

**APPROVED**  
**AFFORDABLE HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE CITY HALL –8<sup>th</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE, FL**  
**MONDAY, DECEMBER 21, 2009 – 6:00 P.M.**

<b>Board Members</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>Cumulative Attendance</b>	
		<b>7/09 through 6/10</b>	
		<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Rebecca Jo Walter, Chair	P	2	0
Janet Riley, Vice Chair [6:05]	P	2	0
Margie Alexander	P	2	0
Tam English	P	2	0
Peter Henn	P	2	0
William Isenberg	P	1	1
Jim Jordan [6:08]	P	2	0
Jonathan Jordan [6:34]	P	2	0
Greg Stuart	P	1	1
Roosevelt Walters	P	2	0

**Staff**

Susan Batchelder, Liaison, Community Development Division  
 Angelia Basto, Clerk/Typist II  
 Jennifer Picinich, ProtoType Inc.

**Communications to the City Commission**

The Affordable Housing Advisory Committee would like to present their discussions on future responsibilities and priorities to City Commission. See discussion on pages 2 – 6 of these minutes.

**Call to Order**

Chair Walter called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

**Roll Call**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. Roll was called and it was determined that a quorum was present.

**Board / Staff Introductions**

City staff and Committee members introduced themselves in turn.

Ms. Riley arrived at 6:05.

### **Approval of Minutes Summary – November 2009**

**Motion** made by Mr. English, seconded by Mr. Isenberg, to approve the minutes of the November 2009 meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

### **Future Responsibilities of the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee**

Ms. Batchelder distributed a copy of the changes to ordinance that the Committee had discussed at their last meeting. The item had been approved for the City Commission meeting on January 6, 2010 at 1:00 p.m.

Mr. Henn referred to exhibit 1 from their November meeting, which was backup for the Commission Agenda Request [CAR] item. He noted that in the minutes, the Committee had recommended adding Item C. Ms. Batchelder said staff had included additional information in the CAR.

Mr. Jim Jordan arrived at 6:08.

Chair Walters advised that she could remain in her appointment as she worked for another non-profit organization that fit the requirements. Ms. Batchelder suggested keeping the member at large position because the required definitions and descriptions of members narrowed the field. Keeping the member at large position would make it possible to appoint a member quickly, if needed. It would be up to the Commission to decide.

Mr. Henn noted that there was a new City Commission, and stated staff had provided “more generic backup” with the report to the State and had not included the Committee’s report and recommendations. He wondered if the new City Commission had seen the Committee’s report. Ms. Batchelder explained that this Commission had approved the Committee’s report in May. She agreed to mention that the Commission should have a copy of the Committee’s report.

Chair Walter had distributed the Committee’s report from last year and a copy of an FIU study that ranked each City and highlighted affordable housing areas they should improve. Chair Walter asked Ms. Batchelder to provide the Committee with an update regarding any items on which she felt the City had made progress, or items on which the Committee should concentrate.

Mr. Henn asked about the City's rating. Chair Walter said this was an excerpt from a 200-300-page report. She agreed to send the full report to staff to email to all Committee members.

Chair Walter referred to page seven of the Committee's plan, which listed their additional recommendations:

- A) Expedited permitting
- B) Impact Fees
- C) Flexibility in Density
- H) Street Requirements
- I) Land Banking

Chair Walter wanted to discuss land banking. She understood the City Auditor had been working on a land-banking list in the fall. Ms. Batchelder reported the City Commission was putting two or three properties out to bid at every Commission meeting. These were typically properties in which adjacent owners were interested. The other inventory of all the land the City owned was still in the works. These were properties that had been purchased with Federal funds and must be used for housing. Ms. Batchelder agreed to provide Committee members with a copy of this list prior to their next meeting.

Ms. Batchelder explained that Federal programs did not allow the City to land bank; the land was supposed to be used immediately for infill housing. Considering the current situation, she felt it would be very difficult to justify building brand-new housing on these properties.

Mr. English remembered there had been a bid to transfer those properties to someone to build infill housing. Some of these properties had been near the incinerator and had been removed from the project. Mr. English asked if these original parcels had been built upon. Ms. Batchelder said there was another group of parcels that had never been built because environmental studies indicated additional work must be done on the land.

Mr. Walters asked if there was a map of parcels owned by the City that would be suitable for affordable housing. Ms. Batchelder agreed to provide this.

Mr. Stuart stated HDR had been hired by the City two years ago to inventory all City-owned properties. The report had been submitted to the prior City Commission. He wondered why the City was spending more money and "investigating this all over again." He requested staff give a presentation regarding the properties listed in this report. Mr. Stuart was also aware of City-

owned property that was “muck site” off of State Road 7 that could be put into production for use as affordable housing. Nothing had ever been done with this property, and Mr. Stuart believed the City Manager had decided to sell this property.

Mr. English said State Law required that all surplus property must be inventoried to determine what could be used. Ms. Batchelder thought that the Real Estate Office had gotten involved with this, and she agreed to research this and distribute the report to Committee members.

Mr. Henn was concerned about the January 6 Conference meeting because it was the day after the Orange Bowl and it was the Commission’s first day back. He feared that the Commission might agree that the suggestions were good, but would “move on to the next item and never really get down to any substance.” Mr. Henn felt it might be better to wait for a February Commission meeting.

Mr. Jonathan Jordan arrived at 6:34.

Mr. Henn inquired if Housing and Community Development was preparing a Power Point presentation. Ms. Batchelder said if Mr. Brown was developing a PowerPoint presentation, she had not seen it. If the Committee was concerned about the timing of the presentation, staff could try to schedule their conference item for a later date.

