



PLANNING & ZONING ADVISORY BOARD

Draft

Minutes of November 6, 2023

Meeting Called to order at 7:00 P.M.

1. ROLL CALL

P&Z Board Members

MEMBERS	11/6/23	7/10/23	4/03/23	2/06/23	10/17/22	8/15/22	7/25/22	5/02/22	4/04/22	2/07/22
Jimmy Goulet	P	P	P	A	A	P	P	P	P	P
David Rouse	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	A	P
Jim Federici	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Kelly Brown	P	A	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P
Alex Weisberg	P	P	P	P	P	A	P	P	P	P
William Barkins	P	P	P	A	P	P	A	P	P	P
James Curran	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Natalie Mor	A	A	P	P						
Robin Morganstine	P	P	P	P						
Michelle Stern	P	A	P	P						

* New appointment

STAFF PRESENT: *Carlos Vega, Director of Community Development*
Jason Chockley, Assistant Director of Community Development
Jacob Horowitz, City Attorney
Jarel & Michelle Lopez, Jamel & Ana Maria (Lily) Lopez, Applicants

2. P&Z BOARD - MINUTES - WAIVE/APPROVE MINUTES OF 07/10/2023:

Motion to waive the reading of the minutes made by William Barkins and seconded by Jimmy Goulet. All eyes on voice vote. **MOTION WAS APPROVED.** Motion to approve the minutes made by James Curran and seconded by William Barkins. All eyes on voice vote. **MOTION WAS APPROVED.**

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None

4. NEW BUSINESS:

GALA RESIDENCES

Rezoning #Z 8-1-23

Chairman Rouse turned the item 4A over to Mr. Chockley.

Mr. Chockley introduced the item as a rezoning application for what is known as the Gala residences. It is located at the Northwest Corner, Northwest 37th Street and Northwest 100th Avenue, approximately half a mile south of Stirling Road. Current land use designation is E Estate and the request is to rezone from E-2 Broward County to E-1 Cooper City, to construct two single family homes on 1.34 and 1.15 acre lots. The subject site is approximately 2.4 acres in size and is presently vacant. The existing zoning and land use designations were inherited from Broward County and are the same as existing before the

property was annexed into City of Cooper City. The rezoning is necessary in order for the lot to be developed with two single family homes because the current County zoning of E-2 requires a minimum lot size of two net acres per house. All zoning changes must first come before the Preservation Board for a recommendation and must be approved by a super majority vote at City Commission. Consistency with the comp plan, the proposed E-1 estate district is consistent with the existing estate land use plan designation and that the density does not exceed that allowed or envisioned by the City comp plan. Land use compatibility, the requested zoning with a minimum proposed lot size of just over one net acre would be consistent with the surrounding zoning districts and existing land uses. The requested zoning would allow a maximum of two units on the existing 2.4 acre lot, 1.34 and 1.15 for each new proposed lot. Traffic impacts, the rezoning requests would not increase traffic impacts on the surrounding roadways since it is just two single family homes. Staff acknowledges that the applicant has addressed the review criteria for the application to be processed before the Preservation Board and the Planning and Zoning Board. The Preservation Board per this item on November 1, 2023 and had a 5-0 approval for vote. The Planning and Zoning Board has now discussed and deliberate second recommendation which will be forwarded to City Commission for final action. The rezoning request would also add one flex unit being dedicated to this lot for that second house being constructed. The applicant is here with a presentation. We can go right into that or I'll be happy to answer any questions from the Board.

Chairman Rouse turned it over to staff for any questions the Board might have.

Mr. Weisberg asked an inaudible question regarding staff recommendations.

Mr. Chockley said anytime you have a rezoning, staff stays neutral. We don't necessarily recommend approval or denial, but we have in there that if the Board is going to recommend approval, that part of the motion locks them into those acre sizes as being specified. Within the E-1 you can have a lower lot size than what they're asking for, but to ensure that in the long run we get what we're approving here, make that a condition of approval for the 1.15 and the 1.34.

Mr. Goulet asked an inaudible question concerning the annexation process.

