inverrary, commented that the proposed development directly affected where he lived, and he was totally against it. The applicant only sought to redevelop the subject site for profit, building, and then going back to wherever they lived, leaving the surrounding residents to live with the results of their development, including increased traffic, drainage problems, and water use. He believed all these issues would affect residents, stating the individuals who sat down with the developers to discuss what was proposed did not speak with the residents who would be directly affected by the development. He urged the board not to approve the amendment, or recommend approval to the Commission, claiming that even the posting of signs on the property was done so they were not sufficiently visible, stating the applicant's team were masters of doing things like this to communities, leaving existing residents to handle the results of their development.

Wayne Simpson, Lauderhill resident, remarked he lacked sufficient information to comment.

Shaundrika Taylor, Lauderhill resident, understood that property values would increase, but so did the property taxes, and the applicant had yet to say what the selling price for the residential units would be. If they were million-dollar homes, existing residents could be priced out of their homes, as regardless of the homestead exemption, property taxes would be higher. She felt the process should start with getting the two third's vote of the Inverrary property owners.

Giubert St. Fort, Lauderhill resident, said he lived at The Falls of Inverrary for 24 years, and over the years he witnessed his property value doing down due to the Inverrary golf course, and its effect on the surrounding areas. He believed the applicants proposed project would increase property values, and the Inverrary community would have the opportunity to be as it once was, which was the pride of Lauderhill, and Broward County. He hoped that the cost of the proposed residential community would not increase property taxes to the extent that he would be forced to move out of his property, so he urged the developer to take this into consideration.

Ken Nichols, Lauderhill resident, stated he lived in the area for 22 years, and when he moved in there was a lovely golf course, and it was one of the reasons why he, like many others, bought his property; he hoped to see the golf course come back, as his property was not worth as much as when the golf course was operational. If the plan including bringing back a portion of the golf course, and the attached country club, along with improvements at the hotel, the development would raise the area's property values, and there would likely be some increase in property taxes, but not significantly. He believed the proposed development would add to the Lauderhill, and the Inverrary community in a great way, so he supported proceeding.

Denise Creary, Lauderhill resident of Inverwood Condominium, said the proposed project directly affected where she lived; thus, she was opposed to it, as the existing traffic was horrendous, taking her about 15 minutes just to get out of her community in the morning. She could not understand adding another 800 homes to the area, as residents were already having issues with flooding on NW 44th Street and Rock Island Road when it rained. She urged the board to take such issues into consideration.

Melvin Parrish, Lauderhill resident of the Sienna Greens community, commented the parties in question did not have the jurisdiction to hold the present conversation, as there was a restricted covenant in place for the subject site; until that covenant was removed, no residential development could be built. He believed Ms. Calhoun made a number of inaccurate statements, one being that the study of the area she referred to was done many years ago, and the Inverrary area had changed significantly since then. It was doubtful that that study included 1,100 houses on the golf course, as homes could not be built on golf course land unless the deed restriction issue was resolved. The maintenance of the golf course land, and the beautification of the nearby areas did not include developing housing on the golf course. He suggested the City petition the Florida Department of Historical Resources for funding to turn the golf course into a historical site.

Giovanni DeMartini, Lauderhill resident of Environ Phase 2, where he lived for six years, stated his main reason for moving there was for the golf course, and he was in favor of the proposed residential project to enable the area being brought back to how nice it used to be. He understood other residents' voiced concerns regarding traffic, etc., so he hoped to see the applicant and city staff work together to mitigate impacts resulting from the project that were causing residents concern.

Charles Fritsch, Lauderhill resident, thanked the applicant and city staff for placing the subject item on the meeting agenda, so he could hear more details from stakeholders with opposing points of view on the proposed project, so he could better determine his position on the matter. He thanked the applicant for putting out the information, yet he still felt he lacked sufficient information to make a good public statement; he was in favor of the subject process at present, but going forward that would be determined by what transpired subsequently. There was a lot of information being shown to the present meeting's attendees, all of which he wished sent to residents via email; the latter could be obtained from the Inverrary Association, city staff, and the residents present. He commented that residents should receive the full presentation, so they could read through what the present sought to accomplish, as well as what the plans were to date for the proposed residential project. He tried to take notes during meeting, trying to read them back, while trying to listen to various speakers; this was too much to do and take in at once.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills indicated that the application submitted by the applicant, including the presentation, was posted on the City's Planning & Zoning website, and he would add the other presentations given at the present meeting.

