

**CITY OF HOLLYWOOD, FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DIVISION OF PLANNING AND URBAN DESIGN**

DATE: November 10, 2025 **FILE:** 25-PV-24

TO: Planning and Development Board

VIA: Anand Balram, Assistant Director /Chief Planner

FROM: Cameron Palmer, Planning Manager

SUBJECT: Site Plan to permit the construction of 23 parking spaces and Variances to the Zoning and Land Development Regulations including; Section 7.2 to reduce the required parking spaces; Section 4.2(B) to reduce the required minimum unit size; Section 4.2(B) to reduce the minimum average unit size; Section 4.22(I) to eliminate the required landscape buffer for at-grade parking on S. Rainbow Drive; Section 4.22(I) to eliminate the required landscape buffer for at-grade parking on S. Crescent Drive; Section 7.1(C) to permit head-in and back-out parking on S. Rainbow Drive; Section 7.1(C) to permit head-in and back-out parking on S. Crescent Drive; and Variances to the Code of Ordinances, Section 155.08(E) to increase the allowable curb cut on S. Rainbow Drive and Section 155.08(E) to increase the required curb cut on S. Crescent Drive; to enable a multifamily development, as part of a recommendation for the Application of the Affordable Housing Bonus Density pursuant to Broward Next Policy 2.16.3; within the multifamily zoning districts RM-9 and RM-18.

REQUEST

- Variance 1: Reduce the required parking spaces from 177 required to 69 parking spaces provided, pursuant to Section 7.2
- Variance 2: Reduce the required minimum unit size for multifamily buildings from 500 square feet to 385 square feet, pursuant to Section 4.2(B)
- Variance 3: Reduce the required minimum average unit size from 750 square feet to 482 square feet, pursuant to Section 4.2(B)
- Variance 4: Eliminate the required landscaper buffer for at-grade parking on South Rainbow Drive from 10' to 0', pursuant to Section 4.22(I)
- Variance 5: Eliminate the required landscaper buffer for at-grade parking on South Crescent Drive from 10' to 0', pursuant to Section 4.22(I)
- Variance 6: Permit head-in and back-out parking on South Rainbow Drive, pursuant to Section 7.1(C).

Variance 7: Permit head-in and back-out parking on South Crescent Drive, pursuant to Section 7.1(C).

Variance 8: Increase the allowable curb cut of 30 feet to 117 feet on South Rainbow Drive, pursuant to Section 155.08(E)

Variance 9: Increase the allowable curb cut of 30 feet to 202 feet on South Crescent Drive, pursuant to Section 155.08(E)

Site Plan: Modification to the parking configuration and circulation with the addition of 23 parking spaces

Affordable Housing Bonus: Application of 10 Affordable Units Bonus Density pursuant to Broward County Policy 2.16.3

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Variance 1: To be determined by the Board

Variance 2: To be determined by the Board

Variance 3: To be determined by the Board

Variance 4: To be determined by the Board

Variance 5: To be determined by the Board

Variance 6: To be determined by the Board

Variance 7: To be determined by the Board

Variance 8: To be determined by the Board

Variance 9: To be determined by the Board

Site Plan: To be determined by the Board, if variances are granted.

Affordable Housing Bonus:

Recommendation ***To be Determined by the Board*** with the following conditions:

1. The number of bonus units applied shall be **twelve (12)**, consistent with the density analysis outlined in this report.
2. Prior to submission for permitting, provide a 30-year affordable housing covenant with Broward County and as part of the Florida Housing Finance Corporation's funding structure provide a 50-year affordable housing covenant that is recorded.

BACKGROUND

The subject property is located at 3880 S. Circle Drive. It is an existing three-story building. This building was built as an assisted living facility for senior housing in 1999. The facility has been operated as senior housing for approximately 25 years and includes 104 rooms (without cooking facilities) and 47 parking spaces. The property is dual zoned within the multifamily zoning districts of RM-9 and RM-18 within the County Low-Medium (10) Residential land use designation.

