MINUTES OF THE CITY OF MIRAMAR
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

JUNE 10, 2025 **6:30 P.M.**

A meeting of the Planning & Zoning (P&Z) Board was called to order by Chairperson Thompson on Tuesday, June 10, 2025, at 6:40 p.m. in the Commission Chambers, Miramar City Hall, 2300 Civic Center Place, Miramar, Florida.

I. ROLL CALL

The following members of the Planning & Zoning Board were present:

Matthew Thompson, Chairperson
Mary Lou Tighe, Vice Chairperson
Marcus Dixon
Wayne Lomax
Sheryl-Ann Mullings
Annette Payne (Late 6:48 p.m.)

The following members of the Planning & Zoning Board were absent:

Anneline Carter
Hobel Florido
Vivian Walters, Jr.(Excused)

A quorum was achieved.

The following City staff members attended:

BPZ Director Nixon Lebrun
BPZ Assistant Director Tekisha Jordan
Senior Planner Frensky Magny
Senior Landscape Planner Sue-Ling Rosario
Planner Robert Artuso
Planner Andrew Unander
Planning Technician Sonia Gollab
City Attorney Candace Cobb

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **Regular Meeting Minutes of May 13, 2025**

Chairperson Thompson stated the minutes did not illustrate the dialog as to who nominated him for chairperson, only the vote on the matter. He wished the minutes to reflect the dialog showing that he opened the floor for nominations for both chair and vice chair, and which board members made the nominations accordingly before the board voted to approve the nominations.

Chairperson Thompson asked for a motion to approve the May 13, 2025, minutes, as amended; Vice Chairperson Tighe made a motion to approve, seconded by Member Dixon; the following vote was recorded:

AYE: Chairperson Thompson, Vice Chairperson Tighe, Members Dixon, Lomax, Mullings, Payne

NO: None

ABSENT FOR VOTE: Members Carter, Florido, and Walters

MOTION PASSED: 6-0

IV. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY PUBLIC HEARING:

City Attorney Cobb collectively swore in all persons wishing to speak on the following public hearing agenda items.

(1) AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIRAMAR, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE OF THE CITY OF MIRAMAR, PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 THEREOF, AND SECTIONS 166.041(3)(A) AND 553.3(5), FLORIDA STATUTES; AMENDING CHAPTER 8, "DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS OF GENERAL APPLICABILITY," BY REPEALING, REENACTING, REVISING, AND REORGANIZING SECTION 816, "STORM DRAINAGE, WATER MANAGEMENT DESIGN AND FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT STANDARDS;" AMENDING CHAPTER 2, "DEFINITIONS," BY EXPANDING AND MERGING THE CONTENT OF SUBSECTION 816.9, "DEFINITIONS," UNDER SECTION 202, "SPECIFIC TERMS;" AND CREATING A NEW CHAPTER 6, "FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT," TO RELOCATE THEREIN ALL SUBSECTIONS OF SECTION 816, EXCEPT SUBSECTION 816.9; TO REFORMAT AND AMEND PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED LOCAL TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE FOR THE PURPOSE OF PARTICIPATING IN THE

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM'S COMMUNITY RATING SYSTEM PROMULGATED PURSUANT TO TITLE 42 UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 4022; PROVIDING FOR HIGHER DESIGN FLOOD ELEVATION; PROVIDING FOR CONFORMITY WITH THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE; PROVIDING FOR AN EXPANDED AND CONSOLIDATED LIST OF DEFINITION OF TERMS; PROVIDING FOR EASE OF REFERENCE AND THE REMOVAL OF ANTIQUATED CONTENT; MAKING FINDINGS; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR CORRECTION OF SCRIVENER'S ERRORS; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.
Presenter: Tekisha Jordan, Assistant Director

BPZ Assistant Director Tekisha Jordan read the title of the proposed ordinance, giving a PowerPoint presentation on the item, as detailed in the backup, noting the following:

- This was a legislative item, not a quasi-judicial item.
- The amendment would help promote public health, safety, and welfare of city residents, and businesses, while minimizing public and private losses due to flood conditions.
- The City Manager recommended approval.

Member Lomaz asked if the new requirements would apply to new construction.

Ms. Jordan answered yes.