Mr. Fritsch pointed out that there were many residents who believed once the board approved the proposed amendment, they no longer had any say in what took place later, so he wished the points made in the meeting to be included as well, so residents who believed they would not be allowed to give further input in the development process going forward could have these concerns allayed.

Richard Hylton, Lauderhill resident in Lakes of Environ, recalled there was a meeting in 2024, introducing the subject developer, and what they proposed for the subject residential development; at that time, there was a large volume of information, as there was now. Because of the large amount of information, it made it very difficult for residents to understand the full import of the proposed development, and the same was happening at the present meeting. He wondered if the consideration of the proposed amendment could be delayed by at least another month or two, so residents could read through the large volume of information for a better understanding of what was being proposed. Though he had only been a resident of

Inverrary for four years, he hoped the applicant understood the history of the area, and what the golf course meant to the community.

Andrew Cathcart, Lauderhill resident in the Hills of Inverrary, asked the residents at the present meeting to give the subject developer a chance to proceed with their proposed plans; the board's approving of the proposed amendment was not saying yes to the project the applicant was proposing. The approval only facilitated the applicant's ability to develop a project that still required the approval by the residents of Inverrary. He mentioned visiting the applicant's website, and speaking with their representatives, and he had yet to see a developer bring so much money without being afraid to make adjustments to roadways, etc. to address residents' concerns about the impacts their development might result in. They were more than willing to work with the Inverrary community to bring their project to fruition; vetoing their project without giving them a chance, resulting in nothing going forward could result in a future developer with little to no willingness to addressing the residents' concerns, such as preserving at least a portion of the golf course, etc. Mr. Cathcart commented the subject developer's team listened to the community, constantly communicating with the Inverrary Association, and city staff, doing a good job keeping community and city entities in the loop about their project; the current iteration of the project was not the same as that presented in 2024 because community representatives' and city staff's feedback led to the developer's team further improving the proposed project, something they continued to do month after month. The developer was only asking the community and the City to give them a chance to move forward to enable them to get to a point where they could present a site plan for the project. He understood many residents were scared, and if the subject developer later presented a project that the community disagreed with, a vote of two thirds of the residents could stop the project. Mr. Cathcart urged the residents present to let the developer prove they could propose a residential project the Inverrary community could support, suggesting resident visit their website to learn about how much the subject developer brought to the communities in which they developed residential projects, as it was so much more than just building houses. He too moved to Lauderhill because of the golf course, an area that no longer looked the same, and the subject developer wished to restore at least a portion of the land as a golf course.

Wilhelmine Carby, Lauderhill resident in International Village, echoed Mr. Cathcart's comments of support for the residents of Inverrary to give the subject developer a chance to present a project for residents to vote on. She was part of the Golf Progression Committee, and they worked extremely hard to make sure that everything, such as a feasibility study for traffic impacts, and they took excellent care to work with the Inverrary Association, on which she currently served. They sought to ensure that the proposed residential project was allowed to proceed, so developers could present the community with a development residents of Inverrary could be proud to support. She stated the numerous amenities would elevate Inverrary; already, the developer invested considerable funds in cleaning and maintaining the golf course property while working to get city approval, and community support. The proposed amendment was just the beginning of a very lengthy development process, and no one knew what would transpire over the next few years, including the time when the developer would need at least a two thirds vote from the community in order to proceed with their site plan.

Male speaker 1:20:21 commented that the new golf course, park, and other amenities would be owned by the Inverrary community, as the developer would gift them to the community when the development was completed. This was an opportunity Inverrary residents might never have again.

Tony Barrett, Lauderhill resident of Inverlake, stated he, too, served on the committee; while he urged each resident to consider that the power was in their vote. If the board approved the

proposed amendment, this did not mean that the developer had the two thirds Inverrary residents' vote they needed to proceed with their development. He asked that the developer put money in escrow to pay a transactional attorney, or a performance bond to show good faith, as verbal promises meant nothing to him. He said the Inverrary Association had one of the best transactional attorneys who spoke for them, so the community could vote on any issues that arose in Inverrary. He urged the developer's team not to take the Inverrary community for granted; they should ensure any amenities they proposed bringing to the community be state-of-the-art, similar to those found in other developments around the country.