REQUEST

The Applicant requests approval for a Change of Use from an existing Assisted Living Facility (ALF) to a Senior Multifamily Residential Building restricted to residents aged 55 years and older. The proposal involves the adaptive reuse of a three-story, 104-unit structure with interior modifications to provide independent living units that include full kitchens. Limited-site improvements are proposed to increase off-street parking along South Rainbow Drive and South Crescent Drive to improve, though not fully achieve, compliance with current parking standards.

Over the past several months, staff has reviewed the technical and regulatory implications of the proposed conversion and evaluated the variances required to facilitate redevelopment. The building was originally designed for assisted living purposes and presents dimensional constraints that limit full compliance with the City's current zoning and parking requirements. In its current condition, the structure is underutilized, and the Applicant indicates that continued operation as an ALF is not economically viable.

Staff's review has focused on verifying the information submitted, assessing the magnitude of the parking variance requested, and ensuring that all reasonable opportunities to add parking within site constraints were explored. The Applicant has submitted Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies, including potential shared parking arrangements, transit incentives, and pedestrian connectivity improvements, as mitigation measures intended to reduce parking impacts.

The Letter of Intent (October 20, 2025) states that ten of the 104 proposed units would be reserved for households earning up to 120% of the Area Median Income (AMI), qualifying the project for 60 density bonus units under Broward County Land Use Policy 2.16.3. The Applicant proposes to maintain the existing building footprint while incorporating interior reconfiguration and limited exterior improvements.

The Applicant's Traffic Assessment prepared by Kimley-Horn supports the proposed parking ratio of 0.66 spaces per unit (69 spaces where 177 are required), citing data from comparable age-restricted projects that reportedly operate with reduced vehicle ownership rates. The study concludes that the proposed use would result in fewer daily and peak-hour trips than the former ALF. As of the time of writing, the study's findings have not been affirmed or supported by the City's Division of Engineering, Transportation, and Mobility, and further analysis may be required with regards to the findings.

Letters from the Cities of Sanford and Winter Park and the Town of Brewster were submitted by the Applicant to illustrate outcomes of similar conversions completed by the development team. Each reference highlights instances where flexibility in parking or land-use standards was granted to facilitate reuse of underperforming ALF properties.

Taken together, the Applicant's materials suggest that the proposed project is a responsible adaptive reuse intended to preserve an existing building, provide attainable senior housing, and align with broader City and regional housing policy goals. The Applicant acknowledges the existing parking deficiency but maintains that the proposed mitigation measures, coupled with demonstrated success at comparable projects, will ensure the project functions effectively and contributes positively to the community's housing inventory.

Through the site plan review process the Technical Advisory Committee and the Applicant have not yet resolved several outstanding issues related to parking justification, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies, and completion of the traffic study, completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Staff notes that the need for several of the requested variances is self-imposed, as elements of the proposal, including the parking design and unit size configuration—deviate from established City Code standards. Staff has communicated these concerns to the Applicant and advised that the project, as currently proposed, does not fully comply with applicable zoning and design requirements.

At this time, staff defers to the discretion of the Board. The request reflects a genuine effort by the Applicant to repurpose an existing structure for viable senior housing; however, staff lacks sufficient justification to rationalize the cumulative impacts of the requested variances. Given the Applicant's financial deadlines, the item has been scheduled for consideration prior to completion of the outstanding analyses.

Variance Requests

Variance 1

The proposed multifamily use requires 177 parking spaces, and the Applicant is proposing 69 parking spaces. This results in a reduction of 108 parking spaces. Article 7.1 of the ZLDRs requires 1.5 parking spaces per unit and 1 space per every 5 units for visitor parking. The proposed site plan has a total of 69 parking spaces, 47 spaces exist, and 22 spaces are proposed, where 156 parking spaces for residents and 21 parking spaces for guests are required. This results in a parking supply of 0.5 spaces per unit. The mix of guest parking to resident parking was not provided by the applicant.

Variance 2 and 3

Request a reduction in the minimum unit size from 500 sq. ft. to 385 sq. ft., and in the minimum average unit size from 750 sq. ft. to 482 sq. ft. The existing building configuration includes smaller rooms formerly used as part of an assisted living facility. The Applicant proposes to convert these rooms into compact residential units.