Mr. Chockley said in the early 2000s, Broward County was going to get out of the land management. This was unincorporated for Broward County. Anything that was an unincorporated area had two options. They could either merge into an existing city or they had to become their own. A lot of pockets were obviously too small to become their own cities, but West Park was a function of Broward County making this rule and they became their own city. When this particular area was having to make a choice, they basically shopped around between us, Davie, Pembroke Pines or Hollywood because the map felt where they could have that as an option because of Brian Piccolo Park. They basically negotiated with those cities on who would offer what. Their concern was any of these surrounding cities enforcing their new laws and regulations upon what they had grown accustomed to of a rural estate area. So the City agreed to having them have their own Preservation Board, so anything that involved a rezoning, their own Board would get to make a recommendation which will be sent to City Commission as you guys do and that any Commission action would take a super majority vote. Ultimately though it is still up to City Commission on what happens, but their Preservation Board was set up so they would get a formal say and a review to help control what would take place in their area.

Mr. Goulet asked an inaudible question regarding density and some of the larger tracts of land in the neighborhood.

Mr. Chockley said each petition is judged on its own merits and its own justifications. This project is a little simpler because it's only two acres and they're only asking to build two houses. For anything more than two acres, Broward County requires you to plat and to site plan. That goes through a lot more formal review than just the construction of two single family houses on two acre estate lots. Most of the larger tracks that would possibly come in the future to do what they're asking to do are the five and ten acre tracks that are back there. That is going to have to plat and it is going to have to site plan. When you get into drainage district requirements of having to do lakes and retention that starts eating away at the lot sizes, so it's not quite apples to apples. This is a rezoning from an E-2 to an E-1, so they would have that in common, but those larger tracks of land would also have other things that these petition does not and those could make differences when the Boards are evaluating.

Ms. Brown asked about how we're defining homes per acre and dwelling units so that we're restricting this to single family units, not multifamily units. She asked if, going forward, if this were to be taken down and then a new improvement were put on here if it is limited to single family units for improvement.

Mr. Chockley said yes. It would be limited to the single family homes just by nature of our code definitions of single family and the zoning district.

Ms. Brown asked if there are any restrictive covenants on splitting out the parcel or maintaining unity of title or if it could be split out and sold off differently

Mr. Chockley said you can sell the property as it is now, as you know, but that doesn't mean that you have the right to build other than what the zoning currently permits.

Mr. Curran asked if anyone could go in there and build a quad or a duplex.

Mr. Chockley said no.

Dr. Barkins asked what restrictions there would be on short-term rentals.

Mr. Chockley said from current legislation, we can't ban short term rentals if that came in. The applicant is here tonight and they're going to go through their presentation on what they're trying to accomplish for these lots, but the state prevents us from outright banning short-term rentals. There is a process where they have to apply to the City and get licensed and inspected for that, but we couldn't ban them.

Ms. Stern asked an inaudible question regarding the lot sizes in the area.

Mr. Chockley said there are a couple lots in there that are just over three quarters of an acre. They were permitted long before they came into the City, so we inherited them that way. At the Preservation Board, there was a woman who was one of the original owners and knew a lot. Historically when somebody got

the County to approve, I forget what road it was, there were multiple units, even though they were within an E-2, the County permitted them just under an acre. It's like fifteen homes on that block.

Ms. Stern asked an inaudible follow up question regarding the same issue.

Mr. Chockley said when the applicant goes through the PowerPoint, they have a whole slide that they put together that shows the zoning districts and shows what lots are tied to what acreages.

Chairman Rouse asked for any additional questions from the Board

There were none.

Chairman Rouse said this is going to be our first meeting where we actually have a quasi-judicial process where people will be sworn in. He asked Mr. Horowitz to give us just a synopsis of exactly what that pertains to and what in general it really is.