Georgia Scott, Lauderhill resident in The Falls of Inverrary, expressed concern about what was taking place with the development at the Woodlands, and the traffic impacts it would have on Inverrary. She agreed the existing condition of the golf course property required improvements, as it was an eyesore; she supported giving the subject developer a chance to show what they proposed, agreeing it would likely lead to the needed improvements to the golf course, and an increase in surrounding property values, but she still had concerns.

Michelle Erskine, Lauderhill resident in Inverrary Boulevard Estates, noted that her position when she came to the present meeting was against the proposed development, but she was now rethinking her position based on the meeting's dialog. The main reason she was upset about the project was that she read that it would be 888 rental units, but she heard the applicant, and city staff state that it would be single-family homes, so she was getting mixed messaging. She said if they were rental units, she was totally against the project; if it was single-family homes, with a partially restored golf course, she could give her support.

Ms. Calhoun confirmed the residential development the applicant proposed were single family homes that would not be for rent; they would be for homeownership only.

George Erskine, Lauderhill resident of Inverrary Boulevard Estates, remarked on taxes increasing with the increase in property values, noting Lauderhill already had one of the highest tax rate in Broward County. He had no issue with the building of new homes in Inverrary, but increased taxes could lead to many people leaving Inverrary.

Angela ? 1:27:28, Lauderhill resident, and president of Sienna Ridge HOA, commented her community attended preliminary development meetings before, and their community continued to have issues with the golf course. She contacted the developer's representatives, as they could not wait for a project to come forward to develop the golf course property; they, in turn, contacted her, and they began cleaning up the golf course property. Residents were complaining about the weeds, and the wildlife, such conditions attracted, such as coyotes, etc.; she even asked them to cut back some of the old trees that were making the community look a mess. She said that if the developer was already so invested in addressing community concerns before they even had the community's vote to proceed with the development plans for their project, she believed there was still more for the community to benefit from if the developer was given a chance to proceed. This was not a yes to their project, but a yes to allow the developer to proceed with proving to the Inverrary community that they could improve the community. She said homes in Sienna Ridge sat on the golf course, and the residents there, like she, saw the improvements they already made, and their project had not started.

Ms. Tomlinson, Lauderhill resident in The Lakes of Inverrary for 26 years; she expressed concern that no one was speaking about the arsenic that would be brought out once the development started, as all golf courses used arsenic to prevent weed growth. When the digging started, and the arsenic was brought to the surface, anyone living in close proximity would breath it in, and get sick. She echoed concerns with increased traffic, particularly if the

developer built the full 888 units, with an estimated two cars per home; the existing roadways could not deal with the current traffic congestion, so she wished to know how the community would deal with the resulting traffic impact.

Eric Black, Lauderhill resident in Manors of Inverrary, stated when he moved into Inverrary, it was like a dream come true, but over a period of time he watched the standard of Inverrary decline, so he believed in the community doing whatever was possible to enhance the Inverrary community for the better. He questioned if as the new proposed housing moved forward, did this mean that the persons who lived in older, lower priced homes in Inverrary had to go backward, as he noticed was the case in neighborhoods in other cities when such large residential developments were built.

Denise Glass, Lauderhill resident of Las Vistas on Inverrary Drive, commented on having a little experience with the subject matter, as she was one of three plaintiffs in Miami-Dade County who sued the county for mowing down the last 193 acres of pine **(unintelligible 1:32:14)** in the world. She was cautiously optimistic, as she was all for improvement; however, she wished to warn people that the developer was motivated by money, and she saw the south Miami-Dade area go from agricultural to nothing but a traffic parking lot; this took place over time with the accomplishment of the various “milestones” developers accomplished that made things different. When she moved to Las Vistas, it was beautiful, and she had a gorgeous view across the water, and she knew that would change with the proposed development, and even though the subject developer said they intended to build a certain number of units, because they were motivated by money, sometimes things were out of their control, and they made changes to some things in order to do other things. No one knew what was really in the developer’s mind at present. Ms. Glass said she heard some good things, but she urged residents and city staff to be cautiously optimistic.

