

**NORTHWEST-PROGRESSO-FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
OCTOBER 25, 2006
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th Floor Conference Room
Fort Lauderdale, Florida**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT	Present Absent	Cumulative from 1/1/06	
		(P)	(A)
Phyllis Berry	P	P-4	A-1
James Brady	P	P-5	A-3
Stan Brown	P	P-6	A-2
Jerry Carter	P	P-5	A-3
Michael Ferber, Vice Chair	P	P-7	A-1
Mickey Hinton	P	P-3	A-0
Bradley Hubert	P	P-3	A-1
Brice Lambrix	P	P-6	A-2
Laura Mutti	P	P-5	A3
Ella Phillips, Chair	P	P-7	A-1
Doug Sterner	P	P-3	A-0
Clare Vickery	P	P-4	A-4
Dr. Rosalind Osgood	A	P-2	A-6

Staff

Alfred Battle, Director CRA
Mina Samadi, Engineer, CRA Staff
Thomasina Diggs, Project Coordinator, CRA Staff
Joan Oliva, Planner III, CRA Staff
Angela Wilson, Program Manager, CRA Staff
Greg Brewton, Acting Deputy Director, Planning and Zoning

I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – September 27, 2006

A motion was made by Mr. Lambrix to approve the minutes of the September 27, 2006 meeting. Mr. Brady seconded the motion. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

[Board member Phyllis Berry arrived at 3:40 p.m.]

III. NE 6 STREET/SISTRUNK BOULEVARD STREETScape ENHANCEMENT PROJECT WRT PLANNING AND DESIGN GUIDELINES RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Battle advised that the single topic for discussion at this meeting was the planning product presented by WRT, the Sistrunk development consultant. He referred Board members to two volumes of the planning recommendations document presented the previous month. He stated that the consultant wanted the Board to move the concept forward with some type of general endorsement that this work product reflected what was wanted on Sistrunk Boulevard.

[Board member Clare Vickery arrived at 3:40 p.m.]

Mr. Battle stated that staff believed the document presented was a good setup with enough “meat and potatoes” to move the project forward. He requested the Board’s feedback. He indicated that Greg Brewton from Planning and Zoning was present and available to offer advice as a resource.

[Board member Laura Mutti arrived at 3:45 p.m.]

Mr. Brady commented that Mr. Battle’s focus was on a form based zoning scheme to be imposed on a fabric that was already in existence. He asked how the appropriate regulations would be imposed to incorporate the Board’s vision for the area within the existing fabric.

[Board member Stan Brown arrived at 3:47 p.m.]

Mr. Battle stated that projects that were already in progress had already started to lead development in the area. He explained that the program being proposed was sensitive to the fact that some land could be affected and was extra sensitive with regard to changing the building stock in some areas. He pointed out there was not as much land between 9th Avenue and the railroad tracks. He stated that staff was also trying to facilitate relaxed parking for existing markets. In addition, staff would be looking at each zoning area uniquely to reconcile the existing fabric with the CRA’s vision.

Mr. Brewton commented that most lots in this area were not deep enough to facilitate very large developments. He felt this plan was a good starting point and recommended that the Board stay close to factors established in the report.

Mr. Brady stated that if parking requirement were reduced, the lack of parking would require a system that allowed people to park away from businesses. Mr. Battle stressed that the CRA's vision was to establish a market place that created entrepreneurship opportunities. He added that parking should not necessarily be borne by the City.

Mr. Brown commented that most activity early on would be west of 9th Avenue. He felt that more height and mass could be facilitated east of 9th Avenue. He stated he had read through the report and believed it was a road map opportunity for the next 5-10 years. He also commented that the depths along the corridor were disconcerting. Mr. Battle agreed that what was presented could be accomplished over the next 10 years; however the plan stopped short at about this point.

Mr. Brady asked if there were any plans to get rid of the outhouses and the bumper factory. Mr. Battle stated that this plan was the first step forward for new projects. However, there would be no such uses going forward. Future plans would reflect a mixed use, pedestrian oriented area.

Mr. Brady commented that "draconian measures" could be taken to make sure such businesses operated legally.

Mr. Brown felt there was not adequate pressure on certain neighborhood businesses. He stated that this would change as the project moved forward and created a new level of pressure. He felt that the plan as presented would help and was key to getting the social web of the area spinning.