Mr. Horowitz said quasi-judicial in general is really to protect the applicant. We know that property owners and applicants have rights and that is to ensure that there is both procedural and substantive due process for any application that is considered both by our City Commission and now in the context of RP and Zoom. Something that is a little unique as it relates to the process that Cooper City has adopted is that you're using a quasi-judicial procedure but you're not a final decision-making body. You're still making a recommendation to the City Commission. Part of the City Commission's motivation in implementing a quasi-judicial procedure for Planning and Zoning is to ensure that when you evaluate an application, you're doing it under the same criteria that the Commission will ultimately be bound by when they make a final decision. Now procedurally, anybody who comes and speaks before the Board will be sworn in. All testimony is taken under oath. Any evidence or presentation that's submitted all becomes part of a formal and final record that will subsequently be presented to the City Commission for their ultimate consideration and approval or denial as they see fit. The key ultimately when it comes to quasi-judicial is there is a legal standard when it comes to making a decision. This is true for variances. It's true for site plan applications and rezoning. In the context of rezoning, there are a couple things to keep in mind. Procedurally the applicant is required to do a couple things. They have the burden of demonstrating that their application is consistent with the City's comprehensive plan and your professional staff can confirm that for you at the appropriate time. They also have the burden of showing that all of the procedural steps, context of notice, of submitting an application and all the other procedural requirements of the code have been satisfied. Again, your staff can confirm that after the applicant's had an opportunity to present. Once the applicant's burden has been satisfied, the burden then shifts to the City in the context of a decision. What essentially it boils down to is if the City seeks to reject the application for any reason, the City would need to demonstrate that there's a legitimate public purpose in ensuring that the zoning remains the same on that property or that denying the zoning application is not arbitrary, capricious, discriminatory or otherwise unreasonable. In other words, there has to be an articulated clear reason on the record why the Commission or why this Board would deny the application if the applicant has otherwise met his or her burden. That's the legal standard that ultimately the Commission is bound to and, if in the unlikely event there were a challenge, that a judge would consider.

Mr. Weisberg asked an inaudible question regarding the requirements for documentation of such a denial.

Mr. Horowitz said I would suggest that it would be appropriate to (document reasons for denial) if the Board were to reject the application because the Commission is ultimately going to be bound by that standard. One of their charges is getting a better understanding of why this Board made the decision that it did, so it would give the Commission some insight into your collective thinking when it comes time to consider your recommendation as part of their evaluation of the application.

Chairman Rouse asked the Board for any other questions they might have for counsel.

There were none.

Chairman Rouse turned it over to the applicants for their presentation.

Applicants Mr. Jarel Lopez, Mrs. Michelle Lopez and Ms. Lois Guffey, a member of the public, were sworn in by City Attorney Mr. Jacob Horowitz.

Mrs. Lopez introduced herself as Michelle Lopez. She said this is my family: my brother-in-law, Jamel, my sister-in-law Lily and my husband Jarel. In the images above there that you could see, the kids up there are our daughters, my husband and my daughters, Aliya and Amelia, and then my nephews, Grey and London. As you may know, we're here to discuss our request to split our jointly owned property into two parcels so we can build homes for our families. I've added a little tidbit in there. GALA stands for Gray, Amelia, London and Aliya, my youngest one's name. Our request consists of converting an E-2 Estate district into two E-1 district for the development of two single family homes. Each home will consist of 5,100 square feet, one sitting at 1.34 acres and the other at 1.15 acres. Our initial goal was to divide the property directly down the middle at 1.25 each. However, to ensure we align with all setback requirements, the lot sizes were adjusted. An opposition petition was promoted throughout the community in the title and throughout the verbiage of the petition, it indicated we were requesting a variance. I would like to provide some clarification. We are rezoning but do not require a variance. For further clarification, according to Cooper City Ordinance code, Section 23-153, a variance is a modification of a zoning district. Because we are not modifying the zoning district and are aligned with all requirements, we do not need to request a variance. The next several slides will address the five concerns in the opposition petition and we'll simultaneously provide evidence that we are consistent with the established rural residential lots in the area and with the remainder of Royal Palm Ranches area. We're also in alignment with Cooper City Development plan, the ordinances and the requirements in the annexation agreement. Before we go into addressing all the concerns from the opposition petition, please note keeping time in mind, each concern is summarized to focus on the concern itself. Concern number one: the history of the Royal Palm Ranches, its annexation into Cooper City and the subsequent agreement to maintain its rural character. Our rezoning request respects the spirit of the annexation agreement. The conversion from E-2 to two E-1 lots does not compromise the rural nature of the area. Instead, it maintains the original agreement between Broward County, Cooper City, and the members of the Royal Palm Ranches community. Evidence will be provided in the next several slides. Concern number two: following the details of the process required in the annexation agreement and the specific obligations by the City to the owners of the Royal Palm Ranches. Having reviewed the annexation agreement, we have insured full compliance. Further detail will be shown on the next slide. As of 14

