



City Commission

Mayor Arlene R. Schwartz
Vice Mayor Antonio V. Arserio
Anthony N. Caggiano
Tommy Ruzzano
Joanne Simone

City Manager

Cale Curtis

City Attorney

David Tolces

City Clerk

Jennifer M. Johnson, MMC

**MEETING OF
THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING**
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83897575721>
MINUTES

Thursday, October 7, 2025

6:30 p.m.

City of Margate
City Commission Chambers at City Hall

PRESENT:

Sloan Robbins, Secretary (Acting Chair)
Joseph F. Eppy, Board Member
Elsa J. Sanchez, Board Member

ABSENT:

Joao D. Brandao, Chair
Shekinah Awofadeju-Major, Vice Chair

ALSO PRESENT:

David Tolces, City Attorney
Cale Curtis, City Manager
Andrew Pinney, AICP, Senior Planner
Christopher Gratz, AICP, Senior Planner
Paul Ojeda, Development Services Office Manager
David Scholl, Fire Marshal
Richard Nixon, Building Department Director
Matthew H. Scott, Greenspoon Marder, LLP
Scott Backman, Miskel Backman, LLP
Chris Heggen, Kimley-Horn and Associates
Ron L. Book, P.A.
Mike Troxell, Thomas Engineering

The regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board (PZ) of the City of Margate, having been properly noticed, was called to order at 6:40 p.m. on Thursday, October 7, 2025, in the City Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

City Attorney David Tolces advised that as the Board Chair was not present, a motion to name an Acting Chair would be in order.

Mr. Eppy made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Sanchez:

Development Services Department

901 NW 66th Avenue, Suite C, Margate, FL 33063 • Phone: (954) 979-6213
www.margatefl.com • dsd@margatefl.com

MOTION: TO NAME SLOAN ROBBINS AS ACTING CHAIR.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Robbins – Yes; Mr. Eppy – Yes; Ms. Sanchez – Yes. The motion passed with a 3-0 vote.

1) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A) *ID2025-273*
APPROVAL OF PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Eppy made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Sanchez:

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2025, PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING AS PRESENTED.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Robbins – Yes; Mr. Eppy – Yes; Ms. Sanchez – Yes. The motion passed with a 3-0 vote.

2) NEW BUSINESS

- A) *ID2025-269*
CONSIDERATION OF A LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF CAROLINA CLUB GOLF COURSE (DRC NO. 24-00400057).
- B) *ID2025-270*
CONSIDERATION OF A REZONING FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF CAROLINA CLUB GOLF COURSE (DRC NO. 24-00400056).

David Tolces, City Attorney, introduced the items by title only, then explained the items before the Board were quasi-judicial in nature and outlined the rules and procedures to be followed.

City Attorney Tolces asked for any ex-parte disclosures from the Board. Mr. Eppy disclosed a conversation with Attorney Matthew Scott. Ms. Sanchez stated she met with staff and City Attorney Tolces to discuss the application. Acting Chair Robbins had no disclosures.

City Attorney Tolces swore in those planning to provide testimony.

Applicant Presentation

Matthew H. Scott, Esq., Greenspoon Marder, LLP, presented on behalf of the applicant, Rosemurgy Properties, and the development team. He provided a brief background on the Lakes of Carolina project and the two (2) applications before the Board at this time. He clarified the

approvals sought did not authorize construction on the site but would be the first step in a potentially long process toward redevelopment.

Attorney Scott stated the Carolina Club Golf Course had been an existing, long-term problem for the City and the surrounding community for quite some time and discussed the proposed comprehensive solution. He shared images of existing conditions, advising that it was dilapidated and overgrown, and while Rosemurgy Properties have the property under contract for potential redevelopment, they are not the current owners. Attorney Scott reviewed existing entitlements for the unique property, advising the site is in a dashed-line area which allows for up to seven (7) units per acre, which would allow over 1,000 units on the 148-acre property. He stated the existing Future Land Use for the property is Commercial Recreation with a Zoning designation of Open Space (S-2). He noted unlike many golf courses, the property's use is not governed by a restriction to the benefit of neighboring property owners, and the restrictive covenant impacting the property had expired decades prior. He commented that these amendments are a common application, with 10-15 Land Use Plan Amendments (LUPA) processed by Broward County each year.