Variance 4 and 5

Request a reduction of the required 10-foot front landscape buffer for at-grade parking along South Crescent Drive and South Rainbow Drive, respectively. Due to the revised parking configuration and proximity to the property line, the landscape buffer is reduced from the existing conditions of an approximate 20-foot buffer to 0 feet, encroaching partially into the right-of-way.

Variance 6 and 7

Requests relief from the prohibition on head-in/back-out parking for multifamily buildings exceeding four units. The Code permits such parking only for single-family, duplex, or multifamily developments of up to four units with integrated garages. The proposal, containing 104 units, proposes a parking configuration that locates portions of the required drive aisle encroaching within the City's right of way. This results in a head-in/back-out parking along South Crescent Drive and South Rainbow Drive, which is not permitted under current standards.

Variance 8 and 9

Request an increase in the maximum allowable curb cut width. The Code of Ordinances, Section 155.08(E), permits a maximum curb cut of 30 feet or 30% of the lot width (whichever is less). The

Applicant proposes curb cuts of 117 feet on South Crescent Drive (where none currently exists) and 202 feet on South Rainbow Drive (where none currently exists), to accommodate the revised parking layout, which is the subject of the Site Plan request. Pursuant to Section 155.08(E), the City Engineer will provide the Planning and Development board with a recommendation pertaining specifically to the curb cut variance requests. Staff notes, the City Engineer has not recommended this variance for approval.

Staff notes that several of the requested variances stem from site constraints and design choices associated with the adaptive reuse proposal. While the requests collectively seek to facilitate the redevelopment of a long-standing senior facility, additional technical review is required to determine the full extent of their impact. Staff therefore defers to the Board for consideration of the Applicant's justification.

Density and Affordable Housing Bonus Request

The Applicant proposes to maintain 104 residential units, equating to a resulting density of 32.5 dwelling units per acre, which exceeds the permitted base density of the County's Low-Medium (10) Residential land use designation. To achieve consistency with the BCLUP, the Applicant relies on the Affordable Housing Density Bonus provisions of the BCLUP Policy 2.16.3, which authorizes the allocation of bonus units in exchange for income-restricted affordable housing.

The Applicant proposes to restrict 10 of the 104 units to rents not exceeding 120% of Area Median Income (AMI) for a minimum of 30 years. Under Policy 2.16.3, developments are eligible for six (6) bonus units for each "moderate-income" unit reserved at 120% AMI. Accordingly, the project qualifies for 60 bonus units (10×6), which, when combined with the 44 base units permitted by right, allows the total of 104 units to remain consistent with the maximum density permitted through the County's affordable housing incentives.

Owner/Applicant:	Elevation Properties LLC.
Address/Location:	3880 South Circle Drive
Net Area of Property:	139,516 square feet (3.20 acres)
Land Use:	Low Medium Residential (LMRES)
Zoning:	Low-Medium Residential (RM-9) and Medium-High Residential (RM-18)
Existing Use of Land:	Assisting Living Facility (ALF)

ADJACENT LAND USE

North:	General Business (GBUS)
South:	Medium Residential (MRES)
East:	Medium Residential (MRES)
West:	Low Residential (LRES)

ADJACENT ZONING

North:	Light Intensity Office District (O-1)
South:	Low Medium Residential (RM-9) and Medium High Residential (RM-18)
East:	Medium High Residential (RM-18)
West:	Single-Family Residential (RS-5)

CONSISTENCY WITH BROWARD COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (BROWARDNEXT)

The property is located within the Low-Medium (10) Residential land use designation on the Broward County Future Land Use Map, which permits residential density up to 10 units per acre.