September, 2023, Cooper City was provided with required materials to send out the notification to all applicable residents. Consequently, the Preservation Board meeting was scheduled and completed November 1st and here we are today. This is a breakdown to show how we comply with the annexation agreement and its specific obligations. Exhibit C an annexation agreement being the section which addresses the agreement between Cooper City and the members of the Royal Palm Ranches residents. The first requirement indicates the Royal Palm Ranches will be a preservation area. Staying within the E Estate district allows us to maintain the parameters of the area and allows the preservation to remain intact. Second requirement: Cooper City will adopt all zoning classifications of Broward County to maintain the rural atmosphere. Parceling the land in the two E-1s maintains Broward County's requirement for land size and the setbacks indicated for our proposal maintains 125 feet and width required. Third requirement: any and all zoning changes must be approved by the City Commission. Currently we have a date scheduled to go before the City Commission as required in the annexation agreement. The last two requirements are for the notification of the residents and the Preservation Board meeting to be set. The notifications were sent out and arrived fifteen days prior to the Preservation Board meeting which occurred November 1st. Concern number three: assumptions about rezoning intentions to only one acre and the fear of doing so will lead to the decimation of the rural atmosphere. Splitting an E-2 into two E-1 plots maintains the Estate district zoning and is consistent with the development plan, the annexation agreement and Cooper City ordinances. There are several homes as indicated in this slide for homes to the east and the south of our property that are zoned as E-1. There is approximate distance and square footage associated on that slide. On this slide you'll see a chart which indicates a total of seventy-eight homes zoned E-1 in the Royal Palm Ranches community and twenty-seven zoned E-2. In the graph, you could see that almost 75% of the properties within the Royal Palm Ranches community are zoned as E-1 which provides evidence that our request will not decimate the rural atmosphere of the community. This slide is just another visual image to provide the identification of the E-1 properties and the E-2 properties within the community. Concern number four: perceived alterations to the community. As highlighted in the visual aids from the previous slides, our request is consistent with established rural residential lots in the area and with the Royal Palm Ranches community in its entirety. Concern number five: the implication of altering longstanding property acreage. Most of the properties were zoned as E-1 prior to the annexation. Rezoning our property will not adversely alter the community's longstanding property acreage. The annexation agreement focused on preserving the rural environment through both E-2 and E-1 designations. Therefore, our proposal aligns with the foundational intent. Verbal concern: If we were allowed to parcel a property, it would make it easier for someone to come and divide the horse farm. We assured the community during the Preservation Board meeting that we would stand with them if a developer tried to turn the horse farm into townhouses or anything that causes a deviation from the current E-Estate district zoning. We believe in and want to aid in the preservation of the Estate district as indicated in the annexation preservation agreement. In an effort of transparency, we visited over thirty homes throughout the neighborhood talking to people so they would understand what we are doing in reference to developing our land. During the Preservation Board meeting I initially stated we garnered support from eleven individuals verbally and sixteen via written support. However, I would like to provide a correction. We received verbal support from nine people and eighteen signatures through petitions and written letters. That total would be nineteen if you count my brother-in-law, Jamel's signature. My husband ended up having the support letters that were missing from our initial count. However, the figures on the slide accurately reflect the written support sent to Jason prior to this meeting for record keeping purposes. Although the majority of the homes we visited were in support of parceling our property, it was evident that the opposition petition contaminated some of our efforts. Some of the individuals who verbally supported us did so after they

already signed the opposition petition and others would not sign for fear of retaliation or causing trouble. The Preservation Board meeting occurred 1 November, 2023 at 6:30. After some deliberation, the Board did agree to ultimately approve our request with five out of five votes. In conclusion, as identified in the presentation, our proposal aligns with the annexation agreement between Cooper City and the Royal Palm Ranches community and maintains consistency with neighboring zoning. Further benefit, it aligns with all City and County regulatory compliance, boosts property values and allows us to build homes in a community we love, intend to be a part of, cherish and aid in its growth and wellbeing. Thank you.

