

Scanned to A. P. ... 6/8/18

Exhibit A.

Ordinance No. 090-07-133

SECTION 4. Allowable use. Land Development Regulations Article III, Zoning Districts, Part 5.0., Special Regulations for Specific Land Use Classifications, Section 5.13., Correctional and Judicial facilities, is hereby amended by adding Subsection 5.13.1., as set forth below.

1. Prohibited use; amortization. A correctional and judicial facility shall be a prohibited use; however, any existing correctional or judicial facility within the Community Commercial, General Commercial or Community Facility zoning districts may continue to operate as a legal non-conforming use until August 31, 2015. Thereafter, the land use shall cease and be abandoned.

SECTION 5. Findings and Conclusions. The Development Review Report prepared by City staff is attached hereto, incorporated herein, and is hereby adopted as the findings of fact and conclusions of law to support the Ordinance amending the Land Development Regulations.

SECTION 6. Conflict. All ordinances or parts of ordinances, all resolutions or parts of resolutions in conflict herewith be and the same are hereby repealed as to the extent of such conflict.

SECTION 7. Codification. The provisions of this Ordinance shall become and be made a part of the City of Lauderdale, Florida Land Development Regulations; sections of this Ordinance may be renumbered or re-lettered to accomplish such intention; and the word "ordinance" may be changed to "article," "part," "section," or other appropriate word.

SECTION 8. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

DATED this 31st day of August, 2009.

PASSED on first reading this 13th day of July, 2009.

PASSED AND ADOPTED on second reading this 31st day of August, 2009.

Police Chief Kenneth Pachnek remarked the facility was not utilized as a jail site, but if someone were arrested, they would be held there until the police arrived to pick them up. Thus, the confinement was temporary, this was not a holding facility.

Mayor Kaplan inquired if staff was comfortable the wording of the ordinance did not grant the right to create a holding facility for the next five years.

City Attorney Hall answered: yes. He had been working with Ms. Baker, the property owner, and the City had the current tenants sign an addendum to their leases to further commit them to vacate the subject premises at the end of the lease.

Mayor Kaplan queried if the site contained any "behind bars" accommodations in which to place violators and, if not, was the applicant proposing to create such a site.

Chief Pachnek stated they did not and would not create such a site.

City Manager Faranda commented there had been some serious issues at the subject site where violators knowing they were going to jail endeavored to evade arrest. He had been assured by the applicant they would not be holding people, as there was no adequately secure detention room. This would only serve to stress the City's police department, increasing the calls for service at Lauderhill taxpayers' expense. The applicant indicated the City's conditions as set forth in the ordinance would be met, though he hoped there was some way for the agreement to be revoked if they were not. The Lauderhill Police Department could attest to the burden created through its records of the number of calls for service generated from the subject facility. He recognized these were tough economic times and the City wished to work with its businesses but, without the conditions, the use could constitute a serious drain on the City's resources and actually cost to help provide the parole officer. These assurances need to be on the record to ensure certain past activities did not recur.

Mayor Kaplan questioned the type of language staff could include in the ordinance to make the agreement revocable if the conditions of the agreement were violated.

City Attorney Hall believed it possible, recommending an amendment to the language in Section 5.13, section four to include a revocation clause accordingly.

Vice Mayor Benson made a motion to amend Ordinance No. 09O-07-133 as stated by the City Attorney, seconded by Commissioner Bates. The vote was as follows:

Commissioner Bates	Yes
Vice Mayor Benson	Yes
Commissioner Berger	Yes
Commissioner Holness	Yes
Mayor Kaplan	Yes

Vice Mayor Benson stated he had similar concerns with the proposed ordinance, citing a personal experience at the subject site when he went there just to observe. He had a questionable confrontation with a deputy sheriff that wished to know what he was looking for and if he was some form of inspector. He did not reveal he was an elected official and