

**NORTHWEST-PROGRESSO-FLAGLER HEIGHTS  
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING  
JANUARY 5, 2005 – 3:30 P.M.**

**Board Members**

**Cumulative Attendance**

**Jan. 2005 – Dec. 2005**

		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
James Brady	P	1	0
Stan Brown	P	1	0
William Cain	P	1	0
Jim Carras	P	1	0
Jerry Carter	P	1	0
William Cone	P	1	0
Albert Fils	A	0	1
Hector Heguabeiro	P	1	0
Tim Hernandez	A	0	1
Brice Lambrix	P	1	0
Laura Mutti	P	1	0
Ella Phillips	P	1	0
Roslyn Osgood	A	0	1
Marcia Barry Smith	A	0	1
Clare Vickery	P	1	0

**Staff**

Brenda Kelley, CRA Planning and Design Manager  
Bob Wojcik, Planner III  
Mina Samadi, CRA Engineering Design Manager  
Kim Vazquez, CRA Project Coordinator

**Guests**

Mike Ferber                                      Diane Esdelle                                      Peter Feldman

**Call to Order**

Chair Stan Brown proceeded to call the meeting to order at approximately 3:39 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

**Approval of Minutes**

**Motion** made by Brice Lambrix and seconded by James Brady to approve the minutes of the September 13, 2004, and October 27, 2004 meetings. Board unanimously approved.

**NE 6<sup>TH</sup> Street/Sistrunk Boulevard Streetscape and Urban Enhancement Project Update**

Chair Stan Brown stated this road was being worked on for the last two years, and the politics have gone on even longer. He stated that the District Commissioner had requested that a status report on this matter be given at the next scheduled CRA Meeting. He stated that presentations would be given today regarding various areas of the road. He further stated that today he wanted to address 3 areas regarding the subject roadway. One issue was in connection with the jurisdiction of the road. He stated that over the last 6 months, the Board had petitioned the City to take over the jurisdiction of the road allowing the City more flexibility in connection with the right-of-way, and in using City engineering standards in designing the roadway. The other things discussed today would be predicated on the resolution of the jurisdiction issue. He stated that this road needed to move simultaneously in 4-5 directions. He continued stating that this road was now ready to address the final stages of the engineering and planning process, along with the final stages of acquisition.

Chair Stan Brown stated further that all the issues needed to move forward in a parallel path. He stated that the key of today's meeting was for this Board to recognize that if the issues were addressed on various fronts, then pressure could be placed for getting the road constructed. If such pressure was not applied at this time, then there could be a chance that this would be a road placed on the shelf and never built. He stated that from a Board perspective, he wanted them to accept this as a warning. He stated that he was not suggesting they abandon the project.

Chair Stan Brown further stated that they would then discuss the status of the details of the roadway, and then move into the acquisition aspect. Then, an overview would be provided so the Board could see what portion of NE 6th Street, along with Sistrunk Boulevard, could be built. He explained they would discuss Phase I, and then apply pressure onto the areas to be addressed to get the roadway built.

Mina Samadi, CRA Engineering Design Manager, stated that Jerry Marston of WRT would provide a presentation.

Jerry Marston, WRT, stated that the City had done a design study of the area and decided there would be 3 lanes of traffic with a potential for on-street parking. The second principle was that it would stay within the 70' right-of-way existing from NW 1<sup>st</sup> to the City limits. He stated there was a 40' right-of-way between NW 1<sup>st</sup> and Federal Highway. The Flagler Heights portion was to be widened. He proceeded to show the ideal section of the length of the project which had a 13' median in the middle. He explained there would be 11' travel lanes in each direction, and parking on the outside of the area. Then, they would be able to construct an 8' sidewalk.

Mr. Marston proceeded to show the Mid-Town zone section, and explained they completed 60% design drawings for the length of the Corridor, and were working on the completion of the construction documents for the selected portions to be completed by March.

