

**MINUTES OF CITY COMMISSION WORKSHOP  
DOWNTOWN MASTER PLAN  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2003 – 4:00  
CITY COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM  
8<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR, CITY HALL  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**

Meeting was called to order at 4:25 p.m. by Mayor Naugle on the above date, City Commission Meeting Room.

**Present:**

Mayor Jim Naugle  
Vice-Mayor Carlton B. Moore  
Commissioner Christine Teel  
Commissioner Dean J. Trantalis  
Commissioner Cindi Hutchinson

**Staff:**

Alan Silva, City Manager  
Harry Stewart, City Attorney  
Lucy Kisela, City Clerk  
Greg Kisela, Assistant City Manager  
Bud Bentley, Assistant City Manager  
Cecelia Hollar, Director Construction Services  
Bruce Chatterton, Planning & Zoning Services Manager

Margaret A. D'Alessio, Recording Secretary

**Consultants:**

Marc C. LaFerrier, Keith & Schnars, P.A.

**Guests**

|                        |                  |             |
|------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Doug Eagon             | Clare Vickery    | Stuart Rahn |
| Margi Glavovic-Nothard | Debbie Orshefsky |             |

**Downtown Master Plan**

Bruce Chatterton, Planning and Zoning Services Manager, stated that on November 4, 2003, the City Commission had deferred consideration of the draft of the Downtown Master Plan to November 18, 2003, and requested today's workshop to be held.

Mr. Chatterton stated that throughout the process, the consultant and staff continued to work with the stakeholders on resolving and clarifying outstanding issues. He continued stating that instead of reviewing the entire plan again, they would only focus on those areas of the design guidelines which had been revised or clarified. He stated these changes were being shown with the hopes of obtaining the Commission's formal

acceptance of the draft plan on November 18, 2003. He added that would be in time for the Broward County Planning Council Meeting to be held on November 20, 2003 regarding the re-certification of the 2960 flex units for the Downtown.

Marc LaFerrier, Keith and Schnars, stated that he was going to discuss the revisions made in the Urban Design Guidelines and the Framework Plan which had been made since the October 21, 2003 meeting. He added that he was also going to give a brief introduction to the Downtown Master Plan document.

Mr. LaFerrier stated that he had broken the discussion regarding the Urban Design Guidelines into two sections. First were the changes presented at the October 28, 2003 meeting of the Steering Committee at the Commission's request. He added that the second part of the discussion would refer to revisions which had been made after the October 28, 2003 Steering Committee meeting. He stated that he would then discuss the character area changes which were proposed by the Steering Committee in reference to the Near Downtown character area. He stated that a slide would be shown regarding the revision of the street layout portion of the Framework Plan regarding the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Extension. He proceeded to show the cover of the document which he stated was still in draft form, and final changes would be made as they approached final adoption of the Plan.

Mr. LaFerrier explained that the Table of Contents showed the progression from the vision of a plan, including public involvement, details of the site context, physical and historical environments, cultural environment, and a description of a framework plan which laid out green space, streets, uses, and building types. He stated it then went into the Design Guidelines and their implementation. He reiterated that most of today's discussion would be about the Design Guidelines.

Mr. LaFerrier stated that the progression in the chapters of the document followed along the progression of the plan.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 4:31 p.m.

Mr. LaFerrier explained that there were two portions of Urban Design Guidelines. One involved building great streets, and most of the discussion relative to the streets was something that consensus had been reached on with the Steering Committee and the engineering entities. He added that Glatting Jackson also assisted in that regard and added that they were presently working on the Precinct Plan for Flagler Heights. He stated that most of the discussion held with the Steering Committee subsequent to the Commission seeing the document on the October 21, 2003, involved the building design guidelines so buildings could relate to the streets and create a good urban environment.

Mr. LaFerrier proceeded to show some of the descriptions of the guidelines and what issues had been addressed. He added that basically they had described street guidelines with typical cross sections of streets, arrangement of pedestrian and vehicular facilities within the rights-of-way, streetscape and street tree planting, and the relationships of new buildings to their adjacent neighbors. He stated those were all items that they would recommend changes in regarding regulations and standards through the engineering agencies.