Chairperson Thompson wished to know when the subject amendment would take effect if the board approved it, and the City Commission subsequently granted approval.

Ms. Jordan responded that the proposed amendment would take effect upon the Commission's approval, which city staff was preparing for to ensure the City remained in compliance with the new requirements.

Chairperson Thompson questioned how the amendment, if approved by the Commission, would affect existing residents wishing to make additions to their home; that is, would they be required to increase any addition to the two-foot requirement.

Ms. Jordan affirmed new construction, including additions to existing buildings would be required to comply with the new requirements. She clarified that the addition would have to lead to a substantial improvement; that is, the addition would need to be to 50 percent or more of the property, per FEMA guidelines. These factors would be looked at by city staff at the time of building permit; contractors would be made aware of the substantial improvement guidelines when they submitted the building permit application.

BPZ Director Nixon Lebrun added that the cost of the improvement that would trigger the 50 percent rule, meaning it had to be 50 percent or more of the appraised or market value of the home. While staff was drafting the proposed amendment, they were in contact with

the State consultant charged with helping cities amend their floodplain ordinance. He believed there was a bill currently before the Florida Legislature that spoke to this matter, and the city had no wish to institute anything that conflicted with that bill; the city's regulations in this regard would adhere to the FEMA definition of substantial improvement, as stated above.

Chairperson Thompson commented on it possibly being unfair for homeowners wishing to improve their property, particularly those in east Miramar, considering the high cost of construction materials that was exacerbated by the current economic climate of the country, and the world with the institution of tariffs, etc. A 50 percent value of a home might easily be reached depending on the work being done on the home, whether it be a new roof, windows, doors, etc., and to homeowners making such improvements would now be asked to pay even more to raise the level of the building.

Mr. Lebrun noted once a city was in the CRS program, these were the guidelines that had to be adhered to in order to receive the discounts of the program; thus, a city could lose its classification, removing the protection for an entire community due to its not enforcing the guidelines in order to accommodate one property owner in an area. FEMA had cycle visits to cities in their CRS program for a class eight community to see how well the community was enforcing its regulations, and the City had to submit documents for an annual recertification, so the cycle visits were to verify what was stated in the documents. In 2016, a home that burned down, and had to be rebuilt was flagged in one such cycle visits, as no one at the City notified the homeowner of the floodplain regulations, and the City almost got in trouble for this oversight. Mr. Lebrun mentioned the Florida Building Code contained the FEMA floodplain guidelines, so contractors were aware of them; what staff sought through the proposed amendment was a local, technical amendment based on the Florida Building Code.

Chairperson Thompson believed the Florida Building Code stated the amount of square footage, not, technically, the value of the home. Thus, when you improve more than 50 percent of the home, the owner had to harden the home to prepare for hurricanes.

Mr. Lebrun understood this, but the decision was up to the floodplain manager, who was the City's building official and him, to determine what method would be established for the City to ensure the new FEMA requirements were met to ensure the City's buildings were up to code based on substantial improvement guidelines.

Chairperson Thompson thought the subject amendment would cause numerous issues for homeowners who did not do improvements, and their neighbors on either side of them did, so their homes were at a higher elevation than theirs, leading to water flowing towards the home at the lower elevation. He thought this would create a domino effect.

Mr. Lebrun commented that since 2024, with the new FEMA flood maps, some 25,000 properties in the City were in a flood zone, and a home that was one foot below the baseline elevation, it would cost that owner another $25,000.00 in flood insurance. The intent was to protect property owners from flood losses.

Member Mullings questioned the property owners residing in multifamily properties, such as condominiums, as they were in an attached building, wondering what the impact of the proposed amendment would be for them.

Mr. Lebrun said he could safely say for homeowners in multifamily developments the impact would be much less than owners of single-family homes. It was highly unlikely a unit owner, for example, on the first floor of a condominium, would make substantial improvements to their unit without it impacting other units around them. He remarked, looking at commercial properties, and multifamily residential properties, it was possible to make dry-flood improvements to properties to prevent or reduce the likelihood of flooding. If a home was valued at $300,000.00, it was unlikely that the owner's improvements would exceed $150,000.00; if they did, then the value of the property would be increased by the improvements, and it would be to the owner's advantage to raise the elevation to comply in such an instance.