Broward County Land Use Plan – Policy 2.16.3 (Affordable Housing Bonus Density) Policy 2.16.3 provides a mechanism for local governments to allocate bonus residential density to developments that include units affordable to very-low, low, or moderate-income households. Under this provision, municipalities may allocate density above the underlying land use designation or zoning district maximums to facilitate mixed-income or affordable housing projects, provided the proposal remains compatible with surrounding development and local planning objectives. The policy establishes the following key provisions:

Bonus Allocation Formula:

- 6 bonus units per 1 moderate-income unit ($\leq 120\%$ AMI)
- 9 bonus units per 1 low-income unit ($\leq 80\%$ AMI)
- 19 bonus units per 1 very-low-income unit ($\leq 50\%$ AMI)

From a policy perspective, the proposed development is consistent with the Affordable Housing Bonus Density provisions established under Policy 2.16.3 of the Broward County Land Use Plan. This policy authorizes local governments to allocate additional residential density to developments that incorporate income-restricted dwelling units, subject to compliance with procedural requirements and findings of compatibility. Policy 2.16.3 provides that the total combined density, inclusive of both base and bonus units, shall not exceed fifty (50) dwelling units per acre in lands designated “Residential” in the BCLUP.

Furthermore, the local government must make findings that the proposed density allocation is compatible with existing and future land uses and that adequate public facilities and services are, or will be, available concurrent with development. Importantly, the policy specifies that the allocation of bonus density does not require a comprehensive plan amendment but may instead be implemented through the local government’s standard land development approval process.

From a land use perspective, the proposed increase in density through the affordable housing bonus is limited to the reuse of an existing structure within a built-out urban context. As such, the proposed density bonus does not result in any adverse land use compatibility issues and aligns with the City’s adopted vision to promote adaptive reuse, housing diversity, and reinvestment in existing neighborhoods.

The principal application of Policy 2.16.3, to enable adaptive reuse of existing structures through the strategic application of bonus density, can be viewed as compatible with the surrounding context and consistent with the City’s planning vision. However, the technical aspects of implementation, including site functionality, circulation, access management, and compliance with engineering and design standards, remain under active review by City staff and the City Engineer. Final confirmation of full functional compatibility will therefore be dependent upon the completion and approval of these ongoing technical evaluations.

Staff notes a discrepancy between the City’s Comprehensive Plan and Broward County’s land use provisions. While the County’s land use designation limits density to 10 dwelling units per acre, the

City's designation permits up to 16 dwelling units per acre. The Applicant's request for 10 bonus units was based on the City's higher base density; however, when applying the County's lower base density, a total of 12 bonus units would be required to achieve the proposed 104 units on the subject property.

The principle of the request remains consistent with the intent of the Broward County Comprehensive Plan, which encourages redevelopment that incorporates affordable housing opportunities. The proposal, which reserves ten (10) units for moderate-income households and achieves an overall density of 32.5 dwelling units per acre, satisfies the eligibility criteria for moderate-income bonus units and remains below the maximum density permitted by County policy. The granting of bonus density, however, remains discretionary to the local government.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Property is within the Medium Residential land use designations on the Hollywood Future Land Use Plan, which permits residential density up to 16 units per acre. It is important to note that the City's density permissions for this property meet and exceed those provided in the Broward County Land Use Plan. In instances such as these where there is a conflict of density allowance, the County's plan prevails.

Land Use Element – Objective 6: Encourage multi-use areas and mixed-use concentrations of density near existing or planned major employment centers and major transportation routes in order to promote energy conservation and mass transit, preserve air quality, reduce the cost of services, encourage affordable housing and promote economic development.

Policy 4.9: Place a priority on protecting, preserving and enhancing residential neighborhoods while incorporating the unique characteristics of redevelopment areas. (CWMP Policy CW.15 and CW.19).

Housing Element – Objective 3: Revitalize and encourage re-investment in older neighborhoods in which housing conditions are in a state of decline.

APPLICABLE CRITERIA

Analysis of Criteria and Findings for a Variance as stated in the City of Hollywood Zoning and Land Development Regulations, Article 5.3.F.(1)

VARIANCE 1: **To reduce the required number of parking spaces from 177 to 69 parking spaces, pursuant to Section 7.2**

CRITERIA 1: That the requested Variance maintains the basic intent and purpose of the subject regulations, particularly as it affects the stability and appearance of the city; and

ANALYSIS: The requested variance is the result of the conversion from an ALF into a multifamily. The ALF requirement for parking is less than a multifamily. An ALF requires parking spaces per bed in a facility while a multifamily in this zoning district requires 1.5 parking space per unit and an additional guest parking space every five units. The required parking spaces for this building is 177 parking spaces, and the Applicant is proposing 69 parking spaces, a ratio of 0.5 parking

space per unit. This building will be a Senior Housing Multifamily building of +55 years where many residents, in addition to guests, will have vehicles.