Ms. Calhoun commented, in response to some of the residents’ statements and concerns, it appeared that the community, for the most part, wished to give the developer a chance to move forward, as the residents, ultimately, had the right to vote yeh or nay on whatever the applicant presented to the community eventually. In terms of putting the cart before the horse with the board voting on the proposed amendment, nothing could proceed unless the subject amendment was first approved. Ms. Calhoun responded as to the issue of arsenic in the golf course soil, all golf courses contained a measure of arsenic; it was no secret, it was an environmental report that was presented by the applicant in the documents for the land use plan amendment application. As an attorney who worked previously on matters for golf course conversations, there were a number of requirements and regulations put in place by the City, County, and State that regulated how redevelopment could take place on golf course land. These including putting in place elements to ensure the safety of not just future residents of the homes to be built on those lands, but to ensure the safety of the existing residents in the area. Ms. Calhoun added that the subject developer had experience with developing housing on golf course land, so they were familiar with the required processes they had to go through to ensure the safety of existing and future residents. Again, as previously stated, the impacts resulting from the maximum 888 houses the applicant requested were already accounted for in the City’s Land Use Plan; they were a part of the total residential allocation in the dashed-line area, so they could be allocated anywhere within the latter where the allocation of residential units was made based on the study done years ago. She noted, again, the anticipated capacities for all impacts, including water, drainage, schools, traffic, etc. were all evaluated, and, as city staff stated, there was sufficient capacity to accommodate the number of units the applicant sought to build. The applicant was asking only for a maximum, but eventually, as the planning process progressed, more and more details would come to light to determine the final number. She invited residents to visit the developer’s website to learn more about their experience in the

construction industry, and the high quality of the residential and commercial products they developed. Ms. Calhoun restated the applicant's willingness to communicate and meet with the Inverrary community to work towards the entire community being happy with what was proposed. She urged the board to grant approval of the proposed amendment.

Vice Chairperson Pinder received no further comments from the public.

Mr. Schankweiler questioned if the areas in Inverrary zoned RM 45 were developed to their full capacity.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills replied there was a density and intensity conducted by the City in 2021, from which the 1, 142 dwelling units in the dashed-line area was determined. The majority of the properties in the dashed-line-area were already developed, with only one vacant property within the dashed-line area with a residential land use designation. The zoning map did not grant any units; this was done in the City's Land Use Plan.

Mr. Shender felt there were a number of issues the City needed to address, a major one being the traffic congestion on the Inverrary roadways, and it would only going to get more miserable. He wished to know what plans the City had with regard to handling existing, and future traffic congestion, even without including the impacts of the proposed project. He was involved with the Woodlands development, and they were very concerned that their water, and drainage systems were already antiquated, so building new homes that would depend on those systems was a major concern. The question was whether the City's systems was up to the task of accommodating the large development the developer wished to build.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills explained that the way the site plan process worked was when a new development was proposed, the developer had to demonstrate that their new project would not deteriorate the levels of service pertaining to water, sewer, traffic, schools, etc. This would be part of the site plan analysis city staff would conduct; in the subject case, there were several roads the City was evaluating with regard to improvements to address existing traffic congestion, and to make sure drivers had options for alternate routes. He noted Inverrary Boulevard was chosen as one of the roadways to be explored for improvement, and this was whether or not the proposed development came to fruition.

Mr. Grey questioned if the City should have recommended a more current study be conducted in light of the considerable development that had taken place since the 2021 study in and around City Hall, etc.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills replied there had been no new dwelling units added to the dashed-line area since that study was completed.

Ms. Calhoun mentioned that in response to being asked about the burrowing owls, she stated there were none currently according to the applicant's environmental report; if there were some at a later time, the applicant would deal with them at that time.

Vice Chairperson Pinder understood no new dwelling units were developed in the dashed-line area, asking if there were any new homes built in Lauderhill that impacted the City's traffic, and, if so, was this taken into consideration. She continued to be concerned that the addressing of traffic impacts was being left up to the developer; traffic congestion was a major issue in all Lauderhill, not just in the Inverrary area.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills explained the developer was not responsible for addressing everything related to traffic congestion throughout Lauderhill. The consideration of the development by the P&Z Board, and the City Commission was the impact the proposed development would have on existing roadways. For example, regarding traffic congestion on Commercial Boulevard, it would have to be shown the extent to which the proposed development created or exacerbated traffic on Commercial Boulevard in order to deny the approval of the applicant's project. He said if there were problems on the City's roadways with regard to traffic, etc., it was the City's responsibility to make needed improvements to drainage, and expand roads to accommodate traffic; this was a part of another ongoing process with the City, as in other cities. The need for such improvements was a given regardless of the decision the board was being asked to make regarding the subject item. He said the applicant had to provide a traffic study to the City, as the latter was responsible for Lauderhill's roadway system.