Chairperson Thompson asked if there was a set elevation point that homeowners needed to be at in a particular area of the City; that is, one foot or two feet above BFE; he had no issue with new construction adhering to the proposed amendment, but it would be extremely burdensome if the cost of a homeowner's improvements led them to have to raise the elevation of their floors, roof, walls, etc. He said a homeowner with a home worth $400,000.00 could easily reach the threshold if they replaced their roof, changed out doors and windows, put in new floors, did a complete kitchen renovation, updated their electrical and plumbing, etc. The proposed amendment might be a hindrance to some homeowners doing any kind of improvements on their home.

Mr. Lebrun explained it was a policy decision; how would the community benefit if the City remained at the one-foot elevation, versus the proposed two-foot elevation with regard to the discount to they would receive for flood insurance based on FEMA guidelines. Again, the change was to both add further protection to Miramar's property owners, as well as give them a further discount on flood insurance; at present, the City had been a member of CRS since 1993, and Miramar's property owners currently received only a ten-percent discount. The proposed change would increase that discount to 25 percent, hence putting money back into the pockets of the property owners. Mr. Lebrun acknowledged that when such policies were implemented, there would be some people who could be adversely affected. In the subject instance, the decision was made on a permit by permit basis; thus, if over a five year period an owner made renovations, and city staff looked at the cumulative value of those improvements, it might be possible to reach the threshold to trigger the 50-percent value regulation, but, again, this was a policy decision, as the renovations could be viewed singularly, rather than cumulatively based on the property. His job as the floodplain manager for Miramar was to ensure that the properties in the City were put in the best situation to get the best out of the CRS program, and the City's Floodplain Management Plan was a creditable activity under the CRS that could also help the City lower that score.

Member Mullings sought clarification as to how Miramar's property owners would benefit from the anticipated cost savings that would result if the proposed amendment were passed by the Commission.

Mr. Lebrun explained that once the proposed amendment was approved, the City would implement more stringent regulations in the City's Building Code, along with the implementation of the Floodplain Management Plan. With these steps in place, the City would go back to FEMA to show the actions Miramar took through the CRS program; FEMA would then make the determination to change Miramar from a class eight to a class six or five, translating into greater discounts on flood insurance for Miramar property owners of up to 25 percent rather than the existing ten percent discount. He said flood insurance was administered by FEMA, so every Miramar property owner in a flood zone would get the discount automatically.

Member Mullings concurred with the concerns expressed by Mr. Thompson, as the proposed amendment was for a long-term cost savings, while in the short-term residents were already feeling the brunt of inflation, and high costs. If the proposed amendment were approved, a homeowner whose renovations totaled 50 percent or more of their home's value triggering the need for them to raise the elevation of their property to two feet would find such compliance extremely burdensome financially, even if they were told that in the long run they would benefit from an additional discount on the cost of their flood insurance.

Chairperson Thompson wished to know the average cost of flood insurance for homeowners in east Miramar, as he lived further west and paid about $600.00 a year for flood insurance. He preferred to continue paying this amount if it meant that residents in easts Miramar seeking to improve their property did not have to be forced to comply with the dictates of the proposed amendment.

Member Dixon understood his colleagues' position, but he believed staff mentioned some actions that could mitigate the possibility of homeowners in east Miramar having to comply with the regulations resulting from the proposed amendment. For example, he thought it unlikely that a homeowner with a home valued $400,000.00 would be making renovations that totaled more than $200,000.00 at one time to trigger the need to raise their home's elevation.

Mr. Lebrun concurred.

Member Dixon continued that if a homeowner made such a decision, at the time of permit application, he would hope that city staff would inform them that if they did all the renovations at once that would trigger such compliance, advising that they consider doing the renovations in phases rather than all at once. This would give the homeowner the chance to make a decision on how to proceed without having to incur the additional cost to raise their elevation. He said this would afford everyone else in the City not doing home renovations, or ones that did not total 50 percent the value of their home to benefit from getting a 25 percent rather than a ten percent discount on their flood insurance. The immediate benefit would affect all Miramar property owners, and gave those doing new builds, or renovations that cost more than 50 percent of their property's value a chance to consider the additional costs to raise the elevation of their building(s).