FINDING: To be determined by the Board.

CRITERIA 2: That the requested Variance is otherwise compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not be detrimental to the community; and

ANALYSIS: Overall, the proposed use is functionally compatible with the surrounding residential context and would not, in staff's assessment, be detrimental to the community in terms of land use character or location. The applicant is repurposing an existing building and is not proposing an increase to floor areas. Nonetheless, the cumulative impact of the requested parking reductions and the elimination of required landscape buffers has not been fully demonstrated to avoid potential adverse effects on neighborhood circulation, on-street parking demand, and visual character. Until such impacts are sufficiently addressed through engineering and design revisions, staff cannot conclusively determine that the proposal meets this criterion in full.

FINDING: To be determined by the Board.

CRITERIA 3: That the requested Variance is consistent with and in furtherance of the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the adopted Comprehensive Plan, as amended from time to time, the applicable Neighborhood Plan and all other similar plans adopted by the city; and

ANALYSIS: The requested variance to reduce the required parking spaces is consistent with the goals and objectives outlined in the Land Use Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Land Use Element promotes a distribution of land uses that enhances residential, business, resort, and natural communities, while also recognizing the importance of allowing landowners to reasonably maximize the use of their property. In this case, the proposed Senior Housing Facility (age 55+) represents an adaptive reuse and renovation project that supports the City's goal of expanding affordable and age-appropriate housing options.

FINDING: To be determined by the Board.

CRITERIA 4: That the need for the requested Variance is not economically based or self-imposed; or

ANALYSIS: The need for the requested variance is, to a significant extent, self-imposed, arising from the Applicant's chosen approach to adaptively reuse the existing structure for an age-restricted senior housing development.

The Applicant has indicated that achieving the full 177 parking spaces required by Code is not feasible due to site constraints; however, staff notes that opportunities appear to exist within the property where additional parking could be accommodated in a manner more consistent with zoning standards.

These options may pose design, financial, or environmental challenges, but their non-implementation reflects a matter of project feasibility rather than a physical hardship inherent to the site.

While the variance facilitates adaptive reuse and avoids significant site disturbance or new building massing, objectives that are supported in principle, staff maintains that alternative design solutions may have been available to improve compliance and reduce the degree of relief sought. Accordingly, the request represents a self-created condition stemming from the Applicant's development choices rather than a constraint beyond their control.

FINDING: To be determined by the Board.

CRITERIA 5: That the variance is necessary to comply with State or Federal Law and is the minimum Variance necessary to comply with the applicable law.

ANALYSIS: Not applicable

VARIANCE 2 AND 3: **Reduce the required minimum unit size from 500 sq. ft. to 382 sq. ft. and the minimum average unit size from 750 sq. ft. to 482 sq. ft., pursuant to Section 4.2.B**

CRITERIA 1: That the requested Variance maintains the basic intent and purpose of the subject regulations, particularly as it affects the stability and appearance of the city; and

ANALYSIS: The intent of minimum and average unit size standards is to ensure livable, functional, and safe dwelling spaces that promote quality design and neighborhood stability. The existing building was originally constructed as an Assisted Living Facility (ALF), with smaller rooms and shared service areas that are not readily adaptable to conventional apartment layouts. The proposed reduction in unit size accommodates the adaptive reuse of the structure without extensive demolition or structural reconfiguration.

The Applicant proposes to retrofit the existing units with full kitchens and independent living amenities to meet residential code standards. While the proposed units are smaller than the City's minimum, they remain consistent with the functionality expected in senior housing, where residents typically live independently but with reduced space needs. The resulting design aligns with the intent of the regulations—to provide safe, code-compliant, and habitable units—while enabling the viable reuse of an otherwise obsolete building.