Ms. Calhoun commented that the applicant's traffic engineer, and the City's traffic engineer identified roadways to be studied with regard to possible improvements; two more applications with more details would come before the board for consideration, and include information on the roadways being studied, impacts the project created, and improvement plans to mitigate potential impacts. Additionally, new development created impact fees, which meant money paid to the City by the developer to address impacts, and those funds could be used by the City to address impacts in any area of the Lauderhill.

Mr. Shender noted, as an aside, the City needed to address drainage improvements on Lauderhill's roadways to deal with the deluge of water from tropical storms, and other major rain events. He claimed the City itself had no real answers for the amount of water Lauderhill received on a regular basis due to rain events, and added more housing served to increase such impacts; more houses, meant more water going into the City's drainage system.

Ms. Calhoun remarked Lauderhill's city engineers were very meticulous, and particular about making sure any development coming into Lauderhill connected properly to existing drainage systems; where improvements were needed to ensure adequate service, staff was vigilant about getting developers to make those improvements as part of any approval process. This she personally witnessed over the years of working with clients developing in Lauderhill.

MOTION TO APPROVE by Mr. Shender, as presented, and with a P&Z Board recommendation for approval to the City Commission.

SECOND by Mr. Mohammed.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

MEMBERS	YES	NO
Mr. Mohammed	X	
Mr. Lewis	X	
Vice Chairperson Pinder		X
Mr. Grey		X
Mr. Schankweiler		X

Mr. Shender	X	
-------------	---	--

**The motion failed 3-3.
(Split Vote – will move forward to City Commission)**

Mr. Keester-O’Mills stated the subject application was scheduled to go before the July 14, 2025, City Commission meeting for consideration.

2. **AN RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA, APPROVING A PLAT NOTE AMENDMENT TO THE LAUDERHILL MALL INVESTMENTS, LLC FOR THE LAUDERHILL MALL APARTMENTS MIXED-USE PROJECT AND RECOMMENDING THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA, APPROVE THE PLAT NOTE AMENDMENT TO THE LAUDERHILL MALL APARTMENTS, MIXED-USE PROJECT AT LAUDERHILL PROJECT TO ALLOW THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESIDENTIAL USES, CURRENTLY RESTRICTED ON THE PLAT, AND TO MAINTAIN 220,260 SQUARE FEET COMMERCIAL USES ON LOTS 1, 2, 3, 4, AND 5, COMPRISING A +/- 3.07 ACRE AREA ALONG THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE LAUDERHILL MALL AND IN THE COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL (CC) ZONING DISTRICT, LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS LAUDERHILL MALL OUTPARCELS B, BOOK 183, PAGE 374 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA, MORE COMMONLY KNOWN AS FOLIOS 494136380050, 494136380060, 494136380070 OR 1201 NW 40 AVE, LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA; PROVIDING FOR TRANSMITTAL; PROVIDING FOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

Vice Chairperson Pinder read the title of the subject application.

Mr. Keester-O’Mills explained the subject item was a plat note amendment for the Lauderhill Mall property; there was a site plan application that was filed by the applicant to do a 233 mixed use development in three buildings. That application was currently going through the process, and he expected it to come before the P&Z Board in the next couple of months, possible during the fall months. He said the applicant would come before the P&Z Board to present their proposed site plan application. The present consideration was to make a change to the existing plat note, which was one of the layers that city staff was charged with reviewing when considering approval of a proposed development; the layers included the effects on the City’s Land Use Plan, Comprehensive Plan, the Zoning Map, Land Development Regulation (LDR), and the plat. Mr. Keester-O’Mills noted in the current case, the proposed development would take place in along City’s transit-oriented corridor (TOC) that allowed such mixed-use development conceptually, with the zoning already in place, that is, community commercial zoning district, but the plat was restricted to commercial uses. Hence, the applicant was requesting a modification to the site’s plat notes to allow for the accommodation of the proposed residential/commercial mixed-use development. He said city staff recommended approval, with a number of conditions to be included as part of the applicant’s development order; specifically: site plan approval was required from the City’s Development Review Committee (DRC), the P&Z Board, and, subsequently, the City Commission; the applicant must

provide to the P&Z Department a copy of final reported plat amendment prior to building permit approval; the applicant must provide to the P&Z Department the final SCAD (school capacity availability determination) prior to building permit.