Mr. Hinton recalled a promise made by the City 11-12 years earlier that was not yet fulfilled. He wanted the Board members to get together and drive down the boulevard and look at zoning issues that still needed to be addressed.

Mr. Carter felt that it was difficult to achieve the CRA's vision because of the lack of depth needed to attract the type of development desired. He pointed out that parking was also an impediment. He stated that with flexibility and momentum, the area would pick up. He believed this plan was a good initial approach because it had the flexibility to adjust along the way.

Ms. Berry stated that the zoning allowed by the City was inconsistent with the CRA's vision, specifically with regard to facilities that encouraged prostitution by renting rooms by the hour. She requested that this be addressed seriously.

Mr. Brewton stated this was not a zoning issue but was instead an operational activity that Planning and Zoning could not control. He stated he was not sure the City could dictate operational activity. Mr. Brewton advised that the Board not allow any usage that was inconsistent with its vision. Mr. Battle stated that the plans proposed three distinct districts that limited usages of concern.

Chair Phillips voiced her concern that these issues be resolved.

Ms. Vickery agreed with Ms. Berry and suggested that conditional usages be considered. She also asked about the status of the Jones' mixed-use project with the grocery store. Mr. Battle advised that this was still in the discussion stage. Ms. Vickery

stated that providing the most flexibility for small, modest projects was a key issue based on the market conditions and physical constraints of the area.

Vice-Chair Ferber raised a few points based on his review of the planning document. With reference to Volume I, pages 9, 30 and 31, Mr. Ferber commented that the maps should be up to date if the document was to be dated July 2006. He also suggested that a note be added to indicate which map was being referred to.

With reference to Volume I, page 1, and Volume II, Mr. Ferber commented that Flagler Village was referred to as if it were finished and accepted.

With reference to Volume 1, page 43, Vice-Chair Ferber stated he was unsure what Wallace Todd was trying to indicate with the two different colors used on the map.

Mr. Brown asked how the Board could move forward to a conclusion.

A motion was made by Ms. Berry to approve the document pending amendments to include comments made by Vice-Chair Ferber.

With reference to Volume III, page 3, Vice-Chair Ferber voiced his concern about language references “slum and blight”. He felt the term “neighborhood compatibility” could thwart an otherwise good project because existing structures were of a different scale.

Mr. Brady stated that his point raised earlier was just illustrated by Vice-Chair Ferber’s comments. He felt the report was written in “ivory tower language” which presumed a clean slate that did not exist in the area. He felt there ought to be a clearer explanation that new development would not be limited to the scale of older development. He stated that there needed to be a distinction between the old fabric of the community and how this language applied or did not apply accordingly.

Mr. Lambrix was concerned with various instances of language in the report that appeared to dictate architectural preferences.

Mr. Battle reminded the Board that staff believed this was the document would help get to the next stage of being development ready. He asked for the Board to make a general motion to move forward. He pointed out that the Board was not the final arbiter but that Planning and Zoning was. He stated that staff wanted a general conceptual approval along with the Board’s comments, in order to move the document along.

Mr. Lambrix felt it was worthwhile to prepare a written response. Mr. Sterner agreed and stated he was interested in hearing all Board members’ comments and feedback.

Mr. Lambrix was concerned with language in the report concerning height restrictions that he felt interfered with owners’ property rights. He believed that it was an owner’s right to build an ugly building. He stated he was not in favor of a “wedding cake design” and did not agree with architectural details being dictated.

Ms. Berry made a motion to approve the concept with accompanying comments from all Board members.

Mr. Brady seconded the motion.

Mr. Carter wanted it to be clear that the Board members' comments should accompany the process. Mr. Battle pointed out that pages 3-11 stated that design guidelines were "suggested" and not mandated.

Ms. Berry restated the motion as follows: to approve the plan conceptually and include as part of the recommendations, comments made by Board members at this meeting today.

A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

[Ms. Vickery left the meeting at 4:55 p.m.]

IV. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Battle advised that the Progresso Village neighborhood was exploring permanent closures to temporarily closed roads. Other temporary closures were also being considered by the City.

Mr. Battle advised that the Flagler Park Village Park dispute had been settled and that closing was scheduled for some time before the end of the month.

V. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.