Chairman Rouse turned it over to the Board for any questions they might have for the petitioner.

Mr. Federici asked an inaudible question regarding the concerns mentioned in the presentation.

Mrs. Lopez said the five concerns that were addressed in my presentation were the concerns written throughout the opposition petition. It covered the history of the Royal Palm Ranches and the annexation agreement and the rural character. They were mainly concerned with the rural character and going from E-2 to E-1. They were afraid that we were going to ruin the rural atmosphere of the community in itself. That was prior to a lot of them realizing that 75% of the houses within the community were E-1.

Mr. Curran asked an inaudible question regarding the selection of this community for their project.

Mrs. Lopez said the main reason why we did pick specifically the Royal Palm Ranches community is because of the community itself. We like the fact that there's horses and goats and chickens and that we would have a community that we can have our kids grow up in. I have a 19-year-old who's going to NSU right now for nursing and she wants to be an anesthesiologist nurse. Right now, we live in Plantation which is close. Cooper City is also close. The school system! I mean you guys know your school system is amazing. Being a military brat and being part of military schools, I want to give the same type of education to my kids. My brother-in-law and sister-in-law have two boys and I have another daughter as well who would benefit from Cooper City schools. My husband and his twin have a dream of living right next to each other forever. What an amazing wife I am, right? To be like, "Yes, let's do this dream and live right next to my in-laws." which I love dearly. I am just pointing out that we're trying to make their dream come true at the same time.

Mr. Lopez introduced himself as Jarel Lopez. He said we lived in Plantation Estate where we had a half acre. We looked for probably ten years waiting for someone to sell their house in our neighborhood and no one sold. So one day my brother called me with his wife and said, "Hey, we found property." It started off as a joke that we could live next door to each other and build a house but that's what we did. That day we made a decision to list our house. We said we are going to buy a property and invest for our kids to come to a city that will be warm and welcome to them so they can grow up there. I grew up moving around from house to house. I moved from Coral Springs to Plantation and went to different elementary schools, and different high schools. I wanted to give my kids something stable, something that they'll grow with friends in their community and they're not bussed in from everywhere else.

Mrs. Lopez said I want to add also that I am twenty minutes closer to work from this location. I work at Homestead Air Reserve Base and that's a drive. That is another benefit.

Mr. Weisberg asked, first of all, who got the bigger lot.

Mrs. Lopez said we do.

Mr. Weisberg asked an inaudible question concerning the lot itself and asked the petitioner to put the slide back up which contained the colored dots showing different lot sizes and locations.

Mrs. Lopez said there is a red square where our lot is located. It's over on the left-hand side.

[Inaudible discussion regarding the PowerPoint slide followed]

Mr. Chockley said to the east they have that ten acre horse barn.

[Inaudible discussion followed]

Mr. Weisberg said I drove out there the other day. He asked if the property just to the south contained two homes.

Mrs. Lopez said yes. It has a mother-in-law house there.

Mr. Weisberg said that he saw the lot when he was there. In the application, one of the things that you say is that the proposed change will enhance the current living conditions in the neighborhood. He asked the applicant to elaborate on that.

Mrs. Lopez said that was added in there only based off of the upkeep that we experienced in our previous community. In the previous community where we lived, it was not as well maintained as the Royal Palm Ranches community. They maintain it really well but that thought process was based off of our previous home. We are very meticulous in maintaining our property. We know that encourages other people to do the same and keep it up. That was really what that was about.

Ms. Brown said I just want to say I think it's great that you guys are choosing to raise your family together. That is very consistent with what Cooper City is all about.