Mr. LaFerrier continued stating that secondly the building and design guidelines related to the massing and scale of buildings, along with the horizontal and vertical articulation of building facades and the treatment and position of entries. He stated that the guidelines were not intended to be prescriptive and they understood there were applications and alternative ideas that would have to be used on different sites with site constraints. Therefore, they described each one with the preface that it was a guideline to be encouraged or a condition to be discouraged, or it was a preferred standard.

Mr. LaFerrier stated that they had delineated the discussion into changes which had been made after the October 21st and October 28th meetings, and he had identified the slides with highlighting. He explained that he had also attempted to categorize them.

Mr. LaFerrier stated that in regard to a new guideline, they had the opportunity to discuss with individuals more about the requirements for open space in the Downtown. He added that one of the ways they had been accommodated in the past was by placing them along the perimeter and spreading out. He explained they felt that should be discouraged and a better approach would be to create an active plaza space. He further stated that part of the guidelines talked about the importance of a street wall which was the wall that ran along a street with active uses, including shading and overhangs, and they wanted to note that the wall could be broken with street entrances and plazas.

Mr. LaFerrier stated that something they wanted to clarify was the street length. He stated that they recognized that 300' would be a maximum appropriate length for a building, but that there could be a break such as dividing the structure into multiple buildings or breaking the façades with entranceways or plazas.

Commissioner Trantalis asked how a 300' building would relate to the length of the City's blocks. Mr. LaFerrier replied that the Downtown had a variety of block lengths, and some of the blocks ranged from 400' to 800'. He stated that a typical block was probably about 400', but in Flagler Heights they were between 200' and 300'.

Mr. LaFerrier clarified that they were encouraging building facades, bay windows and balconies particularly on residential streets, but they needed to keep in mind that other elements were involved, such as street furniture, lighting and trees.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if they were going to encourage awnings, what would be the process so variances would not be involved.

Mr. Chatterton explained that they were encouraging these elements where possible, and some encroachment would be permitted, and he added that there had been a recent code change regarding that issue. He stated they had to retain the DOT standards for clearance.

Mr. LaFerrier stated that the next slide began talking about the different guidelines for the various character areas, and one of the things identified early on in the process was the importance of a diverse downtown. He proceeded to show a computer model which laid out the urban fabric and the build-out of redevelopment and in-fill properties in the Downtown. He added that in the Downtown core there could be signature buildings, more commercial, institutional and financial uses, but it would still have a mixed-use environment that would be a 24/7 downtown core. As one moved out of that core, there would be a transition into a different scale, but they would still have the same density

and intensity only taking a different form. He added the form would be following larger buildings fronting the streets with more active uses, and not the signature skylines of the Downtown Core.

Mr. LaFerrier stated that as one moved away further from the core, there would be the Urban Neighborhood consisting of a more diverse community, but primarily residential use. He stated that with each character area there were specific guidelines which occurred. He reminded the Commission about the discussions regarding street walls, building shoulders, and where towers would be located and how large they could be for each area. He proceeded to show some of the revised design guidelines. He stated that one of the revisions was to provide additional flexibility for the street wall. He explained the former street wall was a maximum of 85' and it would now be 120'. He stated another example of a revised guideline in the Downtown Core was the preferred max gross floor area for the residential towers from 10,000 sq. ft. to 12,000 sq. ft. He stated this showed the Steering Committee's recommended revision to the Near Downtown area to include other properties.

Mr. LaFerrier stated there were a few changes made to the Near Downtown, including the street wall heights to provide more flexibility, a recognition that there was a need to expand the maximum gross floor area for a residential tower in the Near Downtown, and guidance for the maximum preferred gross floor area for office buildings.

Mr. LaFerrier stated there were a number of changes made to the Urban Neighborhood, such as the street wall heights, identification of how townhouses could be fronted on secondary streets, and various shoulders and step-backs. He added that if an office building was in an Urban Neighborhood, they provided an example of a preferred floor plate for a tower. He stated other changes were made as a result of the Steering Committee's recommendations and proceeded to show the update.