Continuing, Attorney Scott shared a history of the property, which was opened in 1971 and closed in 2018. He stated since that time, the owners have marketed the property to a variety of different buyers for development, and the site has sat vacant, becoming an increasing nuisance. He discussed previous offers and advised none were interested in operating it as a golf course. He noted the Rosemurgy Properties proposal had been selected because they are a local company with deep roots in the community and a proven track record of delivering what they propose in South Florida. He shared examples to illustrate the quality of work the applicant was committed to providing. Attorney Scott reviewed the property information, noting it was an a permanently closed golf course with a dilapidated clubhouse and environmental contamination onsite which requires remediation. He discussed the conceptual master plan, including pods as follows:

- Pod A – Commercial (C)
 - Max Intensity: 57,500 Square Feet
- Pod B – Residential (R10)
 - Max Intensity: 377 Units (Townhomes)
- Pod C – Residential (R14)
 - Max Intensity: 507 Units (Apartments)
- Pod D-H – Open Space (S-2)
 - 65 acres

Attorney Scott highlighted the desire to maximize open space, with lakes and pocket parks, to create a development that would not only benefit the residents of the community, but existing residents. He pointed to a proposed mini dog park and more than three (3) miles of walking trails. He discussed benefits to residents, including environmental remediation, improved water retention, and publicly accessible walking trails. Attorney Scott provided an overview of the multi-year process with City, County, and State approvals and shared conceptual renderings. He reviewed the framework of the plan for redevelopment, including a series of meetings with stakeholders to hear concerns and integrate feedback. He advised that in response to feedback

from neighboring residents, the conceptual master plan had been revised to include no apartments whatsoever, and density as follows:

- Pod A – Commercial (C)
 - Max Intensity: 30,000 Square Feet
- Pod B – Residential (R10)
 - Max Intensity: 290 Units (Townhomes)
- Pod C – Residential (R10)
 - Max Intensity: 250 Units (Townhomes)
- Pod D-H – Open Space (S-2)
 - 65 acres

Attorney Scott provided the Development Agreement for context, advising the document binds the developer to the various commitments made. He stated the applicant was seeking a positive recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Board on the revised Development Agreement, LUPA subject to proposed reductions, Rezoning subject to proposed reductions, and the associated Text Amendment. He reiterated the community benefits briefly, including the projected positive impact on property values, and shared a letter from a Certified General Real Estate Appraiser stating the townhome development would cause a property value increase for properties adjacent to the golf course.

Attorney Scott reviewed the LUPA criteria and stated the application complied with all criteria, including potable water capacity, wastewater capacity, drainage capacity, solid waste capacity, school capacity, environmental review – Phase II Environmental Assessment, endangered or threatened species, parks and open space, traffic, and compatibility. He noted the proposed Future Land Use designations:

- Pod A – Commercial (C) with a 7.0 Dashed-Line Area
 - 7.6180 gross acres
- Pod B – Residential (R10) with a 7.0 Dashed-Line Area
 - 37.8922 gross acres
- Pod C – Residential (R10) with a 7.0 Dashed-Line Area
 - 36.2337 gross acres
- Pod D-H – Park with a 7.0 Dashed-Line Area
 - 67.029 gross acres

Continuing, Attorney Scott reviewed the proposed Zoning designations (as amended), advising the request was rezoning of 81.7439 gross acres from Open Space (S-2) to:

- Pod A – Community Business (B-2) District
- Pod B – Multiple Family Dwelling (R-3A) District
- Pod C – Multiple Family Dwelling (R-3A) District
- Pod D-H – Rezoning not required, as it is already designated Open Space (S-2), which allows for the use of the property as a community-serving open space

Attorney Scott shared an article from the Sun Sentinel showing declining enrollment in Broward County Schools and stated there would not be an issue with schools becoming overcrowded as a result of this project.

Chris Heggen, Traffic Engineer, Kimley-Horn and Associates, discussed the traffic analysis conducted, including the procedures and methodology, and advised the evaluation showed no roadway segments were anticipated to be significantly impacted. He stated a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) would be reviewed during the Site Plan approval process to include adjacent intersection operations and access points to identify the need for site-related access and traffic operation improvements based upon the specific details of the proposed development. He highlighted a 38 percent reduction in traffic counts over the initial plan and commented on growth across Broward County, as well as the congestion benefits of mixed-use strategies.