Dr. Barkins asked if there were there any architectural concerns by the people living around you or the Preservation Board

Mrs. Lopez said yes. A member of the Preservation Board did ask me if we would be willing to change our architectural design and I explained to him the reason why. He was referring specifically to the flat roof and that we're very rectangular. I explained that my job is occupational safety and health at Homestead Air Reserve Base. All I think about is safety. No one is a fan of hurricanes. I am not a fan of hurricanes. So for us, we chose the flat roof because we're doing precast construction so that the roof will actually be concrete. This design will also allow one of our rooms in the homes with no windows to be a hurricane safe shelter for us. That is one of the reasons why we chose the flat roof. We also chose it because in our previous home we had a problem with termites a couple times where you have to tent the home. We wanted to avoid that. Also, our last home had a metal roof and we know it is a withstanding roof as far as the years go and we know that a flat roof is also withstanding as far as the years go.

Dr. Barkins said from what I saw on the plans, it doesn't seem to blend into the rural design.

Mrs. Lopez said that is correct. It doesn't blend into a rural design.

Dr. Barkins asked if the Board had a problem with that.

Mrs. Lopez said after we explained the reason why we went with that design, they no longer mentioned it or referenced it again.

[Inaudible discussion]

Mr. Federici said, as far as rural, they have got some really beautiful houses built back there. I am a land guy though. I really do like land. I did drive back there and I do have a few friends back there. Honestly, no offense, it's kind of a mishmash area. You got some big beautiful houses and you got some real not-so-beautiful houses. You want to build some nice homes. One concern I had is you've got an E-2 area where you've got railroad cars parked on it. It is two containers. I'm just not sure how that fits in that area. I am partial to the twin situation because I do have identical twin brothers who do live next door of each other as crazy as it sounds. My big concern is that ten acre parcel. I'm going to be kind of candid with you. I heard a couple of people feel that, your builder I believe, I'm not going to use the word shake down, but yeah, it sounds like he's shaking them down saying that if you don't approve this thing there, there's going to be some issues here. He asked if their builder has anything to do with that ten acres east of you.

Mrs. Lopez said not that I'm aware of.

Mr. Lopez said he doesn't own it. They're still up for sale. It's been up for sale for around ten years.

Mr. Federici said they'd better find a new realtor.

Mr. Lopez said it has been up for sale for ten years. The prices, if you check, it's going up from five to seven million, back and forth. They are still right now where it goes up and down.

Mr. Federici said he had a question for Mr. Chockley. He asked if they could use a loophole & build these homes and have a breezeway in the middle and use one kitchen.

Mr. Chockley said under the E-2 zoning district, you could have one house on that two acres. It would be a loophole because there is an ordinance in their code that says you can only have one kitchen. But if you had a large house with one kitchen, they do meet the definition of single family even though there would be eight of them living in there because they're all related. In our code, the definition of a single family is no more than three unrelated individuals within one house. So if they built a 10,000 square foot house with one kitchen, since they all are of relation that would not be a violation of a single family zoning district. They would only have the one kitchen, so they would meet a single family residence criteria.

Mr. Goulet asked what the Preservation Board is actually preserving. He asked, if it is an area where we're going to have birds and foxes and all kinds of animals, that's one thing, but he asked what the Preservation Board would have to do with this lot.

Mr. Chockley said the Preservation Board was created as a condition of the annexation so that neighborhood and those residents would get a formal recommendation of any rezoning petitions. That Board is supposed to be the sounding board. If they feel like what an applicant is asking for doesn't meet the character or the intent, they could send to Commission a recommendation of denial.

Mr. Goulet asked if they were preserving a neighborhood, not an environment.

Mr. Chockley said that is up to their choosing. They are there to hear all rezoning petitions and make a recommendation which is sent to City Commission. That is their role.

Chair Rouse asked for any other comments or concerns before opening the public hearing.

Mr. Lopez said, in all due respect, when we talk about following the neighborhood, before we purchased the lot, we had ninety days discovery to make sure that we were doing everything correct. We went into the neighborhood. By living in Plantation, they said to make sure you look at what else is built in the neighborhood. We are not the only house that is in there with a flat roof design and I don't think we're the only one that's trying to build a flat roof. We looked around as much as we could to do our due diligence before selling our house and to build a house.

Chairman Rouse opened the public hearing at 7:38 PM.