Mr. LaFerrier stated they had discussed the importance of having shading and cover for pedestrians along the streets and sidewalks, and more ground floor retail. Examples were shown as to how that could be accomplished, including the installation of awnings and eyebrow overhangs. He proceeded to show a graphic describing such elements.

Mr. LaFerrier stated that as one began designing a building with street wall heights described in the Urban Design Guidelines, it began affecting what would be the floor to ceiling height of the first floor, and they felt it was important to have the ground floor at a minimum of 15'. He further stated that sometimes a tower could be proposed on a secondary street, and such streets would be 60' or smaller in right-of-way widths. He also stated that they recognized in order to keep the light and air opened on a narrow street and make sure the tower would not over power the area, there needed to be a greater step-back. He stated that in most character areas there was between a 10' to 20' step-back, but on a smaller secondary street in the Near Downtown or Urban Neighborhood, they were recommending that the step-back be 30'. He added they were also recognizing that this might not be the only alternative in achieving the approach for providing light and air. He stated that another approach could be the sky plan which involved a gradual step-back as one went up the tower.

Mr. LaFerrier continued stating that in regard to the location of the towers, there was a preference to put the larger tower element towards the primary street where possible.

Mr. LaFerrier stated further that they had discussed the character areas in great detail with the stakeholders and the Steering Committee. He stated these were important in providing a diverse environment for the Downtown, and would build on the characteristics of each area providing a variety of business and housing opportunities. He stated this would also avoid the monolith of urban development which could occur if a simple build-out was done. He stated this could also prevent random redevelopment patterns, and allow the building to be done in a planned fashion. He proceeded to show the character area map which was broken down into colors for each area. He explained that the Steering Committee recommended there be a revision to the map which was that the area between Federal Highway and west of 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> would be included in the Near Downtown. He stated they recognized this as a workable solution for the matter.

Mr. LaFerrier explained that there had also been a revision to the Framework Plan. He explained further that such plan laid out in concept the different aspects of a plan in work, and what was important was the movement and access. He stated they recognized that in some of the super blocks, it would be important to add additional roadways in order to help with traffic circulation and provide new store and street fronts for the Downtown. He explained that their most recent Framework Plan showed a new street going from 4<sup>th</sup> about mid-block an extension of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Broward Boulevard. He stated that the Baptist Church in the area was presently going through final review for improvements to their site which would preclude the extension of the roadway to Broward Boulevard.

Commissioner Moore returned at 4:49 p.m.

Commissioner Trantalis stated they had indicated that a section of 4<sup>th</sup> to Sistrunk Boulevard would be resolvable. Mr. LaFerrier replied that what was presented by the Steering Committee which was to extend the Near Downtown to that area would be a workable solution. Mr. Chatterton stated they recognized that as existing zoning.

Mayor Naugle reiterated that the Plan would go before the City Commission for adoption on November 18, 2003. Mr. Chatterton confirmed.

Commissioner Moore stated that he continued to hear that the zoning was not to be changed, but in listening to the presentation it basically stated that in some of the character areas there would be various setbacks in order to get a particular height for a structure. He felt that would reduce the opportunity for developable property, and asked how they would deal with the Bert Harris issue and if such an issue existed.

Mr. LaFerrier stated he could not answer whether a Bert Harris issue was involved, but they worked very diligently with the stakeholders who made them sensitive to the issue. He felt it was recognized that they were not attempting to change the density or intensity of sites, and felt the current zoning was something that could be worked into a different form. Thereby, the buildings would take on different shapes and meet the streets differently.

The City Attorney stated that the issue was trying to find some guidelines and no zoning changes were involved. He further stated that under the current zoning if there were 60 units to the acre and the developer was only permitted to build 30-35, that would not be a taking of property because the zoning permitted up to 60 units to the acre but did not

guarantee those units. He explained that on a case-by-case basis to the extent they frustrated investment backed expectations, then Bert Harris would come into play. He stated this would take the existing zoning and allow them to build "up to" whatever the existing zoning permitted, and would supply the criteria to evaluate neighborhood compatibility which was part of the zoning ordinance at this time. He stated it was not adding anything to the zoning ordinance other than the ability to set out criteria for making such a determination.