Attorney Scott commented that concerns are frequently raised that traffic counts may be taken during summer when there is no school or during COVID-19. He asked Mr. Heggen to confirm that traffic counts were conducted in February 2024. Mr. Heggen confirmed and stated the team would continue to work with the City to conduct additional counts as needed.

Attorney Scott discussed environmental concerns. He stated if redevelopment does not take place, contamination on site will not be addressed and will continue in perpetuity. He advised that if the project is approved, an extensive process of permitting through the County and State to remediate the issues and remove the contamination. He noted this takes place at the time of Site Plan review and discussed the timeline briefly.

Ron L. Book, P.A., governmental affairs expert, reviewed public policy considerations, trends in the State legislature, and the continued erosion of Home Rule. He discussed the Live Local Act, and stated redevelopment of an unused golf course into multi-family housing was exactly what the legislature was telling local governments they need to do. He commented on example projects. Attorney Scott asserted this developer was proposing to be a partner with the City, as the reality was that this discretion could be taken in the future.

Attorney Scott highlighted population trends and stated every city around Margate has grown in the past five (5) years, while Margate has been stagnated, according to U.S. Census Bureau data. He stated 93 percent of Broward County households cannot afford the median-priced home, and the lack of supply is fueling an affordability crisis. He asked the Board to consider a recommendation of approval.

Ms. Sanchez noted the traffic study did not include the intersection of Atlantic Boulevard and Rock Island Road. She stated this is an extremely busy intersection already and suggested that if another traffic study was conducted, this intersection should be included. Attorney Scott advised that Code requires that the traffic study look at one (1) mile radius, and this intersection fell outside that area, but as part of the project, potential improvements to Rock Island Road were being reviewed.

Ms. Sanchez commented that 540 townhouses were being proposed, but the traffic study showed only 142 trips going out and 48 trips in during peak morning hours. She questioned whether only this number of people would be going to work or bringing their children to school in the morning. Attorney Scott clarified the methodology and the formula used to determine trips by category. He commented on growing traffic from development in other municipalities and reiterated the potential impact of improvements to Rock Island Road as a result of this development.

Staff Presentation

Andrew Pinney, AICP, Senior Planner, presented on behalf of staff. He clarified the agenda for this meeting was limited to the LUPA and Rezoning, and the Development Agreement, while attached for reference, was not under purview.

Mr. Pinney reviewed the subject property, located at 3011 Rock Island Road, and shared an aerial image showing the current conditions. He stated site was 143.5 net acres and 148.7 gross acres. He reviewed the historical context, including an aerial from 1973 when Holiday Springs Golf was being constructed, at which time a Rezoning application was approved, and details on the platting of 5.9 acres for the clubhouse in 1988, at which time there was a significant remodel and change in name to Carolina Club. He advised the remainder of the property had not yet been platted. He stated the business started to shut down in 2018, and all operations and the Local Business Tax Receipt (LBTR) records indicate it was closed for business in 2022.

Mr. Pinney shared the applicant's concept drawing and proposal for pods A-H. He noted this was also spelled out and restricted in the Development Agreement, along with height and specific uses. He outlined the details of the requested LUPA, which would break 148.7 acres of Commercial Recreation Land Use into 7.6 acres of Commercial, 74.1 acres of Residential (R10), and 67 acres of Park. He shared the City's Future Land Use Plan Map and explained the definition of Dashed-Line Area, as follows:

An area on the Future Land Use Plan Map bordered by a dashed line and designated as having a particular maximum overall density of dwelling units for all land uses within the area, and/or a particular total number of dwelling units permitted within the area. The density with a Dashed-Line Area may be an irregular density.

Mr. Pinney explained Dashed-Line Area A, which is a total of 636.18 acres at a maximum density of seven (7) units per acre, and explained there are 1,070 dwelling units available in the area. He explained with the proposed project, 530 dwelling units would remain vested on the map. Continuing, he reviewed the Text Amendment requested, which would amend Policy 1.2.6 of the Margate Future Land Use Plan, which identifies all the various dashed-line areas on the map and their maximum build-out potential. He stated the revisions would assign the existing residential acreage, increase commercial use, and decrease commercial recreation use.