FINDING: Consistent.

CRITERIA 2: That the requested Variance is otherwise compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not be detrimental to the community; and

ANALYSIS: The subject property is located in a transitional area characterized by a mix of uses, including multifamily residential buildings, particularly to the east of the site. The proposed reduction in minimum or average unit size is not anticipated to be detrimental to the community, as it aligns with existing development patterns and the evolving housing needs within the city. The Applicant's proposal to revitalize and adaptively reuse an existing building contributes positively to the neighborhood stability and reinvestment. The reduction in unit size does not alter the building's external appearance, or scale, as the Applicant is maintaining the existing footprint and height. The adaptive reuse also enhances the site's contribution to the housing supply without altering the visual character of the area.

FINDING: Consistent.

CRITERIA 3: That the requested Variance is consistent with and in furtherance of the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the adopted Comprehensive Plan, as amended from time to time, the applicable Neighborhood Plan and all other similar plans adopted by the city; and

ANALYSIS: The proposed variance advances the Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Element goals to promote the efficient use of existing structures, encourage diverse and affordable housing options, and support infill redevelopment that enhances community stability. By retrofitting an underutilized ALF into senior apartments, the project supports Objective 4 (maintain and enhance neighborhoods and business areas) and Policy 5.16 (foster economic development through creative land use and zoning).

The smaller unit sizes provide attainable housing options for older adults, supporting the City's long-term objective of housing inclusivity while minimizing the environmental impact of new construction. As no increase in overall building mass or intensity is proposed, the project maintains compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan's vision for sustainable reuse and preservation of existing building stock.

FINDING: Consistent.

CRITERIA 4: That the need for the requested Variance is not economically based or self-imposed; or

ANALYSIS: The need for the requested variance is not self-imposed but rather arises from the Applicant's effort to adaptively reuse an existing structure to meet current housing needs. The building is being remodeled and converted from an Assisted Living Facility into a Senior Multifamily Residential Building, which is a permitted use within the applicable zoning districts. As part of the renovation, each unit will be improved to include a full kitchen and interior upgrades that bring the units into compliance with applicable building and housing codes. These necessary upgrades reduce the flexibility of the existing floorplan and limit the

applicant's ability to increase unit sizes to meet current zoning standards without extensive demolition or site redesign.

FINDING: Consistent.

CRITERIA 5: That the variance is necessary to comply with State or Federal Law and is the minimum Variance necessary to comply with the applicable law.

ANALYSIS: Not applicable

VARIANCE 4 AND 5: **Eliminate the required front landscape buffer for at-grade parking along S. Rainbow Drive and S. Crescent Drive, Section 4.22(I)**

CRITERIA 1: That the requested Variance maintains the basic intent and purpose of the subject regulations, particularly as it affects the stability and appearance of the city; and

ANALYSIS: The intent of the City's landscape buffer requirements is to create a visual and physical separation between vehicular areas and the public right-of-way, enhancing the aesthetic character of streetscapes, promoting pedestrian comfort, and mitigating the visual impacts of parking areas. The Applicant is requesting to eliminate the required 10-foot front landscape buffer along both South Crescent Drive and South Rainbow Drive to accommodate additional parking within a constrained site.

While the adaptive reuse of the building supports reinvestment and housing diversity goals, the complete removal of the landscape buffer compromises the intent of the regulation. The resulting configuration would replace planted areas with vehicular paving, reducing green space, screening, and pedestrian protection. The City Engineer has not yet determined the proposed layout to be satisfactory and continues to coordinate with the Applicant to explore alternative designs that could partially restore or reintroduce landscape separation while maintaining functional parking and access.

FINDING: To Be Determined by the Board.

CRITERIA 2: That the requested Variance is otherwise compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not be detrimental to the community; and

ANALYSIS: The property is surrounded by a mix of residential and low-intensity uses where landscaped frontages contribute significantly to neighborhood character and visual quality. The proposed elimination of landscape buffers would allow for parking to extend directly to the property line, creating an atypical condition in this area and diminishing the pedestrian experience along both street frontages.