Commissioner Moore stated that he understood that the Downtown Core would have 60 units to the acre, and the Near Downtown had 60 units to the acre, but due to the Design Guidelines there would be a number of properties not built to their maximum capacities. He asked how would they select one development interest over another as to who would have the opportunity to build the 60 units to the acre.

Mr. Chatterton explained that they were talking about the shape of buildings and their overall configuration. He stated that under this Plan, the Urban Neighborhoods could achieve high density as long as open space and appropriate setbacks were provided, along with the appropriate building articulation. He added that it had to do with the shape of the buildings, and not the density. He further stated they were recommending a design that would fit the community's vision for the Downtown.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that often setback issues were brought to the Commission's attention and many projects had been denied because of insufficient setbacks. He stated that was even a sticking point in the Palazzo project. He asked how they could overcome such an argument.

Mr. Chatterton stated that in the case of the Downtown, they wanted to have a good building to reinforce the edge of the street with a street wall so the pedestrians would be comfortable. He stated it involved using setbacks in a more positive manner. He stated that in regard to the Beach, they might not want to be as urban. He stated that in looking at some examples of the buildings in the Downtown, it was possible there were too generous setbacks.

Commissioner Trantalis stated he agreed with the vision, but from a practical point of view the developers were looking to maximize the acreage. Mr. LaFerrier explained that the guidelines did not envision pushing back buildings in the Downtown, but envisioned moving them forward. Commissioner Trantalis asked if the wall might not be a little high at 80' to 120'. Mr. LaFerrier stated that it depended where it was located in the Downtown and that was why the heights, street walls and building shoulders were different for different character areas. He added that the step backs were greater in some of the areas. He added that they were envisioning an urban environment for the Downtown core.

Commissioner Moore clarified that they were suggesting that the first floor be 15' for all developments because awnings and other treatments could be provided along the roadways. Then, along the secondary roadways they were asking for 30' setbacks if there was to be a towering building. Mr. LaFerrier stated that the 15' would be the floor to ceiling height for non-residential uses, and then if there was a residential or non-residential use on a secondary street depending upon the character area, the street wall could be against the sidewalk anywhere from 25' to 120'. He stated then the step back would be necessary and would be about 10' to 20' on the arterial streets depending on

the character area. He stated that when one came above the building shoulder, and a tower was being created on a secondary street, the tower would have to step back 30'. He stated they recognized that the 30' step back might not work well in all cases, and was a preference they were encouraging where possible. He stated they had also identified there was another way of getting the 30' step back which was through the sky plan.

Commissioner Moore stated that the design guidelines appeared to possibly propose changing the zoning one day. He stated he wanted to clearly understand if this was a preference to design guidelines or was it going to be the rule, and when it went through DRC what would be the verdict. He asked if it would be the 60 units per acre or would it be the 60 units per acre only if the preferred guidelines were met. He asked for some further clarification on those issues.

The City Attorney stated that it could be neither. He explained they might not get the 60 units to the acre even if the guidelines were met. He stated that if there were 100 units to the acre in the Center City center mass, the way the planning guidelines for neighborhood compatibility were now used, they would be able to build higher in the middle than on the edge. When they would get to the edge of the RAC, they would not be able to go up 30-40 stories and would have to build closer.

Mayor Naugle stated that the New River Market Place was kept at 9 stories since it was on the edge and had been tapered. He stated that site had unlimited height, but what was given in one section was taken away in another or limited.

The City Attorney stated it depended on the mentality of the person reading the ordinance.

Cecelia Hollar, Construction Services Director, stated that she believed the Master Plan would give guidance. She stated that today when a project came in, the Code provided for neighborhood compatibility, but that guidance was needed to understand what they were attempting to achieve collectively. She further stated that it was not how tall the building was, but was how one went tall. She added that it would also give better guidance to staff when working with the development community.