Mr. Schankweiler asked if the state legislation that was passed to allow residential development on commercially zoned properties would precede the proposed development.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills replied there were conditions and criteria associated with that legislation; it did not give developers carte blanche to develop what they desired. Specifically, the Live Local Act allowed for residential development on commercially zoned property provided that certain criteria were met. Such projects still had to through cities' various review processes, including reviews and recommendations by P&Z staff, the P&Z Board, etc.

The Applicant was represented by Hope Calhoun, land use attorney.

Ms. Calhoun reviewed the proposed application, as detailed in the backup, noting the subject property was an outparcel on the Lauderhill Mall (Mall) site. P&Z staff already reviewed existing zoning and land use, and the applicant's proposed use was permitted on the subject property. The current plat note spoke only to the existing commercial-only uses on the property; the applicant was requesting that the existing commercial square footage remain as is, as noted by the land use survey, and the applicant sought to add to that 233 midrise residential dwelling units on specific lots. The 233 units was a maximum number, and this did not mean that the applicant would construct 233 units, but it meant that the 233 number could not be exceeded; the units would be for rent. She mentioned that the subject developer donated a portion of the Mall property to Broward County Transit (BCT) to develop the existing Transit Center situated along 441.

Mr. Mohammed questioned if the applicant would do any road improvements along NW 12th Street, asking about the number of access points the proposed development would have.

Ms. Calhoun responded, similar to the prior item, the City asked the applicant to conduct a traffic study as part of the site plan process, evaluating affected roadways; when the site plan was developed by the applicant, the information presented to the City and the board would include any recommended improvements for adjacent and/or impacted roadways.

Vice Chairperson Pinder wondered if the proposed development would have any impact on the nearby stores, such as Charlie's Pastry's, etc.

Ms. Calhoun replied that any existing stores within the lots to be developed were already aware of the redevelopment; she was unable to say exactly what the plan was for those stores, but there was a plan. A special exception for the subject parcel was recently approved by the City Commission a few months prior to allow the proposed residential uses. The amendment to the plat note was the next step, and upon approval, the next step would be the site plan. She asked the board to approve a recommendation of approval to the City Commission.

Vice Chairperson Pinder opened the discussion to the public; she received no input.

MOTION TO APPROVE by Mr. Mohammed, as presented, and with a P&Z Board recommendation for approval to the City Commission.

SECOND by Mr. Schankweiler.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

MEMBERS	YES	NO
Mr. Mohammed	X	
Mr. Lewis	X	
Vice Chairperson Pinder	X	
Mr. Grey	X	
Mr. Schankweiler	X	
Mr. Shender	X	

The motion passed 6-0.

- 3. AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE CITY'S LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS BY AMENDING SCHEDULE I, ENTITLED "SIGN REQUIREMENTS," SECTION 8.0 "SPECIFIC SIGN REQUIREMENTS" BY MODIFYING THE STANDARDS FOR OFF-SITE NONCOMMERCIAL AND POLITICAL SIGNS TO PROVIDE CONSISTENT GUIDELINES FOR WHEN SIGNS MAY BE POSTED IN BOTH RESIDENTIAL AND NONRESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS; CREATING A TABLE TO CLARIFY THE ALLOWABLE CRITERIA RELATED TO TEMPORARY SIGNS, ESTABLISHING MAXIMUM SIGN AREA, SIGN DIMENSIONS AND TIME RESTRICTIONS; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY, AND CODIFICATION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

Vice Chairperson Pinder read the title of the subject application.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills explained, further detailed in the backup, that the subject item was an amendment to LDRs specific to noncommercial signs, such as political, campaign, election signs, and events all fell under this umbrella. Historically, they were called noncommercial, as a few years prior there was a Supreme Court case that many cities regulated signs differently based on the type of signs, and the Supreme Court ruled this was a discriminatory practice, as all noncommercial signs should be treated the same. He said the City amended its sign code to allow for certain sign types that every property was entitled to post. The purpose of the proposed amendment was to make tweaks to the noncommercial sign criteria. He noted since the report was drafted the previous week, there were a number of modifications to the language, with just slight modifications since the report was explained. In general, the type and size of noncommercial signs would remain the same; a number of modifications were requested in advance of the next election cycle, one being to increase the length of time a noncommercial sign could be posted before or during an election, proposing a time of 90 days, as opposed to the current code allowing 60 days. Another change was to increase the sign area allowed for such signs when they were placed on nonresidential property; that is, commercial and industrial land, and the area was allowed to go up to 36 square feet, up from the existing code allowing 32 square feet. Mr. Keester-O'Mills said much of the other tweaks

was reformatting, moving the language currently in just a paragraph into a tale, so it was simpler to navigate the information. He said the last amendment had to do with the patrolling and enforcement of the sign regulations, adding language that would allow the Broward Supervisor of Elections to remove signs if they were (unintelligible 2:19:18) area. Staff recommended the board approve moving the item to the City Commission for consideration.