Chairperson Thompson sought confirmation from staff that if a homeowner decided to do renovations to their home in phases, possibly doing some each year until they were completed, they would not have to meet the raised elevation requirement.

Mr. Lebrun responded that the City had since removed five-year cumulative cost of renovations done to a home from the Miramar's Land Development Code, so improvements to existing properties would be evaluated on a permit-by-permit basis.

Member Dixon wished to know that a homeowner could submit two permits for renovations to their home in one year that, cumulatively, could trigger the 50 percent value threshold, but the permits could be considered separately, thereby no triggering that threshold.

Mr. Lebrun answered yes; most cities that adopted the five-year cumulative value policy found that it had become a nightmare for them to implement.

Chairperson Thompson thanked Mr. Lebrun for the clarification, as he now had a better understanding of what the effect of the proposed amendment.

Vice Chairperson Tighe wondered how long it would take for the new discount to people's flood insurance take effect.

Mr. Lebrun replied that his staff and he expected FEMA to visit the City in May 2025 to do their five-year inspection, as the last one took place in 2020, but they were waiting for the aforementioned bill to be adopted first.

Member Dixon visited the City's website, and the examples of properties shown were near water, so he wished staff to send the board illustrations of what raised elevations looked like for inland properties.

Chairperson Thompson agreed, asking for clarification for the various acronyms.

Mr. Lebrun stated the base floor elevation (BFE) was established by FEMA; once they published new maps of an area, categorizing the flood zones they fell into based on studies they had done on the likely height water would raise in each area if they flooded. In some areas, the BFE was 5.7, etc.; the BFE was a concept number that varied. Many properties in west Miramar were built on land that was significantly filled; east Miramar's homes were built prior to 1968 when Congress passed the National Flood Insurance (NFI) Act, and subsequently implemented the NFI and CRS programs that were managed by FEMA. The existing flood elevation of east Miramar properties were not that far below the BFE for that area; it was about six inches, hence it triggering letters to homeowners in east Miramar from insurance companies that they had to get flood insurance. He said the two-foot BFE requirement had become the standard in other cities.

Chairperson Thomposon questioned if once the applicable homes raised their elevation the City's existing drainage infrastructure was satisfactory, as it seemed raised elevations would create more water run off into the drainage systems; property owners would likely

slope the ground up to the house, thereby creating more of a slope towards the street, or to neighboring properties.

Mr. Lebrun commented, as part of the process of putting fill on a property, owners were required to submit a no-rise certification; this meant that by placing fill on one's property to raise its elevation, it would not cause flooding to neighboring properties. He added that the City was currently in Phase 6 of its drainage infrastructure improvement in east Miramar, so the City continued to make drainage improvements to mitigate flooding. In east Miramar, there were no new housing developments that required filling the site; and the new development near 441 would not have a substantial impact on existing homes.

Chairperson Thompson opened the discussion to the public; he received no input.

Chairperson Thompson asked for a motion to approve the subject amendment as presented, with a recommendation of approval to the City Commission. Vice Chairperson Tighe made a motion to table, seconded by Member Lomax; the following vote was recorded:

AYE: Chairperson Thompson, Vice Chairperson Tighe, Members Dixon, Lomax, Mullings, Payne

NO: None

ABSENT FOR VOTE: Members Carter, Florido, and Walters

MOTION PASSED: 6-0

(2) AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIRAMAR, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE OF THE CITY OF MIRAMAR, PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF SAID LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AND SECTION 166.041(3)(C)(2), FLORIDA STATUTES; MORE SPECIFICALLY BY AMENDING CHAPTER 3, ENTITLED "PROCESSES," AT SECTION 321, ENTITLED "ZONING CERTIFICATES OF USE", TO PROVIDE FOR PRORATED FEES FOR NEW BUSINESSES; AND FURTHER PROVIDE FOR THE ANNUAL RENEWAL OF ZONING CERTIFICATES OF USE, IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT ALL EXISTING BUSINESSES IN THE CITY COMPLY WITH THE CITY'S LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, THE CITY'S CODE OF ORDINANCES, BUILDING CODE AND LIFE SAFETY REQUIREMENTS, AND OTHER APPLICABLE CODE AND REGULATIONS, AND ULTIMATELY PROTECT THE CITY'S RESIDENTS AND CONSUMERS FROM THE HARMFUL EFFECTS OF ILLEGAL BUSINESS OPERATIONS; MAKING FINDINGS; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR CORRECTION OF SCRIVENER'S ERRORS; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.
Presenter: Sue-ling Rosario, Senior Landscape Planner