Commissioner Moore asked what the stakeholders' opinions were about this.

Courtney Crush, attorney representing Summit Properties, stated that comments from her clients regarded the maximums for the 12,500 sq. ft. floor plate limitations. She stated they hoped there would be flexibility and possibly some creative design could be applied.

Stuart Rahn, representing Paul Hugo, stated that one of his properties had been changed from RAC-CC to the Downtown Middle area, and if one studied the graphics there were three areas. One was the Downtown with high-rises, the second one showed high-rises on the corners, and the third one showed lower properties. He stated that his building was in the center of a long secondary street and the setbacks were larger. He stated being a smaller property owner that affected him more. He stated that Paul Hugo's property was not on a major street and was a smaller parcel also and because of setbacks, they would force his place to be smaller and cause greater impacts.

Mr. LaFerrier reiterated that there was no description of heights anywhere in the presentation materials and it was still considered part of the zoning.

Commissioner Moore stated that Mr. Rahn felt with the larger setbacks that his property could only have a 5-story building constructed on it. Mr. Rahn further stated that side setbacks were also involved and nothing had yet been discussed regarding that issue. He further explained that if he put a building on a parcel that was 100' x 135', and taking into consideration all the setbacks, greater impacts would be felt. He reiterated that they would be cutting back on buildable area.

Mr. LaFerrier stated that there appeared to be some confusion regarding setbacks and step-backs. He explained that a setback occurred on a ground plane with the first floor being set back from the property line. He stated they envisioned that to change with the guidelines so there could be a build-to line and the setback would be reduced, and the building moved up to the sidewalk. He stated then for the next 7-8 floors there could be a step-back which could be as small as 10' and as much as 30'. He reiterated these were only guidelines which were being encouraged, and they realized that staff would have to work with the individual developers as projects came in. He further explained the step-back was above the building shoulder, and if on a right-of-way less than 60' one would have an opportunity to take the graduated step-back approach. He stated that more could be built because there would be less setback on the ground floor, and possibly the building could even be slightly taller.

Mr. Rahn stated that he had been misinformed previously and it appeared the issue was also how wide the sidewalk would be.

Clare Vickery stated that this was a great master plan, and she wanted the City Commission to discuss, especially in the urban neighborhoods regarding the new units, massing, height and setbacks, and not be afraid to address those elements. She stated that would help provide some high quality residential for the areas and provide financial gain.

Commissioner Moore asked if there were any height restrictions in any of the areas. Mr. LaFerrier replied there were no height restrictions except for those which already existed under zoning.

Mr. Chatterton stated that Urban Village allowed up to 150' if certain conditions were met such as neighborhood compatibility. The Urban Design Guidelines would help to better define what was compatible.

Ms. Vickery reiterated that she would like to meet with staff regarding further clarification of the urban neighborhoods.

Doug Eagon, Stiles Corporation and member of the DDA, stated that he wanted to thank Mark LaFerrier and the entire planning staff and the consulting team. He felt they were sincere in their cooperation and responsiveness. He stated the plan was not perfect, but was a workable one. He felt there were solutions available, and they were now at a jumping off point. He believed there would be confusion and there needed to be a learning process for everyone involved in order to understand how such guidelines were to be utilized. He felt they all had to work together, and the guidelines would direct them, but everyone involved needed to put forth their best efforts to adhere to such guidelines.



He suggested that possibly additional guidance could be provided by the consultants to further explain the plan and misspell any misconceptions that people had regarding this.

Commissioner Moore suggested models be shown explaining what could be built in the areas before and after this plan. Mr. Chatterton stated that if the guidelines were to be applied in a RAC-UV area, there was an envelope up to 150' under certain conditions. He reiterated that there would be a range involved.

Margi Glavovic-Nothard, Vice-Chair of the Steering Committee and Professor at FAU, stated that the School of Architecture and Department of Regional Planning at FAU would be happy to host a forum in order to help get to the next step in the process. She also thanked the consultants and her colleagues on the Steering Committee, and stated they were proud of what had been achieved and they believed this was a process and not an end to something.