Although staff acknowledges the Applicant's intent to maximize on-site parking to support the adaptive reuse, this approach results in an urban form that is inconsistent with adjacent properties.

FINDING: To Be Determined by the Board.

CRITERIA 3: That the requested Variance is consistent with and in furtherance of the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the adopted Comprehensive Plan, as amended from time to time, the applicable Neighborhood Plan and all other similar plans adopted by the city; and

ANALYSIS: The Comprehensive Plan emphasizes high-quality design, enhanced streetscape appearance, and the incorporation of green infrastructure as integral components of sustainable urban redevelopment. The requested elimination of landscape buffers directly conflicts with these goals, as it would reduce pervious area, eliminate opportunities for shading and visual screening, and detract from the City's efforts to improve the public realm.

While the broader adaptive reuse of the site is consistent with the City's goals for reinvestment and expanded senior housing options, the complete removal of the required landscape buffer does not align with policies promoting pedestrian-oriented, visually cohesive, and environmentally responsible development.

FINDING: To Be Determined by the Board.

CRITERIA 4: That the need for the requested Variance is not economically based or self-imposed; or

ANALYSIS: The variance request is primarily a result of the Applicant's design decision to prioritize additional parking over landscaped frontage, rather than a condition arising from physical hardship. Although the building footprint and existing site depth constrain parking layout options, staff finds that the complete elimination of buffers exceeds what is necessary to accommodate the adaptive reuse.

FINDING: Inconsistent

CRITERIA 5: That the variance is necessary to comply with State or Federal Law and is the minimum Variance necessary to comply with the applicable law.

ANALYSIS: Not applicable

VARIANCE 6 AND 7: **Variance to Section 7.1(C) to permit head-in and back-out parking along S. Rainbow Drive and S. Crescent Drive in a multifamily building.**

CRITERIA 1: That the requested Variance maintains the basic intent and purpose of the subject regulations, particularly as it affects the stability and appearance of the city; and

ANALYSIS:	The requested variance does not maintain the basic intent and purpose of the applicable zoning regulations. While the Applicant is proposing an adaptive reuse of an existing building, the specific site design and parking configuration, particularly the new parking layout along Crescent Drive and Rainbow Drive, is contributing directly to the need for the variance. The proposed head-in and back-out parking is only allowed in multifamily projects of four units or less. Consequently, it is not allowed in this proposed Senior Housing Facility.
FINDING:	Inconsistent
CRITERIA 2:	That the requested Variance is otherwise compatible with the surrounding land uses and would not be detrimental to the community; and
ANALYSIS:	While the subject property is located in an area with some multifamily buildings, several of these existing properties maintain legal non-conforming parking configurations, including parking located in alleys where head-in and back-out parking are provided. However, it is important to note that these conditions reflect older developments that predate current zoning requirements and are not representative of what the Code allows for new or redeveloped sites. The Applicant's parking proposal includes a new configuration that significantly create the condition where head-in and back-out parking is provided along Crescent Drive or Rainbow Drive.
FINDING:	Inconsistent
CRITERIA 3:	That the requested Variance is consistent with and in furtherance of the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the adopted Comprehensive Plan, as amended from time to time, the applicable Neighborhood Plan and all other similar plans adopted by the city; and
ANALYSIS:	The Land Use Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan establishes the goal of promoting a balanced distribution of land uses that enhance residential, business, resort, and natural communities, while also allowing landowners to reasonably maximize the use of their property. However, the requested variance to allow head-in and back-out parking fails to align with the intent and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, the proposed parking does not comply with established Code requirements; it introduces new non-conformities rather than addressing existing site constraints.
FINDING:	Inconsistent
CRITERIA 4:	That the need for the requested Variance is not economically based or self-imposed; or
ANALYSIS:	The need for the requested variance is determined to be self-imposed. While the applicant is proposing to remodel and adapt the existing building into a senior residential facility, which is a permitted use within the RM-9 and RM-18 zoning districts, the resulting site design and parking layout introduce a non-

conforming condition that does not comply with current zoning requirements. The proposed parking configuration is a result of design decisions made by the Applicant and not an unavoidable consequence of the site's physical characteristics.

