Workshop Agenda

- Introductions
- Project Presentation
  - History
  - Project Scope/Timeline
  - Character of Study Area
    - Land Use
    - Public Realm/Pedestrian Mobility
    - Multimodal Transportation
    - Parking
- Polling Questions
- Open Discussion
- Closing Remarks/Next Steps
History – City Effort

- Fast Forward- 2035 Vision Plan (long-term)
- Press Play- 2018 Strategic Plan (short-term)
- CAAP - 2016 Annual Plan (yearly)
History – Community Effort

- Envision Uptown, Inc. was formed
- Business and civic leaders – Public/Private
- Concerned about recruiting/retaining a talented workforce in the Uptown area
- Attracting/expanding existing businesses
Recent Planning Efforts

- Uptown Urban Village – ULI, Technical Assistance Panel (TAP), 2014
- Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Master Plan, 2015
- I-95/Cypress Interchange Study – FDOT, 2016 (underway)
ULI – TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PANEL

- City’s focus on planning for climate resiliency
- Drive future growth
- Higher elevation/less vulnerable
- Existing transportation infrastructure
- Employment hub/corridor
- Education facilities

Panel objective: identify long term strategies for future growth that transforms Uptown into an urban village
ULI – TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PANEL

Recommendation Themes

- CLIMATE RESILIENCY
- LAND USE AND VISION ALIGNMENT
- WALKABILITY AND GREENWAYS
- TRANSPORTATION CHOICES
- EMPLOYMENT AND INNOVATION
- DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT
- LEVERAGING RESOURCES
ULI – TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PANEL

Recommendation for Regulatory Changes

- Land use amendment to City’s Comprehensive Plan
- Amend to a mixed land use designation
- Prepare and adopt a form-based regulatory code
- Identify opportunities for new development or redevelopment opportunities
- Complete Streets approach, encouraging more modes of travel on streets and safe access to the transportation network
- New cross-sections showing lanes, sidewalks, trees, cycling network, pedestrian sidewalks, and parking
CYPRESS CREEK MOBILITY HUB MASTER PLAN

• Study began December 2014
• Multi-agency participation
• Market and Economic Analysis
• Evaluate site plan concepts
• Conceptual streetscape designs
• Return on investment
CYPRESS CREEK MOBILITY HUB MASTER PLAN

Market and Economic Analysis

Source: HNTB Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Presentation dated 3-15-16
## Market and Economic Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Study Area Demand</th>
<th>Mobility Hub Site Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Residential | 400-600 Rental Units  
             Near-term (1-5 years)                             | 200-250 Rental Apartments  
                        (Market Rate at $1.55+ per sq.ft.;  
                        or, Mixed Income)                                    |
| Office    | 150,000 to 250,000 square feet  
             Mid-term (4 to 6 years)                              | 125,000 to 150,000 square feet  
                        ($30-$32 per sq.ft., 92% Stabilized Occ.)        |
| Hotel     | 150 room select service, branded  
             Mid-term (3 to 5 years)                                | 150 room select service, branded  
                        (ADR - $130+; 75% Stabilized Occupancy)         |
| Retail    | 125,000 to 175,000 square feet  
             Near-term (1 to 5 years)                               | Supporting use within Mixed Use Development               |

Source: HNTB Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Presentation dated 3-15-16
Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Master Plan
Streetscape Concept – North Andrews Avenue, Section 3
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CYPRESS CREEK MOBILITY HUB MASTER PLAN

Streetscape Concept – North Andrews Avenue (Typical Section)
CYPRESS CREEK MOBILITY HUB MASTER PLAN

Recommendations

- Completion of area wide land use amendment to City’s Comprehensive Plan
- Transit oriented development (TOD), transit oriented corridor (TOC), or mixed land use designation
- Form-based code to establish predictability
- Building heights are limited by FAA
- Parking requirements should be reduced
- Streetscape improvements be prioritized, impact of the FDOT interchange, leverage funding
I-95/CYPRESS INTERCHANGE STUDY

• Started January 2016
• Capacity and safety at Commercial and Cypress Creek interchanges
• Includes the street intersections immediately adjacent to interchange
• Evaluate demand based on current and project growth
• City shared initial planning concepts and potential development growth
PROJECT SCOPE

LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT (LUPA)

Regulates uses and entitlements (e.g. residential units, commercial square footage)

MASTER PLAN AND FORM BASED CODE

Regulates built form and public realm (e.g. building height, public plazas, site layout)
Project Scope

• Consists of two planning efforts:

1. **Land Use Plan Amendment Application (LUPA)** - amend the various underlying future land use designations to a single land use designation providing for a mix of land uses.

2. **Master Plan with Form Based Code Requirements** - planning document with overall guiding principles and specific design standards for future development.
Project Schedule

• Land Use Amendment – *September 2016 to September 2017*
• Master Plan with Form Based Code – *September 2016 to December 2017*
• Envision Uptown Meeting – *3rd Quarter October 2017*
• Public Workshop – *3rd Quarter 2017*
Project Study Area

- Generally described as the area located south of the C-14 canal and McNab Road, NW 57th Street, and Powerline Road.
- Divided into four Sub-Areas.
Project Sub-Area 1
Project Sub-Area 2
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Project Sub-Area 3
City of Fort Lauderdale

UPTOWN URBAN VILLAGE

Project Sub-Area 4
Character Area – Land Use

Sub-Area 1

Sub-Area 2
Character Area – Land Uses

Sub-Area 3

Sub-Area 4
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Character Area – Public Realm/Pedestrian Mobility
Character Area – Multimodal Transportation
Character Area – Parking
Issues/Challenges

• Building height restrictions due to Executive Airport.
• Lack of residential development.
• Provide affordable housing.
• Impact to schools.
• Roadway configurations/traffic flow.
• Parking within the Corporate Park and in Tri-Rail.
• Lack of connectivity to Tri-Rail.
• Poor pedestrian network.
Opportunities

- Develop a small neighborhood grocery store
- Identify a site for a possible school
- Redevelop surface parking lots
- Improve connections to Tri-Rail station
- Potential development along 59th Street
- Repurpose some industrial uses
- Create more pedestrian friendly environment/CSX crossings/greenways
Polling Questions – Demographics
1. Where do you live?

