

APPROVED
MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
JANUARY 27, 2010 – 3:30 P.M.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative Attendance May 2009 - April 2010	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Michael Ferber, Chair	P	7	1
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	A	7	1
Phyllis Berry	A	4	4
James Brady	P	7	1
Ron Centamore	P	7	1
Mickey Hinton	P	5	3
Bradley Hubert (4:48 dep.)	P	5	3
Doug Sterner	P	6	2
Clare Vickery	A	1	7
Alan Gabriel	P	4	4
Samuel Williams	P	8	0
Jessie Adderley	P	6	2
Steve Lucas	P	8	0
John Wilkes (3:44 arr.)	P	6	1

Staff

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA
Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA
Margaret Evan, Budget Analyst, City OMB
Mina Samadi, CRA
Stephen Scott, Economic Development
Thomasina Turner-Diggs, CRA
Angela Wilson, CRA
Jennifer Picinich, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to the City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Mr. Sterner, to recommend that the City Commission not renegotiate the existing contract with the developer based on the proposed revision [Northwest Commercial Redevelopment Project]. In a voice vote, the motion passed 6-4 as follows: Mr. Gabriel, yes; Mr. Centamore, yes; Mr. Wilkes, yes; Mr. Sterner, yes; Mr. Brady, yes; Mr. Hinton, yes; Mr. Williams, no; Ms. Adderley, no; Mr. Lucas, no; Mr. Ferber, no.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 3:37 p.m. by Chair Ferber. As of this date there were fifteen appointed members to the Committee, which means eight would constitute a quorum. Following a roll call it was determined that a quorum was present.

II. Approval of October 28, 2009 Minutes

Mr. Sterner noted on page eight, paragraph five, the phrase, "... would become the standard," should be replaced with, "... is insufficient."

Motion made by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Brady, to approve the minutes of the October 28, 2009 meeting with the change noted.

In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Battle stated a December meeting was held. There was no quorum for the meeting, however a Directors Report was provided. Mr. Battle agreed to provide minutes of that meeting to the Board members.

III. Super Bowl 2010

Mr. Battle introduced Stephen Scott, Director, Economic Development. Mr. Scott explained his role with the Super Bowl project by saying the Mayor and the City Commissioner requested a liaison between the City and the NFL and Live Nation. Mr. Scott stated the Pro Bowl would also be held in Fort Lauderdale, and estimated the hotel and restaurant economics would be higher than normal for approximately twelve days.

Mr. Scott noted this would be the tenth time the Super Bowl was played in south Florida, and in the past most attention was directed at Dade County. In this event, however, Fort Lauderdale and Fort Lauderdale Beach would be the focal point for the NFL, and the NFL executives would be staying at the Westin Hotel on Fort Lauderdale Beach. Mr. Scott noted the media center would be located at the Fort Lauderdale Convention Center, and the CNN headquarters would be at the Fort Lauderdale Aquatics complex, and media outlets would be filming on location around the City.

Mr. Scott explained very large Roman numerals were placed on the sand at Las Olas and A1A. Mr. Scott pointed out the Super Bowl generated an estimated four hundred million dollars in revenue to the tri-county area economy. In order to be more "event friendly" the City enacted a special Super Bowl ordinance declaring the Super Bowl a

public purpose, waived the provisions of the sign code, and allowed open alcohol containers in the A1A area.

Mr. Scott provided printed information regarding Super Bowl Saturday Night, a major event including live concerts and a fireworks display. The event was expecting between thirty thousand and forty thousand people. The printed information included a detailed security plan and traffic plan.

Chair Ferber thanked Mr. Scott and his staff for their work.

IV. Flagler Village Park Event Series

Mr. Battle introduced Kate Sheffield with the Downtown Development Authority. Ms. Sheffield introduced Vanessa Santiago-Mejia. Ms. Sheffield provided an overview of the Flagler Village Park Event Series with the following main objectives:

- To strengthen neighborhood ties in the neighborhood.
- To activate the new park.

Ms. Sheffield noted renderings of the new park would be unveiled at the event. The event would be a series of casual parties held in the evening with live entertainment and refreshments. Ms. Sheffield explained, depending upon the success of the first event, similar events would be held seasonally or monthly, and hosted by different organizations. All area businesses and residents within the CRA would be invited to the themed events. Ms. Sheffield announced the first event was scheduled for April 8, 2010, 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

Ms. Santiago-Mejia provided a brief overview of proposed activities, art installations, prizes, and the creation of a local directory.

Mr. Hubert suggested targeting other areas of the City who might be interested in moving into Flagler Village. Ms. Sheffield agreed with Mr. Hubert's suggestion. Mr. Battle added the City had access to databases such as the Civic Associations to assist in getting the word out. Mr. Sterner stated the Council of Fort Lauderdale Civic Associations often disseminated this type of information and would be happy to help with the event. Mr. Wilkes suggested pursuing an annual permit for the event to save future paperwork time.