Mr. Marston explained there was a gap in the project due to funding. He stated their initial projections had \$3 Million allocated.

Ms. Samadi explained there were \$6 Million allocated for construction, along with \$1 Million from Congressional Funds.

Mr. Marston stated the initial thought was that it would not cost \$3 Million for the one portion, but enough funding was not available for the entire project. He stated that CRA was interested in the Sweeting Estates project and they wanted to invest public monies towards its development. He added that from 27<sup>th</sup> to the Downtown area, they wanted to restore neighborhood traffic. He further stated that the Sweeting section was different because they were required to have a 5' bike lane. He showed on the map where such lanes would be installed. He explained there would be a shift in the width of the street. He stated they wanted to end planting on the right-of-way line, and obtain easements for the sidewalks and setbacks of the buildings. He stated the CRA would be able to exercise some control in the Sweeting area.

Mr. Marston further stated that in the area of 6<sup>th</sup> Street, there were two alternatives which were predicated on an existing 40' right-of-way. He continued to state there was an assumption made that there would be an additional 20' right-of-way on the south side of the road, and 10' on the other side. As they proceeded with the project, they realized there were not enough funds to do the entire property acquisition necessary to have the complete 70' right-of-way. Some property owners might be unwilling to give up some of the right-of-way. Therefore, they needed a system whereby the road could be built without obtaining property on either side of the road. He stated that on the south side if land was acquired, they would develop the planting and parking strip, along with wide sidewalks. He stated that there was not enough room for parking and a sidewalk on the north side.

Mr. Marston stated there were two alternatives available. If the property owners on the north side did not cooperate, the road would be built to the property line. If 10' was acquired, then a planting strip and sidewalk could be constructed. If the owner on the north side participated and added an additional 5' easement for the sidewalk, then the parking and sidewalk could be built. He stated that trees were in the proper locations so as the property developed, parking would fit in between.

Ms. Samadi stated that the sidewalks would be concrete and not pavers in that area.

Mr. Marston stated that all grading and things needed to accomplish the construction in the area would be done, and then other enhancements could be added over time.

Ms. Samadi further stated that if they did not get right-of-way on either side of the road, then the City Engineering Department would not permit them to build the road within the 40' right-of-way because there would be no place for pedestrians to walk or cross the roadway.

Mr. Marston stated again that there were other alternatives available.

Mr. Marston continued stating that when they first began looking at the design aspect of the streetscape, they went through an exercise of recommendations. He stated they had recommended, and the CRA concurred, that due to how redevelopment operated, a type of pavement was needed such as pavers so there would be no flaw in the sidewalk. He

explained they developed a palette of pavers of various sizes. He reiterated that they wanted Sistrunk and the NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street roadway to be related, but yet be unique in their own way. He proceeded to show the area being discussed on the map. He stated the same thing was being done in regard to street furniture and plantings being used. He stated the theme regarding color would be orange and yellow. On the 6<sup>th</sup> Street end due to the type of development going in the area, plantings and colors would be carried through such as purple, blue and white. He showed renderings of some of the plantings that would be used.

Mr. Marston stated the sidewalks would consist of concrete unit pavers. Trees would vary depending on the FP&L powerlines in the areas. He explained that initially discussions were held for the intersections consist of concrete pavers, but as plans progressed they decided that stamped asphalt would be used which would consist of custom textures creating different colored patterns. He stated that the life of such material was about 5 years. He suggested the City purchase the stamps used, along with the heating tool, and then they would be able to maintain and refresh the areas.

Mr. Marston explained that to get the left turn onto 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue as required by the traffic study, the median would be eliminated. He stated it was the intention of the plan that some of the driveways in the area would be retained, and various criteria would be met in order for that to occur. He explained that all the penetrations of the driveways onto the street take away the ability to make this a wonderful neighborhood avenue. The more driveways that could be eliminated, the better.