A. Within Study Area
B. Elsewhere in Fort Lauderdale
C. Elsewhere in Broward County
D. Outside of Broward County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within Study Area</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>41.03%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Broward County</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of Broward County</td>
<td>28.21%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What is your employment status?

A. Employed Full-Time
B. Employed Part-Time
C. More than One Job
D. Retired
E. Not Employed
F. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time</td>
<td>86.84%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Part-Time</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than One Job</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Employed</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. If you are employed, where do you work?

A. Sub-Area 1
B. Sub-Area 2
C. Sub-Area 3
D. Sub-Area 4
E. Outside the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Area 1</td>
<td>27.03%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Area 2</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Area 3</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Area 4</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the Study Area</td>
<td>62.16%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What transportation mode do you use most often to commute?

A. Bicycle
B. Public Transit
C. Car (single-occupant)
D. Carpool
E. Walk
F. Ridesharing (Uber, Lyft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car (single-occupant)</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridesharing (Uber, Lyft)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How did you get to this meeting?

A. Bicycle
B. Public Transit
C. Car (single-occupant)
D. Carpool
E. Walk
F. Ridesharing (Uber, Lyft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car (single-occupant)</td>
<td>87.18%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridesharing (Uber, Lyft)</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. How many times do you use public transit per month?

A. 1 to 3 Times/Month
B. 4 to 6 Times/Month
C. 7 to 10 Times/Month
D. More than 10 Times/Month
E. None
Polling Questions – Issues and Challenges In the Study Area
7. What types of land uses are needed most in the Study Area? (Select up to 3)

A. Residential Uses
B. Office Uses
C. Industrial Uses
D. Parks/Open Space
E. Retail Uses
F. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Uses</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Uses</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Open Space</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Uses</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. If you had the option, would you live in the Study Area?

A. Yes
B. No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23.68%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76.32%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. What are the primary transportation issues in the Study Area? (Select up to 3)

A. Traffic Congestion
B. Pedestrian Connectivity/Safety
C. Bicycle Connectivity/Safety
D. Access to Public Transit
E. Lack of Visitor Parking
F. Lack of Employee Parking
G. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>27.96%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Connectivity/Safety</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Connectivity/Safety</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Public Transit</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Visitor Parking</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Employee Parking</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. What types of public realm improvements are most needed (Select up to 3)

A. Improved Sidewalks
B. Wayfinding Signs
C. Parks/Open Spaces
D. Trees/Landscaping
E. Street Lights
F. Shade Structures
G. Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved Sidewalks</td>
<td>24.47%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding Signs</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Open Spaces</td>
<td>19.15%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees/Landscaping</td>
<td>25.53%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Lights</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade Structures</td>
<td>14.89%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Initiate LUPA
- Conduct traffic and mass transit analysis
- Establish the vision, context and framework for the Study Area
- Develop design standards – Form Based Code
Break Out Sessions

• Groups will be formed by facilitators
• Have 60 minutes to discuss the four focus topics:
  1. Land Use/Character
  2. Public Realm/Pedestrian Experience
  3. Multimodal Transportation
  4. Parking
• Facilitator Feedback
Break Out Sessions

1. **Land Use/Character**
   
   • Existing land use issues
   • Benefits of creating more residential opportunities within the Study Area (i.e., mobility, market support for additional uses, development potential, etc.)
   • Challenges for infill (i.e., site selection, interim parking, congestion, meeting attainable housing objectives, etc.)
   • Design Alternatives (i.e., single use, mid to high-rise buildings, mixed-use buildings, etc.)
Break Out Sessions

2. Public Realm/Pedestrian Experience
   • Overall area connectivity
   • Pedestrian safety/experience
   • Parks/open space

3. Overall area connectivity - pedestrian to public realm space

Multimodal Transportation
   • Existing transportation system
   • Deficiencies
   • Opportunities
Break Out Sessions

3. Parking
   • Current parking resources
   • Current challenges
   • Changing demand patterns
   • Impacts of mixed-use redevelopment
     o Interim parking challenges and opportunities
     o Long-term demands
PRIMARY CONTACTS

City Contact:  
Jim Hetzel, AICP, LEED Green Associate  
Principal Planner  
Urban Design and Planning  
City of Fort Lauderdale  
100 N. Andrews Avenue  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301  
Phone: 954-828-5019  
E-mail: jhetzel@fortlauderdale.gov

Consultant Contact:  
Evan Johnson, AICP, LEED AP  
Project Manager  
Tindale Oliver  
1000 N. Ashley Dr., Suite 400  
Tampa, FL 33602  
Phone: 813-224-8862, ext. 1250  
Email: ejohnson@tindaleoliver.com
CLOSING REMARKS

Thank you for coming out and sharing your feedback with us!!!