

Mr. Brink said that it will look similar to how it looks today but will include landscaping and fencing.

Mr. Stacer closed the public hearing.

**MOTION** was made by Jerry Mills and second by Rhonda Eaton to recommend approval of the right-of-way abandonment PZ #18-18000001 per Alternative Motion I as described in the staff report. All voted in favor of the motion; therefore, the motion passed.

## **H.    REZONINGS**

### **3.    ISLAMIC CENTER OF SOUTH FLORIDA INC / ISLAMIC CENTER OF SOUTH FLORIDA Planning and Zoning #17-13000008**

Consideration of the REZONING submitted by **SALAH ELROWENY** on behalf of **ISLAMIC CENTER OF SOUTH FLORIDA INC.** to rezone the property from RM-12 (Multiple-Family Residence) to CF (Community Facility) in order to add a full-time school to the property. The subject site currently consists of the worship hall, an administration area, and 11 weekend-school classrooms. The applicant's short-term plan is to expand the educational uses starting with preschool and elementary-grade levels. The long-term plan is to eventually provide preschool to 12th grade education. The existing classrooms will serve for the short-term preschool and elementary-grade phase; however for the long-term preschool – 12th grade phase, new construction will be necessary. All parcels are legally defined as follows:

ALL OF "FERNANDER / WRIGHT SUBDIVISION" ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF  
AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 159, PAGE 6 OF THE PUBLIC RECORD OF BROWARD  
COUNTY RECORDS

AKA: 1641 NW 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
ZONED: RM-12 (Multiple-Family Residence 12)  
PROPOSED: CF (Community Facility)  
STAFF CONTACT: Maggie Barszewski (954) 786-7921

Mr. Daniel Keester-O'Mills, Principal Planner, stated that the applicant is requesting to rezone the property from RM-12 (Multiple-Family Residence) to CF (Community Facility) in order to add a full-time school to the property. The property received a Special Exception approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals in 2006 for a house of worship. Religious education is permitted as an accessory use to the house of worship use. The subject site currently consists of the worship hall, an administration area, and 11 classrooms for weekend use. The applicant's short-term plan is to expand the educational uses starting with preschool and elementary-grade levels. The long-term plan is to

eventually provide preschool to 12<sup>th</sup> grade education. The existing classrooms will serve for the preschool and elementary-grade phase while new construction will be necessary for the additional grades up to 12th. The rezoning application was reviewed by the DRC on February 7, 2018. The Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) commented at DRC that the request is “not in conflict with the CRA Redevelopment Plan, Goals, or Objectives” and all other DRC comments concerned future considerations to be addressed at the time of site plan review. Section 3.02.A.5 of the Comprehensive Plan’s Land Use Element states that Community Facilities is a permitted use in residentially-designated land “to serve the residential area, such as schools, day care centers, churches, clinics, nursing homes, governmental administration, police and fire protection facilities, libraries and civic centers.

Given the information provided to the Board, as the finder of fact, staff provides the following recommendation and alternative motions, which may be revised or modified at the Board’s discretion.

**Alternative Motion I**

Recommend approval of the rezoning request as the board finds the rezoning application is consistent with the aforementioned pertinent Future Land Use policies.

**Alternative Motion II**

Table this application for additional information as requested by the Board.

**Alternative Motion III**

Recommend denial as the Board finds that the request is not consistent with the following pertinent Future Land Use policies.

**Policy 01.03.04** Consider the preservation of established single family neighborhoods in all rezonings, land use plan amendments and site plan approvals.

**Policy 01.03.06** Consider density and intensity revisions with an emphasis on minimal negative impacts to existing residential areas, particularly single family areas.

**Policy 01.03.11** Consider the compatibility of adjacent land uses in all Land Use Plan amendments and rezonings.

**Policy 01.03.12** The following criteria may be used in evaluating rezoning requests:

1. Density;
2. Design;
3. Distance to similar development;
4. Existing adjoining uses;
5. Proposed adjoining uses;
6. Readiness for redevelopment of surrounding uses; and.
7. Proximity to mass transit.

Staff recommends alternative motion I.

Mr. Salah Elroweny (480 S. Cypress Road, Pompano Beach, FL) introduced himself as a local architect and representative for the applicant. He stated that staff did a good job at explaining the application and he could answer any questions the Board might have.

Ms. Jackson asked if a traffic study was done.

Mr. Elroweny stated that they have not done a traffic study since they are only requesting the rezoning, but they will do it once they propose construction and if the City requires it. An analysis was done to determine how many cars they can store for queuing and found that about 54 cars can be stored, which could accommodate 540 students. They only anticipate having about 200 students, however, 10 years from now. He explained that this type of school typically adds a new grade each year.