Mr. Pinney discussed the required LUPA considerations identified in the plan and how the individual requirements were addressed by the developer. He provided an overview of the steps

in the LUPA process, including Development Review Committee (DRC) review, followed by this hearing Planning and Zoning Board (PZB). He advised that the PZB meeting was the first public hearing, and the item would move forward to the City Commission with whatever recommendation was made, followed by reviews by the State and County, second reading by the City Commission, and finally recertification by Broward County Planning Commission. Continuing, Mr. Pinney outlined the details of the Rezoning application, which would break 148.7 acres of Open Space (S-2) into 7.6 acres of Community Business (B-2), 74.1 acres of Multiple Dwelling (R-3A), and 67 acres of Open Space (S-2). He shared the City's Zoning Map and reviewed the Rezoning process as stated in Section 40.303 of the Universal Land Development Code (ULDC).

Mr. Pinney discussed the required Rezoning process as stated in Section 40.303 of the Unified Land Development Code (ULDC) and how the individual requirements were addressed by the developer. He stated staff had raised concern during the DRC process as to condition C, which reads: "Existing zoning district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change". He commented as it was a golf course and the zoning was S-2, it was zoned logically. He stated there was question as to whether criterion I, which reads "There are substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with existing zoning" had been met, as new golf courses are being developed in Florida.

Mr. Pinney shared the DRC staff review by department, including Development Services, Environmental and Engineering Services (DEES), Fire, Building, Public Works, Police, and Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA), identifying positive findings and questions raised in each area which would result in additional responses from the applicant.

Acting Chair Robbins inquired as to whether the project was measured against recently increased parking standards. Mr. Pinney confirmed any new development would be subject to the new parking requirements. He noted maximums, or not to exceed, levels were being reviewed with this application, and finite details would be worked out at the site plan level. Discussion continued regarding changes that may take place in the site plan process.

Mr. Pinney continued to review DRC comments. He clarified that the permit authority on contamination remediation would be the County and State, and the City would have visibility of the plans. He stated compatibility concerns had been alleviated by the revision to remove apartment units from the proposed plan. He noted the DRC had completed two (2) cycles of review and had recommended resubmitting the application in both cases to provide additional information. The applicant had chosen to conduct community workshopping and proceed to the PZB without a recommendation of approval from the DRC.

Acting Chair Robbins asked staff why there was not a requirement for the seller to maintain the land. He asserted it was a growing trend that commercial spaces could neglect their spaces without consequence. Mr. Pinney stated his understanding was that all properties are required to be maintained, whether occupied or vacant, improved or unimproved.

Acting Chair Robbins asked if there were liens on the property. City Attorney Tolces advised the City has a very robust Code Enforcement division that handles those things separate and apart from the considerations before the Board with respect to the application. He stated the seller does have a duty to maintain the property while it is on the market, and the City is using the Code Enforcement process to the best of its ability to ensure the property is maintained in a condition on a regular basis. He noted the meeting was not regarding whether the condition was satisfactory or to debate Code Enforcement issues.

Acting Chair Robbins questioned whether the property was priced as a defunct golf course or as a property to be rezoned for tremendous development. He stated it may be that no golf course had put in an offer because they were priced out of the market. He noted Coral Springs had been able to sell off some land and maintain a golf course. Attorney Scott provided background on the maintenance issue and communication with the seller. He stated the property was not posted with a list price, but with a request for best offers on proposed projects and associated pricing. He noted that he was not saying golf was dead, but that this golf course was not coming back because there had not been a redevelopment offer over the course of the seven (7) year listing for a variety of reasons. He added that there had been several proposals for the site, including a wave park.

Ms. Sanchez noted staff had pointed out there were more units available in the area and asked if needed to be rezoned because there were more units that were going to be built. Mr. Pinney explained the units were referenced in the presentation in relation to the LUPA and the Land Use Plan because there are 636 acres that are allowed up to seven (7) units per acre but only 3,383 units were built, so there is excess within the red lines where units could be landed on a property. He stated the majority of the dashed-line area had been developed, apart from the golf course and the FPL easement, so this development would consume the last open space, and they were leaving those units undeveloped.

Mr. Eppy asked if anything would restrict the open space so that it could not ever be developed. City Attorney Tolces advised that this would be contained in the development agreement and recorded in the public records. He noted additional covenants may also be recorded to restrict the use of the Open Space as well as the development of the units. Mr. Pinney added that the restriction would not just be on this developer, but on their assigns and their heirs, as well.