Ms. Guffey introduced herself as Lois Guffey. She said I live on 35th Street and we have one acre. And I'm sure the gentleman here knows, he says he was here, but there were a lot of people, it felt like old home week. We bought the property in 1979 and it took us five years to pay for the property to be able to build a house on it. So we've lived there since 1984. We've had many, many Christmas parties. I have never met these people until I came November 1st and I just said, "I'm here because I'm for you and I just want to welcome you to the neighborhood." And really, that's what our neighborhood is because we really love people and that's kind of a crazy neighborhood because a lot of those people know each other. I ride my bike in there now that I'm retired. I used to work all the time. A lot of the people that were retired know everybody in the neighborhood. A few blocks away is Dale Oakes. There were about three people that did speak against it. And it was people that more had the two and a half acres and stuff like that. And I can understand that. And the other thing is we have some beautiful homes in there that are painted white and they've got the gray and the new colors of black and everything. I said, "We really need to progress into the future and calm down because the styles, they are changing." And so we need to move to the future and have nice young families with kids and all ages of people in our neighborhood. I'm one of the old farts, but that's it. I'm for it. There were a lot of neighbors here that were for it and only about three spoke up against it. One lady that was against it, she said something and the people yelled out from the audience because I think it had to do with the acreage. And they said, "How many acres do you have?" And of course she only had one acre and she was complaining that they were dividing it into one acre.

Chairman Rouse closed the public hearing at 7:42 PM.

MOTION: TO APPROVE GALA RESIDENCES #Z 8-1-23 MADE BY JAMES CURRAN AND SECONDED BY JIMMY GOULET. THERE WERE ALL AYES ON THE ROLL CALL VOTE. MOTION WAS APPROVED.

5. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REPORT:

Chairman Rouse turned it over to Mr. Chockley to inform what petitions they have upcoming.

Mr. Chockley said we have a couple of petitions that will be coming up shortly. I don't think that they'll be before the end of the year. It will probably be January. I've talked to you guys a couple times regarding the Hanson property being built with CC Devco. They're going to their second DRC this Wednesday. Like I was saying, they're probably anticipating a January Planning and Zoning Board. We also have the last outparcel at Cooper City Commons at Sheridan and Pine Island. They're coming in with a site plan for a new Taco Bell. That is getting ready to start the DRC process. I would expect maybe a February or March meeting for that. The Wendy's is getting a remodel out at Cooper City Commons as well. They came in with an administrative approval, not a site plan requirement. So we'll have a brand new Wendy's facade plus this new Taco Bell. You guys frequently ask about the Winn-Dixie. Carlos and I actually walked that last month and met with the owners for the inside of the store. They have put a ton of money on the inside getting it all freshened up. They have new fixtures. They're still working on getting some of the permit and approvals for the refrigeration units with the landlord and finalizing interior plans, but 100% they are moving forward. He was \$3 million into this job so far. It is a long time coming due to the complications with equipment, things like that, but they were looking at first quarter of 2024 as their target date. They felt it was too risky to finish up by the end of the year so that is their target date as of now. We do have a couple of new digital marquee signs going in front of both BSO Police and the opposite corner of Sue Ellen Fardelmann Park which will have all of the City advertised meetings and other notifications. Those will be two brand new nice signs going in the next probably month and a half. That concludes my report on current activity and upcoming petitions.

Mr. Federici asked for an update on the Sun Credit Union project.

Mr. Chockley said they are getting ready to resubmit back in due to the change in market and some construction delays with COVID. They did not start construction prior to the site plan expiring. The code does have an 18-month start date to get permits after site plan approval and that time has passed. He will be submitting back in to re-go through that site plan. Overall, it was a great project so I wouldn't suspect there'd be many issues with it. The wild card, which he's vetting now, would be if the drainage district has changed any regulations since his last approval. That could change the dynamic of the site plan. I haven't heard back from him where he is on that and if that will be an issue or not.

6. BOARD MEMBER CONCERNS:

Chairman Rouse turned it over to the Board for any concerns they might have.

There were none.

7. **ADJOURNMENT:**

Meeting adjourned at 7:46 PM.