Ms. Jackson asked if the applicant is looking for approval for K-12 grades.

Mr. Elroweny stated that the current request is only for the rezoning. He explained that the idea is to rezone the property now since the current zoning is not even consistent with the existing use.

Ms. Jackson asked if Mr. Elroweny spoke with the principal of the adjacent school.

Mr. Elroweny responded that he did reach out to the principal regarding his intention of creating the school but they have not commented since they did not attend the community meeting.

Ms. Jackson asked when the community meeting was held.

Mr. Elroweny stated that it was March 14, 2018.

Ms. Jackson asked about the content of the notice material provided to the residents regarding the meeting.

Mr. Elroweny responded that the information in the notice was very similar to the language in the rezoning application and staff report.

Ms. Jackson asked if anyone from the applicant's staff went door-to-door to discuss the rezoning with members of the community. She also asked how soon they plan to start the school should the rezoning be approved.

Mr. Elroweny stated that they will begin with the Pre-K and possibly Kindergarten the next academic year.

She asked if the children in the community will be allowed to attend the Pre-K.

Mr. Elroweny stated that anyone would be able to attend. He acknowledged that there is a great need for Pre-K programs. He said that the facility will provide an alternative to public school.

Ms. Jackson stated that she hopes that the community will become more involved with the project and suggested that another community meeting be held. She stated that there are lots of children in the area and the applicant should want the support of the residents.

Mr. Stacer asked Mr. Keester-O'Mills if the applicant complied with City rezoning requirements.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills stated that when evaluating rezoning applications staff makes sure they are compatible with the Comprehensive Plan. He confirmed that staff's position regarding the rezoning in question is that it would be compatible with the Land Use designation.

Mr. Stacer asked if the notice requirements were complied with.

Mr. Keester stated that the applicant pays a fee that covers the advertisement costs. The notices were mailed and an advertisement was published as required. The applicant also held a non-required community meeting.

Mr. Stacer asked if the applicant has applied to the DRC for the first building.

Mr. Elroweny stated that they already have classrooms in their existing building and that there will not be additional structures built right now.

Mr. Stacer stated that the process can be completed in a relatively short period of time since they just need the zoning to allow for the intended use. He asked the applicant how many times they would have to come back to the Board for additional buildings, assuming that they reach their current capacity.

Mr. Elroweny stated that the applicant might have to build an additional building, but probably not within the next 5 to 7 years since the school would grow very slowly with one grade per year.

Ms. Jackson asked if the applicant would only be having Pre-K for the next 5 to 7 years.

Mr. Elroweny explained that they already have a number of classrooms that will allow the student body to grow before they need to build any new facilities.

Ms. Jackson asked if the school will be charging a fee for grades beyond Kindergarten.

Mr. Elroweny stated that there will be a charge since the school will be private, but the State will likely cover the cost of tuition through the Step Up scholarship program.

Ms. Jackson asked how the school would accommodate the neighborhood children that are in subsidized housing.

Mr. Elroweny stated that the Step Up scholarship program could cover most of the tuition for qualifying families. Most private schools also have financial aid programs.

Ms. Jackson stated that the applicant should communicate with the parents of the students to explain to them what they are trying to accomplish.

Mr. Elroweny stated that the scholarship is for everyone and that qualifying families would have to pay around \$50 a month. He reminded the Board that the request was noticed and a voluntary community meeting was held. He stated that there will be someone that will assist parents with the scholarships application.

Ms. Jackson stated that the applicant should find a better way to communicate with the residents and that they should knock on doors and reach out personally. She stated that she lives in this district and is part of the Board to represent the community. She stated that she will vote no to the request.

Mr. Stacer asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak. There were none.

**MOTION** was made by Rhonda Eaton and seconded by Richard Klosiewicz to recommend approval of the rezoning PZ #17-13000008 per Alternative Motion I as described in the staff report. All voted in favor of the motion with the exception of Jocelyn Jackson.

**I.    OTHER BUSINESS**

**4.    TEXT AMENDMENTS: CHAPTER 155 – MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS**

Staff is recommending approval of text amendments that include changes to Article 2, Article 4, Article 5, and Appendix C: Fee Schedule.

Paola West, Principle Planner, stated that Development Services Department staff has hosted 2 roundtable forums: one in August 2017 and the most recent in March 2018. The purpose of these forums was to obtain developer and development community input regarding development processes and zoning requirements. The input obtained from the roundtable forums allowed staff to assess the requirements and processes to identify where additional improvements can or should be made. The text amendments presented herein include changes that stem from suggestions made at the roundtable forums as well as staff recommendations that remove burdensome processes for more streamlined methods. Staff also utilized this amendment to prepare other housekeeping-type edits in order to clarify the code and/or to reflect existing policies and interpretations.