Public Comment

Acting Chair Robbins opened the item to public comment.

Commissioner Tommy Ruzzano, 116 Palm Drive, Margate, spoke in opposition. He stated the attorney said substantial, competent evidence, and asserted that the approximately 150 people gathered were probably not for the project. He asserted the golf course property sits open for a reason, and the Land Use Plan Amendment states that because of the density in the area, the open space is needed as designed. He added that the potential financial benefit to the City was an unknown. He stated the owner had not wanted to talk to developers who wanted to make the property a golf course, but he believed the golf course could come back.

Christopher Snare, 2741 SW 81st Way, Davie, read from the Brownfields Redevelopment Act from Florida Statute and stated the authority for environmental remediation had been handed to the County. He discussed arsenic concerns and concerns with the contaminant blowing around the community during the remediation process. He asserted no plan had been presented as to how arsenic mitigation would be taken care of and the meeting should be deferred.

Allen Copelman, 2870 NW 74th Avenue, Margate, stated he had argued with everyone on the development team about the project, and they had made changes based on feedback from Fairway Estates residents. He asserted the City has done a bad job of enforcing rules on the current owner. He stated the project would increase home values, and his only real concern was public access to the walking trails because they don't want strangers walking behind people's houses. He noted the contamination was a huge issue and had to be addressed. He stated he wished it would stay a golf course, but after eight (8) years of it looking bad, it was time to decide if this was the best choice or if the application should be deferred.

Cecilia Cohn, 6791 NW 34th Street, Margate, spoke in opposition. She commented that she understood everything being said, but when she leaves her house in the morning, there is already a traffic problem. She stated she did not understand how adding to the problem made sense to anyone. She asserted there were plenty of shopping plazas around, and open space was needed. She stated the golf course should become a City park and added that Margate can be an example by not allowing development and maintaining open space.

John Deming, 7770 NW 29th Street, Margate, spoke in opposition. He stated this was far too many units and adding 540 townhouses would add to traffic congestion and have a lot of problems that are avoidable. He commented that when the area was laid out, this was intended to be green space. He stated based on his research, data shared regarding values not going up in the area were untrue. He argued homeowners had paid extra to live on a green space and this development would impact the quality of life of every resident of the Carolina Club.

Catherine Nieves, 3151 Holiday Springs Boulevard, Margate, asked how many years it would take for the project to be approved and constructed. She stated she saw the proposal had a gate or entrance on Holiday Springs and noted that traffic is already heavy at 5:30 a.m. when she leaves for work. She commented that residents bought their houses because of the openness and peacefulness and asked how close these townhouses would be to them.

Louise Acciaccarelli, 3190 Holiday Springs Boulevard, Margate, spoke in support. She stated she was president of Holiday Springs Village Condominium Association 1 and 2 and the Recreation Center. She commented that residents needed to stop listening to the rumors and get the facts themselves. She encouraged people to read the plans and ask their questions and go in with an open mind. She asserted the area was an eyesore and needed to be beautified. She stated this project would bring infrastructure improvements and millions in annual property revenue, as well as increase property values. She agreed there would be more traffic but noted

there would also be traffic lights and stop signs. She noted the area is growing and this was going to be beautiful. She encouraged residents to educate themselves.

Aya Ikematsu 7530 NW 29th Street, Margate, spoke in support. She commented that she would be adjacent to Pod C and had been a resident there for five (5) years. She stated she loves the open feel and pushed back on people expressing concern that strangers would walk on the paths behind the houses, as strangers walk through the property every day. She argued that more chemicals would be placed on top of the existing chemicals if the property was kept a golf course, and traffic would still come. She noted this company has proposed a plan to create the parks the residents asked for, creating dog parks to bond with your neighbors, and cleaning the existing waterways. She stated she believes in this plan and in building before the local voice is taken away and the chance to improve the neighborhood is lost. She asserted this company has the neighborhood's best interest at heart and was making the best offer possible.