Senior Landscape Planner Sue-ling Rosario reviewed the proposed amendment, as detailed in the backup, noting the following:

- Upon adoption of the proposed ordinance by the Commission, the outreach program would commence, and renewal requirements would begin October 1, 2025, with a compliance period to January 2026.
- Existing businesses prior to the approval of the proposed ordinance not required to obtain their ZCU (Zoning Certificate of Use) would receive their initial at no charge.
- The City Manager recommended approval.

Member Dixon expressed confusion regarding the language in 321.1.8, seeking clarification that the 2010 version grandfathered in businesses, so they did not have to go through the subject process; city staff now sought to bring them into the annual zoning ZCU process. However, the proposed language appeared to say these businesses would be given one year to become compliant, while also stating these businesses had to do so when their business tax receipt (BTR) was due for renewal; it sounded conflicting, as this meant some businesses would have a shorter timeframe to come into compliance.

Ms. Rosario clarified that the one-year period to come into compliance was only for businesses previously exempt from obtaining ZCU. Staff added the language in the proposed amendment for the City to be concurrent with the BTR to make it easier for business owners. At the time that businesses were issued with the notice that it was time for renewal, they would receive the notice that it was the renewal of their ZCU. Any business established after Ordinance No. 10-03 took effect in 2010 to current would not have the one-year grace period.

Mr. Lebrun explained all BTRs were from October 1 to September 30, the dates the new fiscal year began and ended; for any business to get a BTR, they had to first secure a certificate of use (CU). Regarding the renewal process, the Finance Department sent out the notification to renew by July 1 each year to all businesses, and the same process would be used to inform previously exempt businesses of the need to renew their ZCU, which was for the calendar year, not the fiscal year timeframe.

Member Dixon questioned if the inspectors were all employed by the City currently.

Ms. Rosario affirmed when a business came to the City to obtain ZCU, the City had inspectors who went out to do the inspections: the Fire Department did their own inspections, and other inspectors inspected for electrical, mechanical, and structural.

Member Dixon read that some 350 to 400 inspections done in the City each year.

Ms. Rosario confirmed the City averaged about 350 to 400 new businesses each year over the last three years.

Mr. Lebrun remarked the subject program paid for itself, as for every ZCU, businesses were charged a fee. The City recently added two community enhancement officers to help

with the building violations; they could be assigned additional tasks to help with inspections, and in the department's budget, there was funding to hire additional outside staff to help with the subject process.

Member Dixon sought clarification on the process for businesses with violations.

Ms. Rosario responded that this was dealt with under proposed section 321.5, additional violations, where it stated violations would be subject to prosecution/enforcement pursuant to existing section 2-330 of the City Code of Ordinances. Code compliance officers went out to issue notices to any businesses with violations.

Vice Chairperson Tighe wished to know more about the fees for the ZCU.

Ms. Rosario replied the initial ZCU was $300.00, and renewal was $150.00.

Chairperson Thompson opened the discussion to the public; he received no input.

Chairperson Thompson asked for a motion to approve the proposed amendment, as presented with a recommendation of approval to the City Commission. Member Dixon made a motion to approve, seconded by Member Mullings; the following vote was recorded:

AYE: Chairperson Thompson, Vice Chairperson Tighe, Members Dixon, Lomax, Mullings, Payne