Debbie Orshefsky, attorney, stated there had been a lot of discussion regarding the changes and alternatives regarding movement of the Near Downtown further north, and asked if there was a general concession among the City Commission that was the direction that would be presented to them on Tuesday. Mayor Naugle confirmed.

Mr. Chatterton stated that along with asking the City Commission on November 18, 2003 to accept the plan in principle, they would also be asking them to enact zoning in progress so they could tie in the allocation of units should they be re-certified by the Broward County Planning Council on November 20, 2003.

Commissioner Moore asked about the status of the drafting of an affordable housing ordinance.

The City Attorney explained they were working on that and were obtaining a recommendation from the Construction Services Bureau. Mr. Chatterton replied that he believed that was coming from the Economic and Community Development Department.

Commissioner Moore further asked when they would have something that the public could understand.

Cecelia Hollar, Construction Services Director, stated that the Master Plan encouraged affordable housing as part of the vision for the Downtown. She stated they had worked with Faye Outlaw and her staff and an analysis had been done which identified the type of market that would be needed for Downtown workforce and affordable housing. She stated they needed to proceed to the next step and arrive at a methodology to be used. She added that there was the largest work force housing in the Downtown. She stated after accepting the Plan and receiving the units, then they could proceed with an affordable housing study which would allow them on a City-wide basis to say that a certain percentage of each project would be required for affordable housing, or partner and transfer development rights, or use other options which were available.

Mayor Naugle stated that the previous Commission had given direction on that issue which he believed had been 20%. Ms. Hollar explained that the study was needed in order to validate a correct number, and she added they did not have the expertise to do that.

Commissioner Moore stated they had been told that 1-2 years ago when discussing affordable units for the Downtown. He reiterated that the boundaries for Downtown appeared to constantly change.

Mayor Naugle asked which area had the most work force housing. Ms. Hollar replied that based on the information she had read from the study which was City-wide, the Near Downtown area (using Broward Boulevard as the east/west core) had the largest percentage of work force housing than further north, south, east or west of the City. She added that she did not know what radius had been used and reminded everyone that it takes money to hire consultants and do the studies.

Commissioner Moore reiterated that money had been found to hire these consultants, and stated it was the will of the policymakers to see that things happen. He further stated that possibly it was not the will of the policymakers to have an affordable housing ordinance, and if that was the case, then he would drop the issue. He felt staff needed to provide the materials that had been requested. He stated he was concerned that they were at this stage, but still did not have the critical issue resolved that he thought a consensus had been reached on.

Mayor Naugle stated that he had not been asked about monies being available for a study, and he had assumed the issue was to be brought back to the Commission. He reiterated that this was a different Commission now. Commissioner Moore stated that maybe this issue needed to be discussed at this time so staff could have a clear understanding of the urgency and priority for having such an ordinance. Mayor Naugle asked if it had been staff's thought that the affordable housing element could not be implemented for this 2900 units, but could be implemented for units that would become available in the future.

Ms. Hollar stated it was her understanding that the Downtown Master Plan Study was not the study to validate affordable housing that was required. Ms. Hollar confirmed that the affordable housing element could not be implemented for this 2900 units, but could be done so in the future. She added that they would be happy to follow the direction of the Commission, and she reiterated that it was not their department that normally did affordable housing studies. She stated she did not have the staff or the resources to conduct such studies.

Mr. Chatterton stated that something which recently came to light was that they had received confirmation from the Broward County Planning Council staff, that the limitations and the density of the RAC was that they could bring in affordable housing units from any portion of any other flex zone within the City. He added there was a limitation now as to the number of units which could be built, and they did not have such limitation for true affordable housing units as defined by Broward County, but those units could be brought into a true affordable housing project. He stated there was interest in that because it would allow them to move ahead with such a project.