Pete Martino, 7401 NW 29th Street, Margate, spoke in support. He stated he had attended a meeting regarding the development and realized apartments were not going to be positive for the community, and after discussion with the developer they had made exceptions and dropped down to townhomes instead of apartments as well as reducing the heights to fit into the community. He likened the existing conditions to an armpit, noting the clubhouse was boarded up and there were weeds. He stated he did not believe the property would be revived to be a golf course, though he would rather see greenspace. He noted this company was trying to turn it into something, and he didn't see anyone coming along to try to build a golf course. He stated the City had mishandled the Code Enforcement process related to the project. He stated this project would add to the community and its home values.

Emily Canedo, 2401 NW 72nd Avenue, Margate, spoke in opposition. She stated according to the developer's traffic study the project would add thousands of new daily trips onto the roads that are already failing the community. She noted nearby intersections are at a Level of Service F by 2030 and questioned the formula used for analysis. She stated residents don't want a Boca-style redevelopment they want open space. She commented that she walks her dog through the park every day and walking paths already exist. She asserted this was not a minor change and changes could always be made in the future.

Tony Spavento, 3194 W Buena Vista Drive, Margate stated he had heard promises before regarding roadway improvements by developments and asserted traffic was dangerous. He argued it made no sense to do this because it is not in the City plan. He discussed planning issues and narrow streets in his community and other developments, as well as agreements regarding protections from developments. He stated he was not completely against the project and added that a traffic light was needed at Rock Island Road and 30th Street.

Nina Culver stated she had come to the meeting to learn. She noted traffic would be an issue, and Broward County would need to work with timing at the lights and other improvements. She stated she was not happy with the proposal for apartments, but when the residents were able to advocate with the developers and have real conversations that led to changes in the plan that

cost them money, it showed they wanted to make the property better for other people. She commented on the distance from existing homes to the townhomes and stated the toxic soil had to be removed due to genuine health concerns. She asked that the City work with the developer and make a plan so that everyone can be on the same page before they get nothing.

Jan Trump, 5524 Lakewood Circle, Margate, spoke in support. She stated the project would be a good thing.

Juli VanDerMeulen, 2913 NW 68th Lane, Margate, spoke in opposition. She stated the community asked that the Board uphold their responsibilities and recommend a denial of the LUPA and Rezoning. She asserted the application was inaccurate and incomplete, with multiple fatal defects, and staff had found the application fails to demonstrate adequate capacity for drainage, water, and sewer. She stated that studying these things after approving the density violates the Comprehensive Plan and the traffic study was fraudulent. She advised that Police concerns regarding safety hazards had been ignored and questioned the zoning designation requested as well as traffic. She stated this would ruin the neighborhood.

Arthur Dragone, 3241 Holiday Springs Boulevard, Margate, spoke in opposition. He distributed photos of the golf course on the dais and stated there may be some areas that need to be cleaned up. He stated under this plan the pond would be filled in and there was no canal being built for drainage. He asserted the condos are lower than the level of the land being developed, and there was no protection from flooding. He stated traffic on Holiday Springs Boulevard was already busy. He added that all he would see in his 55 plus community was roofs and most people living in the community can't leave. He noted he did not see property values going up.

Richard Zucchini, Lakewood on the Green, spoke in support. He stated he understood the emotionality of the subject, but they should be talking about facts. He commented that an average golf course uses 50,000 pounds of pesticides each year, including various toxins. He stated living near a golf course had been found to increase the chances of developing Parkinson's Disease, and people were arguing to save this. He argued it was a toxic dump, not green space. He stated the developer's offer to trade toxic land for 65 acres of true green space was reasonable. He noted 55 plus residents should not argue against development, because they count on the younger families to pick up the excess property taxes and maintain safety personnel. He added that the Live Local Act would force high density if terms were not negotiated now.

Anthony Kempiak, 7332 Pinewalk Drive South, Margate, spoke in support. He stated when he was looking for a house in the area it took months because housing was not available, and an opportunity to increase housing was great for Margate. He commented that he appreciated the walking path and the open lake and park. He noted that starter homes are a rarity and difficult for future families to afford.

Lauren Baraka, Paradise Gardens 3, Margate, spoke in opposition. She stated references that the senior community pay less in taxes were inaccurate and asserted there had been deception said during the meeting tonight, whether intentional or not. She commented requesting the R-10

designation was not a commitment to the number of units referenced, but a permanent legal right to develop at higher density. She stated the commitment in a development agreement was temporary, but the LUPA was permanent and could be exploited in the future. She commented that the developer had failed to prove concurrency.