FINDING: Inconsistent

CRITERIA 5: That the variance is necessary to comply with State or Federal Law and is the minimum Variance necessary to comply with the applicable law.

ANALYSIS: Not applicable

Analysis of Criteria and Findings for a Variance as stated in the City of Hollywood Code of Ordinances, Section 155.08 (H)(2):

VARIANCE 8 AND 9: Increase the allowable curb cut on S. Rainbow Drive from 30' to 202' and on S. Crescent Drive from 30' to 177', pursuant to Section 155.08(E)

CRITERIA 1: That special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land involved and which are not applicable to other lands;

ANALYSIS: The requested variance does not satisfy this criterion, as the circumstances prompting the request are not unique to the property but rather result from the Applicant's proposed site design. While the adaptive reuse of the existing building is commendable, the specific parking configuration, particularly the new layout along S. Crescent Drive and S. Rainbow Drive creates conditions necessitating the variance. The proposed design relies on use of the public right-of-way and introduces a new curb cut that does not conform to current zoning and engineering standards. These elements are design-driven rather than land-driven and therefore do not represent a special condition inherent to the site. As proposed, the configuration conflicts with the intent of the zoning regulations to ensure safe, functional, and code-compliant site access and circulation, while maintaining the integrity of adjacent public spaces and land uses.

FINDING: Inconsistent.

CRITERIA 2: That a literal interpretation of the conditions set forth in this section would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties;

ANALYSIS: The request does not meet this criterion. Although the surrounding area includes several multifamily developments with parking configurations that do not comply with current standards, these conditions generally reflect older, legally nonconforming developments established prior to the adoption of modern zoning and engineering requirements. As such, they are not indicative of rights currently afforded to property owners under the existing Code. The Applicant's proposal introduces a new curb cut along S. Rainbow Drive and S. Crescent Drive that exceeds the maximum allowable width by a substantial

margin, approximately six times the permitted standard, and incorporates parking areas within the public right-of-way along S. Rainbow Drive and S. Crescent Drive. These elements are inconsistent with the rights and development standards applicable to new or redeveloped properties and therefore do not demonstrate a deprivation of rights commonly enjoyed by others.

FINDING: Inconsistent.

CRITERIA 3: That the special conditions and circumstances do not result from actions of the applicant; and

ANALYSIS: This criterion is not satisfied. The conditions leading to the requested variance stem directly from the Applicant's proposed site design rather than from inherent characteristics of the property. The proposed curb cut substantially exceeds the maximum width permitted by the Code, creating a new nonconformity instead of mitigating existing site limitations in a manner consistent with the City's planning policies. Furthermore, the design conflicts with neighborhood and area-specific plan goals intended to promote walkability, safe and efficient street design, and a cohesive urban form. Therefore, the need for the variance arises from the Applicant's design choices, not from special conditions inherent to the land.

FINDING: Inconsistent

CRITERIA 4: That the granting of the variances requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this section to other lands. No pre-existing conditions on neighboring land which are contrary to this section shall be considered grounds for the issuance of a variance

ANALYSIS: This criterion is not met. The requested variance would confer a special privilege to the Applicant by allowing a site design and parking configuration that exceed the dimensional and locational standards established by the zoning code. While the proposed adaptive reuse of the existing building as a senior residential facility is a permitted use within the RM-9 and RM-18 zoning districts, the resulting design introduces new nonconformities, specifically, an wide curb cut and parking areas within the public right-of-way, that are not consistent with what is permitted for other properties. These conditions result from the Applicant's design choices rather than from any unique or unavoidable characteristics of the site. Staff's review indicates that alternative site layouts appear feasible and could accommodate code-compliant parking and access. As such, approval of the variance would effectively grant the Applicant a special privilege not available to other similarly zoned properties.

FINDING: Inconsistent

CRITERIA 5: That the variance is necessary to comply with State or Federal Law and is the minimum Variance necessary to comply with the applicable law.

ANALYSIS: Not applicable

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Application Package

Attachment B: Land Use and Zoning Map

Attachment C: Public Participation Meeting