NO: None

ABSENT FOR VOTE: Members Carter, Florido, and Walters

MOTION PASSED: 6-0

(3) AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF MIRAMAR, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE OF THE CITY OF MIRAMAR, PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF SAID LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AND SECTION 166.041(3)(C)(2), FLORIDA STATUTES; MORE SPECIFICALLY BY REPEALING SECTION 712, OVERLAY DISTRICT, REPEALING SECTION 715, TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR DISTRICT CODE, AMENDING CHAPTER 2 DEFINITIONS, AMENDING CHAPTER 3, PROCESSES, AMENDING SECTION 310, SITE PLANS, AMENDING SECTION 311, COMMUNITY APPEARANCE BOARD, AMENDING SECTION 315, VARIANCES, APPEALS AND ZONING RELIEF, AMENDING CHAPTER 4, ZONING, AMENDING SECTION 401, ZONING DISTRICTS, AMENDING SECTION 403, NON-RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS, AMENDING SECTION 404, MIXED-USE DISTRICTS, AMENDING SECTION 405, SPECIFIC USE REGULATIONS, CREATING NEW SECTION 407, TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR (TOC) DISTRICTS, AND AMENDING CHAPTER 5, SECTION

505, ACCESSORY USES AND STANDARDS; TO ENHANCE PROCEDURAL CLARITY, STREAMLINE INTERNAL REVIEW PROCEDURES, CLARIFY PERMITTED USES, PROVIDE NEW DEFINITIONS, REFINE ZONING REGULATIONS, AND TO ALIGN WITH THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND LONG-TERM PLANNING OBJECTIVES; MAKING FINDINGS; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR CORRECTION OF SCRIVENER'S ERRORS; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.
Presenter: Frensky Magny, Senior Planner

Senior Planner Frensky Magny gave a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed amendments, as detailed in the backup, noting the following:

- The Transit Oriented Corridor (TOC) District was established via LDC amendment in 2012; this was different than the land use designation, as it established zoning districts for the TOC, the State Road 7 corridor.
- The 2012 regulations established minimums and maximums for building heights, which were normally shown in stories in the LDC, but in this subsection building heights would be, henceforth, shown in feet to be consistent with the rest of the code.
- The proposed changes established a build-to line, and maximum front setbacks, as well as for a mixture of uses within a single structure, which was new for the City of Miramar.
- Incentives for these districts included an allowance of 35-percent reduction in parking for mixed use projects, reduction in development fees for site plan and Community Appearance Board (CAB) applications, and administrative approvals; this allowed applicants to go through the Development Review Committee (DRC) process without a final determination by the City Commission.
- Subsequent amendments took place for the TOC to facilitate development, including: allowing the 35-percent reduction in parking for all projects within the TOC; reduced the minimum lot width requirement from 100 feet to 50 feet within the mixed-use districts, thereby stopping the incentivizing lot assembly.
- The proposed amendment sought to create subsection 407, replacing and consolidating the TOC regulations, repealing outdated and inconsistencies in section 712 and 715 that had conflicting language, placing all relevant language in 407, providing one concise place to find all the regulations; other proposed changes revised multiple sections pertaining to the TOC, including zoning standards, some additional definitions, site plan procedures, as well mixed-use regulations.
- The proposed amendment provided for city-initiated development applications to be exempt from the DRC, and CAB review to expedite public service projects.
- In addition to changes in the bulk regulations, a new table was being established for principal uses to maintain consistency with the remainder of the LDC; staff found that the code section for nonresidential uses worked well with developers, and business owners seeking to locate to Miramar; staff sought to maintain the

same format, and applying it to the zoning districts within the TOC.

- Staff proposed eliminating some incentives within the TOC, including: reduction of application fees, and the reduction in parking, as staff found that they were not working, sometimes becoming problematic when going through the DRC process, particularly parking reductions for a single building.
- Additional amendments proposed were included for clarification purposes: distance separation for businesses selling alcoholic beverage; definitions for businesses engaged in pharmaceutical distribution, and direct-to-consumer pharmaceutical businesses to be permitted by right in within the employment center and planned industrial development zoning districts.
- A residential pet structure definition was being added, working with code compliance staff to ensure the City had a meaningful definition, as well as clarity on regulations as to how this was facilitated.
- The City Manager recommended approval.

Member Payne sought clarification on the proposed language in 847, particularly with reference to the applicant not having to come before the board or the Commission for final approval if they met certain conditions.