Mr. Marston stated it was the County's intention to continue the same sections to 27<sup>th</sup> Street. He stated that it was important to understand for this to work certain improvements would have to be done on the roadway in various areas, and not necessarily decorative enhancements. He stated another alternative was for bulb-outs at some of the intersections.

Chair Stan Brown asked what the speed limit would be for the area. Ms. Samadi stated the speed limit would probably be about 25-30 mph.

Mr. Marston further stated there were numerous left-turn lanes that would be required, such as at Federal Highway and 3<sup>rd</sup>. He stated that some parking would be lost due to the turn lanes. He further stated that bus stops were preferred at intersections with lights so they could flow back into traffic.

Clare Vickery asked for some further clarification of the 40' right-of-way. Ms. Samadi explained that the road could not be built as described with a lane of traffic on each side and a median in the middle because there would be no walkway for pedestrians. Therefore, if there was a sidewalk on one side of the street, then they would be able to build the road. If there was not, the design would have to be reviewed to see what could be done. She stated options were always provided as to what could and could not be done. Possibly lanes could be built with a smaller median and narrower sidewalks, and then later on a developer could complete the design.

Clare Vickery stated that she hoped property owners would understand that the City was spending public money in order to improve the property.

Chair Stan Brown reiterated that the Board's focus today needed to be on what could be done, and the acquisition process could be addressed separately. He stated the "perfect world" was 20' on the south and 15' on the north. He stated that was a condition from the right-of-way acquisition perspective on the north side. Under such conditions, they could build the section as desired with sidewalks on both sides and parking. He stated there was 20' on the south side, but only 10' on the north side. Easements could possibly be granted for the sidewalks. He asked how they would handle the sidewalks on the north side.

Ms. Samadi explained there would be 5' sidewalks on the north, along with a 5 ½' planting area. Mr. Marston explained that a sidewalk was only needed on one side of the road. Ms. Samadi recommended that nothing be done to hold off and build something substandard. She stated monies were being spent and properties were increasing in value.

Chair Stan Brown stated that from an acquisition policy perspective, the acquisition team has been speaking with the property owners and discussions were held regarding contracts, but such delay could cost a significant amount of money. He further stated that the acquisition team would operate under a policy and have contracts stating that all this was subject to the City obtaining jurisdiction of the roadway. He stated they wanted the ability to proceed with hard contracts as soon as possible so they could see whether transition problems were small or large.

Mr. Marston further stated there was a large incentive for adjacent property owners to cooperate. He explained the incentive was that once this was established as a section with a design, and if a property owner did not sell his land for the right-of-way acquisition, when the property came about for reuse or redevelopment the owner would be giving away the land and would then be responsible for all improvements.

Chair Stan Brown reiterated that incentives had been available but they had not worked, and in the past the CRA had not decided to proceed with such construction.

James Brady stated there were two things the CRA needed to consider. The analysis relative to getting paid now and not giving it away later on was incorrect because it was not justifiable. It had been pressed upon developers, but having this as part of the policy would create a weak link in the chain.

Chair Stan Brown explained that had not been the policy and was part of the discussion.

James Brady stated the other issue as to why would anyone want to give an easement instead of a fee on the sidewalk portion was because giving a fee would lose their setback, but an easement would retain the setback which would increase the density. The City could solve that problem by tailoring their zoning regulations saying they would go to the original right-of-way line even though a fee was given for the sidewalk.

Chair Stan Brown stated it would be an "arrow in the acquisition team's quiver" to shoot at individuals contemplating either solution, but such discussions should be held in a narrow window with appropriate pressure so the project could move forward.

James Brady asked what was the thinking regarding the aesthetic design to change the pattern of the paver grid and the nature of the landscaping materials. He stated that it resembled a railroad track and he felt that should be removed because it would divide people. He preferred a continuity design.

Mr. Marston stated they needed to resemble each other in order to eliminate such a feeling. He stated that having each one different would help the Flagler Village area change to a different contemporary and higher density neighborhood using various specified materials. The Sistrunk area wanted to maintain a sense of history and community. Therefore, in describing these areas he felt they were well received by both groups. He stated it was not their intention to draw in the railroad track, but to respond in subtle ways to the current and future residents for the areas.