Paul Murphy, 7220 NW 29th Court, Margate, spoke in opposition. He stated he purchased his home because of the golf course and noted he is a golfer and works at a golf course. He asserted there are golf courses all over South Florida and the industry is not dying. He stated Palm Beach County had put together a golf course in a park run by the County and it is difficult to get a tee time because they are busy and making a profit. He asserted the Carolina Club property is embarrassing and had been let go for some time. He stated the green space was needed and highlighted issues with traffic.

Eric Allison, 3325 Pinewalk Drive, Margate, stated he was a retired commercial real estate broker and avid golfer and had sold a few golf courses. He noted the owners of this course had been approached for years by people who wanted to build a golf course but had always asked too high of a price. He suggested the City come up with a bond to purchase the golf course and take their time in developing it with resident input. He stated it was an excellent location for a golf course.

Jeffrey Odum spoke in opposition. He stated he bought his house because it was on a golf course, and he is an avid golfer who has played many hours on this course. He agreed with the previous idea to invest in a golf course. He commented that people like the idea of it being a golf course or a park but keeping it green.

Acting Chair Robbins closed public comment.

Attorney Scott thanked everyone for getting up to speak about their concerns and stated the developer did not take these lightly. He responded to comments briefly, noting that golf courses owned by Pompano Beach and Delray Beach are subsidized by taxpayer dollars, and addressing bond discussion. He noted this would be a big commitment for the 50,000 taxpayers who do not live on the golf course. Continuing, Attorney Scott referenced comments on the difficulty young families have in affording housing in Margate and stated the County had determined it must develop 200,000 more homes, and this is the type of project the County and State are looking for. He addressed environmental concerns briefly, pointing out this was a County and State permitting issue which would be addressed later in the process. He stated this project creates an opportunity where the developer will be required to remediate the issue.

Board Discussion

Mr. Eppy stated the Board had to consider the fact that the developer had put money into the project and the State or County may come in with changes. He noted he also loved golf, but it was unrealistic to believe this could be turned back into a golf course and the City could go into developing. He stated when you purchase a home, you are not guaranteed your views, and to stop development in Margate was a serious problem. He commented that the tax base needed

to grow, or services would be cut in the City. He agreed the 67 acres would be true greenspace, but it was economically unrealistic to expect the entire thing to remain open. He stated development was a fact of life, and mixed space was profitable.

Acting Chair Robbins commented that he liked the idea of attracting quality commercial properties, but he also liked the idea of splitting the parcel and having the commercial pay for the golf course if there was a potential to not develop all of it. He noted the community was divided.

Mr. Eppy stated there was a developer here who was willing to make concessions, but somehow this was going to be cleaned up. He asserted they would not be doing their job if they didn't allow the City to use this land for development.

Acting Chair Robbins stated it was his understanding that the City makes more money off of Commercial taxes, so he would not be opposed to the larger intensity for Pod A of 57,500 square feet if this was a possibility.

City Attorney Tolces reminded the Board that they were to focus on making recommendations related to the presentation before the Board and the applications submitted.

Ms. Sanchez thanked the applicant for the meetings and changes to the original plans. She stated there were issues that had to be resolved, but at this time the City has a say in what can be done with the property and could face worse conditions in the future. She commented that she heard and understood residents wanted this to remain a green space, but that was not possible as the owner would be selling the property and there were no golf course buyers. She noted there were already 20 parks in the nine (9) square miles of Margate. She added that the soil remediation would have to be taken care of, and traffic could be worse either way.

Mr. Eppy made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Sanchez:

MOTION: TO RECOMMEND THE CITY COMMISSION APPROVE A LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF CAROLINA CLUB GOLF COURSE (DRC NO. 24-00400057) BASED UPON THE TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE PRESENTED.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Robbins – Note; Mr. Eppy – Yes; Ms. Sanchez – Yes. The motion passed with a 2-1 vote.

Mr. Eppy made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Sanchez:

MOTION: TO RECOMMEND THE CITY COMMISSION APPROVE A REZONING FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF CAROLINA CLUB GOLF COURSE (DRC NO. 24-00400056) BASED UPON THE TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE PRESENTED.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Robbins – No; Mr. Eppy – Yes; Ms. Sanchez – Yes. The motion passed with a 2-1 vote.

3) GENERAL DISCUSSION

None.

4) ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joao D. Brandao, Chair