Chair Walter said the Committee should decide if they wanted to go to the Commission this time to get their blessing to continue to meet, or if they also wanted to go over their report and/or get direction from the Commission. Chair Walter was certain that many of their suggestions had not even been considered. They must determine if they wanted to concentrate on a specific topic, or if they wanted the Commission to consider all of their suggestions.

Mr. English noted that it would be difficult for Committee members to contact members of the Commission in the next two weeks because of the holidays, and recommended they request to be put on the next Commission agenda after January 6. Chair Walter wanted to stay on the January 6 agenda to get the Commission’s approval to continue meeting. They could request to be put on another agenda in a couple of months to present the real issues.

Mr. Henn suggested that the PowerPoint Mr. Brown would present in January should include a summary of the Committee’s suggestions to get some direction from the Commission.

Mr. Jim Jordan said he still did not have a handle on what the Committee wanted to do. Chair Walter wanted to be able to provide the Commission information regarding the direction they wanted to take.

Chair Walter asked if the Committee could add more to the presentation; Ms. Batchelder advised they should wait a couple of days to add to it. Mr. Stuart did not believe the presentation would change. He thought they must meet with the Commission in January and again after that, when they could present a business plan for the Commission's review and approval. Mr. Stuart said each Committee member should meet with his/her Commissioner to get some agreement.

Ms. Alexander was frustrated by the situation and the inaction on the part of the City to provide affordable housing. She did not feel the Committee should be "trying to beg people to recognize us." Chair Walter said the entire Committee should attend the January 6 meeting to show their desire to be recognized and to request permission to move forward.

Ms. Riley was frustrated as well. She agreed that the Committee must create an agenda and have the Commission's backing.

Mr. Henn noted that April 6 was the Commission's first meeting in the second quarter, and perhaps they should request to return to the Commission then with a follow-up report. In the meantime, they should include a PowerPoint summary of their suggestions. Mr. English recommended they request any meeting in April, to provide flexibility. The Committee agreed to this.

The Committee agreed to meet next on February 15.

Chair Walter agreed to work with staff on the presentation for January 6.

Mr. Henn felt the Committee should concentrate on short-term recommendations, such as the land banking and permit expediting. Ms. Riley pointed out that the permitting idea had been in the works for years. Mr. English said the expedited process existed, but it was not what it should be. Ms. Riley said they needed to pin this down and discuss how it should be improved.

Mr. English felt that the biggest issue was funding, which the Committee could not solve. Mr. Henn thought the Commission would discuss the Dr. Kennedy Homes on January 20. Mr. Henn remarked that zoning allowed another 80 units to be built on the Dr. Kennedy Homes property, but these would not be built not only because of economics, but also because of the neighbors and politics. He felt this was a true test case.

Ms. Riley said she had problems with the Dr. Kennedy Homes. She did not believe that the current residents would be able to afford to return to the new development.

Chair Walter did not want to bring this up on January 6 because it was a separate issue and people were split on it.

Mr. Stuart referred to the Committee's report, and noted that on page 12 they recommended development near transportation hubs and employments centers. He remarked that the Dr. Kennedy Homes site was near a transportation hub and an employment center. Mr. Stuart reminded everyone that there were density bonuses available for affordable housing, yet this project was not being built even to the density allowance. He felt this was ridiculous.

Mr. Stuart thought the Committee might take on the challenge of getting the current residents of Dr. Kennedy Homes back after the property was re-built, and work to convince the City to build to the allowed density even when the neighbors thought it was objectionable.

Ms. Riley said Broward County Housing Authority had torn down public housing and purchased adjacent land. They would build low income, tax credit housing and public housing, which would be paid for by increasing the density. She wondered if something like this could be done at Dr. Kennedy Homes.

Mr. Stuart stated he would welcome an agenda for their next meeting that described how the Committee could get to where they needed to go. In reading the CAR, Mr. Stuart did not believe there was staff support for the Committee to exist, and he said staff should let the Committee know if this was the case. Ms. Batchelder stated at the Administrative level, they wanted the Committee.

Mr. Henn thought the Committee might schedule a Special Conference meeting with the Commissioners on April 13 at Dr. Kennedy Homes or a location on Sistrunk Boulevard to discuss the issues.

Mr. Walters stated there was consensus that they all wanted to do something but they lacked consensus regarding what they should be doing. He thought they needed the time to come up with recommendations to present to the City, and suggested that their February meeting should "last until we get something accomplished" so they would have something to present to the Commission in April.

Mr. English felt there were things that could be done with the funding that came into the City, and there were many opportunities about which the Committee could give some guidance to the City, depending on how much direction the Commission was willing to give them.

### **Other Business**

[This item was heard out of order]

Chair Walter reported that FIU had provided a 2009 affordable housing update to the Broward County Housing Council. She agreed to forward this to staff. Chair Walter explained that FIU had conducted several housing studies, and this update pointed out that there was still an affordability gap for single-family housing. The problem for renters was not going away, and the gap for the very low income had worsened. FIU projected that 75% of future renters and 55% of future owners would come from the low and moderate-income households. This showed the need for affordable housing in the County and the City. Ms. Batchelder agreed to send this update to the City Commission.

Chair Walter asked Committee members to attend the January 6 Commission conference meeting. She also asked Committee members to look over the back-up materials and the needs assessment and send staff comments.

### **Good of the Order**

None

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business to bring before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by J. Opperlee, Prototype, Inc.]