Chair Stan Brown stated this Board needed to provide a positive atmosphere for this project. He stated that next Tuesday's meeting should provide a commitment date, and asked what would take place after that was accomplished.

Ms. Samadi explained they were to complete the final design for the project by March, 2005. They also had to coordinate the waterline in the area and that was the first thing that would be done. She stated that without the jurisdiction issue being resolved, they could not knock on doors and attempt to gain the right-of-way. She stated the traffic report was done and was forwarded to the County in December, and hopefully, they would grant such jurisdiction. If jurisdiction was granted, they hoped to continue with the right-of-way acquisition and begin construction at the end of 2005.

Chair Stan Brown stated that while the City wanted jurisdiction, and the County was willing to grant it, the County had written a letter in September or October, 2004, regarding traffic mitigation from 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue down past Sweeting into Sistrunk, they were going to re-examine the area once again. The traffic study was reviewed once again. He stated the study addressed what mitigation was required for the traffic.

Ms. Samadi stated the County's concern were the parallel and neighborhood streets. The report discussed the characteristic of the parallel streets north and south of Sistrunk, along with the neighborhood streets. They had addressed what existed and the possibility of people cutting through, along with stop signs and other items to be considered. At the same time, a traffic count had been done on the south side of Sistrunk Boulevard, and funding was available for some improvements. The City was committed to doing a traffic count before and after, along with traffic modifications as needed so problems could be corrected.

Chair Stan Brown stated at this point assuming the traffic report was accepted, this would no longer be an impediment to the project.

Ms. Samadi stated the acquisition could move forward, along with the construction. She added there was still the issue of the 5' additional sidewalk easement on NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street, along with the existing driveways. She stated that guidelines would have to be developed regarding the driveways. She stated that she had made some recommendations regarding that matter, but another issue was the FP&L lines.

Brice Lambrix stated that the traffic study done showed that a right-turn lane was being provided at 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and Federal Highway. Ms. Samadi stated they were to be at major intersections, but she did not recall one being at Andrews Avenue. Brice Lambrix asked if the project was to proceed were they obligated to provide the right-turn lane. He stated that the traffic would be pushed onto major thoroughfares, and the original premise of the presentation was that they were trying to make this a neighborhood street. He felt adding a right-turn lane at the two intersections and making the road 4 lanes would be inappropriate for the community. He stated that a standard lane was a "free lane."

Ms. Samadi stated that in regard to the traffic count, the engineer had allowed for a few hundred vehicles for the turns. She stated that she would discuss the matter of combining the turn lane with the through lane, and see if that was a possibility.

Mr. Marston stated he was not sure what numbers had been used as a basis for the traffic count.

Brice Lambrix further stated that he lived on 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue which was a 60' right-of-way and cars sped by, and opening this up they were providing the opportunity to clench this.

Chair Stan Brown stated that this was an issue that would be re-examined within the next 60-90 days.

Mr. Marston stated that this Board could ask the consultant if the traffic could be handled in the area without a right-turn lane.

Laura Mutti asked how traffic could be diminished in the area. Mr. Marston stated there was a limited number of cars that could proceed through in a single lane in either direction. He explained they were creating a bottleneck and the objective was to make it slower to travel, and not use the area as a cut-through. Once people were conditioned not to come through the community, then the street would become a neighborhood roadway.

Chair Stan Brown stated there were issues regarding driveways, but with the acquisition program for 6<sup>th</sup> Street from Andrews to Federal various conditions existed, and the driveways would be addressed. He stated that as the acquisition was worked out, other matters would get resolved. The procedure was simple, but there would probably be owners granting the land, but not giving up their driveways. In the first round, all issues might not be resolved, but decided upon through a collaborative arrangement in the future. He stated that staff would report back to the Board on the matter.