Mr. Magny remarked, with reference to bypassing the DRC and City Commission approval, this was very specific to city-initiated developments. Staff found that several developments, such as the fire station, that the City review bodies had already seen, particularly after the funding portion of the project was approved by the City Commission. He said at that point, the City's support services division staff began the actual development process, starting with procuring a consulting contract, developing the plans beyond just the conceptual; that is, doing more detailed work for civil engineering, architectural, etc. portions. At present, after the City Commission reviewed, and approved the conceptual of the plans, and the funding, after the design phase for the actual project was completed based on the approved conceptual(s), the project went back to the City Commission for approval; the proposed amendment sought to remove the need for the second Commission approval, allowing the project to proceed to the building permit stage, as it was redundant. He said such public facilities were much needed, and with very time sensitive funding, so staff sought facilitate this process.

Chairperson Thompson questioned if the Commission or any relevant city staff saw the actual design of the project to give input other than the architect before the plans were moved to the building permit stage.

Mr. Magny explained that from the initial Commission and DRC approval of the conceptual, and later the funding, there was little change. What went back to these bodies was the detailed site plan, such as the physical number of parking spaces, setbacks, etc. Staff found that, over time, those things did not come into question, which they usually did in the conceptual phase.

Member Mullings expressed concerns that residents might be deprived of giving input on the actual site plan for a project.

Mr. Magny said residents would have the opportunity to give input both at the conceptual, and funding stages, as the plans were presented for approval. The proposed amendment accommodated the possibility of minor changes, such as moving the generator from the side to the back of a proposed building, parking, etc.; by the time the project reached the technical site plan phase, typically, there were no extensive changes that would change the dynamic of the project. In over a decade of his working with the City, from the conceptual to the actual design, the project remained the same, just with more pages of details in the finalized plan.

Member Mullings understood the explanation, but she remained uncomfortable bypassing further City Commission and staff review before going to building permit.

Chairperson Thompson wished to know how often members of the public attended Commission meetings when conceptuals and funding for a public project was presented for approval. That is, were residents/businesses around the project area given additional notification of the matter coming before the Commission for approval. He preferred to have the chance to review any public project for site plan approval.

Mr. Magny stated public input was received, typically, when a project was in its first round of financing. However, city staff usually notified the surrounding community before the conceptual stage to get input on what the City planned in their neighborhood. Thus, by the time of the actual site plan for the project, all stakeholders knew what to expect.

Mr. Lebrun added city projects were all capital improvement projects (CIP) that were approved as part of the City's CIP Plan, and the City had to go out to bid to fund those projects, thus there were two approvals; this applied to any project over $75,000.00 that first required City Commission approval to proceed. This meant the conceptual, design, site plan, etc. all had to come before the Commission for approval. He noted that as public projects were presented to the public multiple times with proper noticing before the final site plan was executed, there were very few changes, if any, to the final design from the conceptual design presented initially. The proposed change was to accelerate the process, so the City could access time-sensitive funding for its public service building projects. Throughout the process of the project, the City embarks upon considerable community outreach, including door hangers, multiple community meetings, etc.

Ms. Mullings asked if the noticing media included electronic notices; she resided in Miramar for over 22 years, and she had yet to receive an email from the City.

Mr. Lebrun mentioned the City's Marketing Department staff did a great job getting word out to the community, including using billboard noticing. All residents and businesses on the City's email list received notices accordingly, but they had to provide the City with their email address in order receive such communications.

Member Mullings wondered if there was an effort by the City to determine the most effective and efficient ways of communicating with the Miramar community to ensure information was getting to the residents and businesses. She asked if it was possible to mail all Miramar addresses an invitation to provide their email address in order to receive

information on what was taking place in their city; she found that, in general, people did not know what was going on in Miramar, though when it came to many events city staff was very vigilant with providing information. However, when it came to development projects that could impact the aesthetics of their property, they were unaware.

Mr. Lebrun indicated he would ask the Marketing Department Director Lorna Walker or her designee to attend a board meeting to give a presentation on the City's marketing efforts, and address the board's legitimate concerns.

Chairperson Thompson wondered if Mr. Lebrun could suggest to Marketing staff that they conduct a drive or blitz to the community, encouraging them to sign up to receive city information via email. In this way, it would be residents' responsibility to sign up.

Mr. Lebrun assured the board he would have an answer for them at the next board meeting.

Vice Chairperson Tighe agreed as to Marketing staff getting emails out to the community on city events, but she would know if an email concerned a P&Z issue, which had yet to receive. The board was speaking to the community getting very targeted communication, and without that in place, she, too, was not comfortable removing a second review by the Commission and the public; the more opportunity the public had to listen, talk, and be heard on any matter made a better community.