Commissioner Moore stated that about 2900 units were being brought in and none of those units dealt with affordability. He reiterated that there was no ordinance which stated that this was one of the concessions offered to a developer. Mayor Naugle stated it was not a requirement. Commissioner Trantalis stated that the market dictated that there would be an affordable component, but it was not Commission driven. Commissioner Moore reiterated that they were missing an opportunity. He stated if they

were going to guide development and have neighborhood compatibility, he felt neighbors should be afforded the opportunity for such housing in the Downtown. He emphasized there would be no pedestrian activity if such affordable units were not offered. Commissioner Trantalis reiterated that affordable rental units were available and were part of the Downtown. Commissioner Moore stated that some of the rental units would not be developed based on the design guidelines because when they lessened the opportunity for height and width of a building, it would take the developer out of such a market. He felt they were forcing the developer to do something that would give them a greater chance to make money, and not assist them in providing affordable units.

Mayor Naugle stated that affordable units could be obtained by doing something creative, and possibly an ordinance was needed in order to do that. He stated that possibly 20% of the units would have to be under 700 sq. ft., and affordability would be provided by design.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that Pinecrest Apartments were being converted into condominiums and consisted of 660 sq. ft. and were priced at about \$150,000 to \$160,000. Commissioner Moore stated that affordability was not the fact that there was 660 sq. ft. of living space which sold for \$150,000, but was talking about how to bring affordability to units for families. He stated that he wanted the Commission to either say they were going to have an affordability ordinance or stop the discussions.

Mayor Naugle stated that he felt there was a chance that the County might do that at the Planning Council level because they had the ability to mandate it.

Commissioner Moore asked if the City Commission could take a position regarding the ordinance, if there was such a consensus. Commissioner Trantalis reiterated that the market was identifying opportunities for affordable housing. He stated that Old Progresso Village which was south of Sunrise were priced under \$200,000 for 2-3 bedroom duplexes. He stated that he did not know the definition for affordable housing, but in his mind that would be more affordable than \$300,000.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated she was not opposed to it, but there was no money available for a study in order to come up with an ordinance for this 2900 units, unless mandated by the County. She stated if they were looking at layoffs in the City, a study could not be conducted for an ordinance because money would not be available.

Commissioner Moore asked what such a study would cost. Ms. Hollar stated she could not offer an amount because they did not have the expertise to do such studies. She further stated that the analysis which had been done about the need could be brought into the Plan, and it could be encouraged as part of the allocation of the units because the Commission would be the authority authorizing the allocation of units, but it would not give them the 20%. She stated that when projects came in, they could look at them from such a perspective and that could possibly help during the design negotiations. She reiterated they had an analysis of what the need was, and she believed when the Commission allocated such units, they could then look at the projects as they came in.

Commissioner Hutchinson left the meeting at approximately 5:25 p.m. and returned at 5:26p.m.

Ms. Hollar stated this would be a goal and would respond to comments made by the development community. She added that if they were providing something which filled the void, then possibly some of the design issues would be less of a public goal than affordable housing. She believed there was enough of a plan that when the units were allocated, they could be done on a case-by-case basis without having designation numbers City-wide.

Mayor Naugle reiterated that they could encourage people to come in with that element in their plans. Commissioner Moore agreed it could be encouraged.

Mr. Chatterton reiterated that it was additional incentive and would not be subject to the caps they now had on residential. He added that affordable housing units could be moved into the Downtown and they did not need a plan amendment in order to do that.

Mayor Naugle stated that the previous Commission had given direction to staff stating that before the other units were available, they would have affordability. He stated they did not want 100% affordable and did not want to encourage more rental, but wanted more home ownership units. He stated there was to be mixed income housing in order to provide some lower priced units in a development. He stated that direction had not been followed up on and now they were coming to the deadline of the Planning Council meeting, and they were caught without anything firm. He stated they did have language that would encourage this before the next round of units would be available. He stated they would see if the soft requirement would produce any units, and if it did not then they could have something firmer for the next round of units. Commissioner Trantalis stated that he believed that was fair.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 5:40 p.m. and returned at 5:41 p.m.

Mayor Naugle thanked the consultant for the presentation and stated this had been a major break through since the last workshop.

Workshop adjourned at 5:41 p.m.