Chair Stan Brown stated that regarding Sistrunk Boulevard, they were not readily involved in an acquisition program. He explained the proposal was to take the roadway and if there was a corner parcel with access through a side street, then the front driveway would be closed. He stated that in the middle of a block a growing business would retain their driveway, but if there was vacant land with no ongoing business, such driveway would be closed.

Clare Vickery stated that if jurisdiction was granted to the City, it normally related back to financing, but hopefully in the future they could request grants. She stated this concerned her as a property owner because of the escalation costs.

Ms. Samadi stated they would further explore the MPO, and were also looking at leveraging monies being spent now and the obtaining of Federal funds. She stated they were also exploring DOT and the County for funding of bus shelters. She asked for the Board to supply any information they might have regarding other funding sources.

Chair Stan Brown reiterated that there were several unknowns since they did not yet know how much of 6<sup>th</sup> Street would be done, along with Sistrunk Boulevard. He stated that the jurisdiction issue was not yet solved, nor were final issues regarding design.

Ms. Samadi stated the design of this project would end in March, 2005. She stated they did not yet know when the final decision would be made regarding jurisdiction.

James Brady asked if this would be an opportunity to have FP&L place their lines under ground. Ms. Samadi stated that she had called them ongoing since August, 2004, but their excuse was that due to the hurricanes, a ball park figure could not be given regarding the under grounding of lines. She stated that a meeting was finally going to be held this Friday. She stated if the lines were going to be in the way, poles would be relocated at no charge, but they would not necessarily agree to under ground lines. James Brady stated the City's burden would be to pay the difference for the cost of relocation of the poles and the under grounding. Ms. Samadi confirmed.

Ms. Samadi further stated there were 4 items to be addressed. She stated that in regard to the driveways there were 2 options. One was the acquisition of 5' sidewalk easements on the north side, and the other item was that they needed different size easements at some intersections for ADA requirements. This had not been discussed as of this time. She stated that documents could begin being prepared and individuals approached on this matter. She continued stating that she was requesting this Board to recommend through a motion to approve her four recommendations provided in her memorandum.

Brice Lambrix asked about the alleyways. Ms. Samadi stated that many were to remain closed so they could provide on-street parking.

Jerry Carter stated that it was mentioned that only one sidewalk be provided. Ms. Samadi stated that in order to construct something along this roadway, only one sidewalk was required. She explained that the Sistrunk Boulevard portion already had sidewalks, and they only needed to provide a sidewalk from Andrews to Federal Highway and right-of-way would have to be purchased.

Clare Vickery stated she wanted to add that wherever possible they should negotiate an easement instead of purchasing the right-of-way. She suggested that notes be made where that could be done, and those individuals could possibly obtain development rights later on.

Ms. Samadi stated that she believed they could ask for donation of a sidewalk easement, but was not sure they could ask for a travel lane easement.



Chair Stan Brown stated that after next Tuesday's meeting, they should meet with the acquisition team and set the parameters for negotiation. Clare Vickery stated they needed to protect the taxpayers.

**Motion** made by James Brady and seconded by Brice Lambrix to adopt the four recommendations contained in staff's memorandum on page 3, and urge the CRA to adopt a policy consistent with such recommendations. Board unanimously approved.

James Brady suggested that the City Attorney talk with FP&L's attorney to get things moving. Clare Vickery stated there was a government liaison, Lynn Chatas, that could be dealt with in regard to FP&L.

### **New Business**

#### **New CRA Director**

Chair Stan Brown advised that Al Battle from Jacksonville was retained as the new CRA Director. He stated that Jacksonville was a combined City/County government who had a large development group. He stated that he had good housing, developer and negotiation experience. He stated that he had read his resume and was very impressed. He advised that he would arrive in Fort Lauderdale early to mid-February. He stated that some projects were on hold until the new Director could be brought up to speed.

**Motion** made by James Brady and seconded by Jim Carras to adjourn.

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. D'Alessio  
Recording Secretary