Mr. Schankweiler thought the bond paid by persons wishing to post signs should be increased from \$200.00 to \$500.00.

Mr. Shender wondered what types of complaints/issues that were coming forward to the City regarding noncommercial signs that led to proposed amendments. He witnessed signs, such as election signs, sitting in place long after elections were over, asking if the proposed modifications would improve such occurrences, and the inundations of these signs.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills said the current code required candidates to remove their signs seven days after the event; this was not being changed in the proposed amendment. The genesis of the subject amendment was from a commissioner, not resident driven; the request sought to address the posting of signs to align with primary dates, as well as allowing for candidates running in general elections, and not necessarily for a primary, etc. He said in the case of candidates running in a general election, but not in a primary, primary candidates could have their sign out first, and the proposed amendment would increase the time allowed for both types of political candidates to have political signs posted at the same time.

Mr. Grey questioned, with the proposed increase in sign size, as to the process the City had in place to ensure that signs were properly anchored, and reinforced in the ground, such as in the case of a high wind.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills responded, with the proposed increase to the size of signs, the board could recommend parties were required to get a sign permit if the sign they wished to pose was greater than a set number of square feet. This was an additional criterion the board could recommend for inclusion among the proposed amendments to the City's existing sign code, as well as Mr. Schankweiler's earlier recommendation to increase the bond amount. There were no engineering standards for the temporary signs being discussed, but he understood the board's expressed concerns, and requiring a permit was one way to address them.

Vice Chairperson Pinder wished to know what was driving the need for larger signs.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills mentioned researching other cities' sign codes, and though each city did things their own way, 32 square feet appeared to be the limit as to larger signs allowed. Lauderhill was a unique shape, so when passersby driving along a major corridor, election candidates in one city could post signs of a certain size based on what their city allowed that could be different from the size permitted by another city on the other side of the roadway. Staff sought to create more consistency with neighboring cities.

Mr. Schankweiler observed a permit not be required, rather for persons wishing to post signs to provide engineering calculations to show their sign would meet the wind load.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills asked which city entity would review that if the sign application did not go through permitting, and having a permit would establish such guidelines, and ensure someone was reviewing such information.

Mr. Schankweiler thought engineering staff could do this; requiring a permit would remove the exemption from needing a permit. The amendment should include requiring adherence to a site triangle to prevent posted signs from blocking lines of sight for vehicles and pedestrians.

Mr. Keester-O’Mills remarked that the current city code did not have setbacks for posted signs, where they could be located on private property. This could be another recommendation from the board, as it would be a good safety rule. He said these, and the abovementioned conditions could be added to the motion to approve the proposed amendments.

Mr. Schankweiler wondered if persons wishing to post signs needed to also submit where the sign(s) would be posted, along with a letter of approval from the property owner allowing them to post the sign(s).

Mr. Keester-O’Mills said he was unaware of any city approval requirement that persons wishing to post signs on private property had to show the City they had permission to install sign(s).

Mr. Schankweiler stated his motion to approve moving the proposed amendment to the City Commission with a board recommendation of approval, adding language for the following to the amendment: for commercial sites, large signs should be set back from the entry and exit points of the posting site for public safety reasons, with the safe distance being established by the city engineer; and including some process for the city engineer to certify the safety of signs posted.

MOTION TO APPROVE by Mr. Schankweiler, as presented, and as noted above, with a P&Z Board recommendation for approval to the City Commission.

SECOND by Mr. Shender

ROLL CALL VOTE:

MEMBERS	YES	NO
Mr. Mohammed	X	
Mr. Lewis	X	
Vice Chairperson Pinder	X	
Mr. Grey	X	
Mr. Schankweiler	X	
Mr. Shender	X	

The motion passed 6-0.

H. NEW BUSINESS: NONE

I. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: NONE

J. NEXT MEETING DATE:

The next P&Z Board meeting would be held on Tuesday, July 29, 2025 @ 7:00 p.m.

K. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:46 p.m.