Member Dixon understood the aim of trying to incentivize certain types of development in the TOC, and the need to reformat to simplify, and clarify guidelines and regulations. However, other than changing from stories to feet, and the parking change, it did not appear to him that the proposed amendment sought to achieve anything substantive.

Mr. Magny affirmed that with regard to the TOC staff proposed no changes other than clarifying the bulk regulations, the uses, height limitations, and the elimination of incentives. This was due to staff awaiting comments, etc. for the Comprehensive Plan; staff would review the TOC at a later date with regard to possibility of new incentives, or the need for any other changes.

Member Dixon asked if the uses referenced were in both table 403-1 and 407-3.

Mr. Magny explained 407-3 was specific for the TOC; again, they mimicked what was in 403-1, as staff found the latter worked very well, though 403-1 was only for the City's business B1, B2, B3, industrial, etc., not the TOC. The uses in the latter did not change, just how they were structured in the table.

Member Lomax felt it seemed there did not exist a thorough method by which the City adequately communicated invoice to residents; utilizing a billboard and/or sign to post development information was inadequate was not very successful, and the use of emails was, pretty much, archaic. In today's environment, anything short of text messaging, SMS communication would be unsuccessful; text messaging was already used my large groups, including school boards, medical entities, etc., and this method of communicating

to the public continued to evolve.

Chairman Thompson agreed an adequate communication system was repeatedly an issue discussed by the board. The board should allow Mr. Lebrun to speak with the Marketing director and relay his findings to the board at the next meeting; it was unlikely to be a matter the board could resolve at the present meeting. He asked board members to consider possible solutions, and bring them back for discussion at the next meeting; engaged in such a collaborative effort, a solution might be found.

Vice Chairperson Tighe thought each board member could speak with members of the Commission to alert them to the fact that communicating information to the public was an issue that the board continued to have, for which they sought a solution.

Member Dixon looked forward to the board receiving a presentation from Marketing. This would allow the board to give input on ideas to resolve the matter. He knew the City had text messaging capabilities; staff advised that this, too, was through Marketing; an update on noticing radii from staff would be good too.

Chairperson Thompson opened the discussion to the public; he received no input.

Member Dixon recalled that some board members expressed reservations as to the bypassing final Commission approval on the site plan for public facilities projects. He wished to withdraw his motion in case those board members wished to comment further.

City Attorney Cobb stated that if there was a wish to amend the language of the proposed amendment, the board would have to vote on the amendment first, and then the item as a whole.

Vice Chairperson Tighe wished to amend the proposed ordinance, removing that portion of the language where staff recommended bypassing or removing a second review of public projects by the City Commission.

Member Dixon understood his colleague's concerned, but he had no issue with bypassing a redundant process that could slow down the development of public facility projects. He was comfortable accepting city staff's proposed amendment as presented.

> Member Dixon made a motion to amend the proposed amendment's language, as she stated above; seconded by Vice Chairperson Tighe; the following vote was recorded:
>
> **AYE:** Chairperson Thompson, Vice Chairperson Tighe, Members Dixon, Lomax, Mullings, and Payne
>
> **NO**: None
>
> **ABSENT FOR VOTE:** Members Carter, Florido, and Walters

MOTION PASSED: 6-0

Chairperson Thompson asked for a motion to approve the proposed amendment as amended. Member Dixon made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Lomax; the following vote was recorded:

AYE: Chairperson Thompson, Vice Chairperson Tighe, Members Dixon, Lomax, Mullings, and Payne

NO: None

ABSENT FOR VOTE: Members Carter, Florido, and Walters

MOTION PASSED: 6-0

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairperson Thompson asked for a motion to approve the excused absence of Member Walters. Member Lomax made a motion to approve; seconded by Member Payne; the following vote was recorded:

AYE: Chairperson Thompson, Vice Chairperson Tighe, Members Dixon, Lomax, Mullings, and Payne

NO: None

ABSENT FOR VOTE: Members Carter, Florido, and Walters

MOTION PASSED: 6-0

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting: July 8, 2025, at 6:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Matthew Thompson, Chairperson
MT/cp