Chair Ferber referred to an earlier meeting discussion regarding the occupancy levels in some of the new buildings at Flagler. Chair Ferber asked if the Downtown Development Authority was able to share more recent occupancy data. Ms. Sheffield felt the current

occupancy rate was seventy to eighty percent, and would be able to provide updated information in March. Mr. Lucas informed the Board members a monthly newsletter was distributed by the Downtown Development Authority contained occupancy information. Ms. Sheffield agreed to add the Board members and Mr. Battle to the newsletter distribution list.

Mr. Lucas asked for a status on Peter Feldman Park. Mr. Battle informed the Parks Department was ready to put the construction RFP out for bid. Mr. Battle explained the Downtown Development Authority approached the City for a contribution towards the effort. A confirmation of the "construction numbers" was needed to determine the contribution amount.

Mr. Wilkes asked if a dedication or ribbon cutting for the park was held. Chair Ferber stated it was not. Mr. Wilkes asked the Board be notified when a dedication was held, and suggested tying into the April 8th event. Chair Ferber explained the park fell in both the CRA and the Downtown Development Authority jurisdictions, with the Downtown Development Authority being the lead agency. Ms. Sheffield was not aware of any planning towards a dedication, and agreed to bring the subject up to the Board.

Mr. Brady expressed concern with the timing of the April 8th event regarding people being able to get to the park by the 5:30 start time with the after work traffic. Ms. Sheffield explained since it was a neighborhood activity focused on Flagler Village, the expectation was for people to walk from the neighboring businesses or residences. Mr. Brady suggested extending the event from 5:30 – 8:30 p.m. Ms. Sheffield agreed to take the suggestion to the Board.

V. Northwest Commercial Project

Mr. Battle stated, at the request of District Commissioner DuBose, a public meeting was held at the site of the Northwest Commercial Project (also known as the Milton Jones Project). A presentation was provided to the public, and the developer was present to answer questions. Mr. Battle noted sixty to seventy people from the community attended, and felt there was a good dialogue regarding community concerns. Mr. Battle provided Board members with a copy of the presentation and additional information regarding the grocery store.

Chair Ferber stated the assemblage of land, and the construction of Regal Trace and Cityview Townhouses predated the formation of the CRA in 1995. Chair Ferber noted the land was acquired through one of the few times the City used eminent domain, and one of the promises made to people was a quality grocery store for the area. Chair

Ferber felt they were as close to that goal as they had ever been throughout all these years.

Mr. Battle provided a brief history of the project using a timetable provided in the information packet. Chair Ferber asked if the issue would come before the CRA Board or the City Commission. Mr. Battle confirmed the issue would come before the City Commission on February 2, 2010 to give permission to the Staff to negotiate changes as requested by the developer. Mr. Battle stated a consensus motion was necessary for Staff to begin amending the existing development agreement.

Mr. Brady referred to the list of grocery stores provided, and asked who was driving the search for the supermarket. Mr. Battle stated it was the responsibility of the developer. Mr. Brady commented the Home Depot on Sunrise appeared to be busy all the time with nothing like that downtown, and suggested Stephen Scott approach BJ's or Costco regarding downtown opportunities. Mr. Battle stated some of that was being done, and some of those same questions were asked at the Saturday presentation.

Ms. Adderley noted the grocery store decision was the holdup for the past twenty years. Publix and Winn-Dixie were the original choices, and Publix and Winn-Dixie said no, due to the demographics of the area. Only Save-A-Lot expressed interest, and the community people were pleased with bringing Save-A-Lot in to the site.

Mr. Battle provided an overview of the presentation, including a timeline of the project since 1991. Mr. Battle outlined the 2008 agreement requiring the following:

- Redevelopment consistent with HUD guidelines, providing job creation and housing availability for both low and moderate income individuals.
- A grocery store with a minimum of twenty-five thousand square feet.
- Required approvals obtained through the DRC and the City Planning and Zoning processes.
- The City site and the Church's Chicken sites would be combined for development purposes.
- Everything would be built at once with no phasing of the project.
- Fourteen month timeline.

Mr. Battle stated the project plan was then submitted to HUD, and HUD required an environmental audit. Following the public hearing at the end of 2008, HUD officially signed off on the project as presented by the developer in March 2009. The HUD approval officially put the developer "on the clock" for the fourteen month timeline, and the agreement would automatically terminate in May 2010, unless an amendment was approved.

Mr. Battle stated the project costs were estimated at fifty million dollars, and a projected twenty-four months to build. Mr. Battle emphasized the fifty million dollars was a projection of the capital investment and had nothing to do with the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Mr. Battle provided a history of the recruitment efforts regarding the grocery store, including visits to the site by Bravo Supermarkets, Publix, Wal-Mart, Super Value and Save-A-Lot.

Mr. Battle explained if the City Commission chose to negotiate an amendment, they would basically be accepting the Save-A-Lot and allowing the developer to revise the site plan to reduce the twenty-five thousand square foot minimum to Save-A-Lot's proposed fifteen thousand six hundred square foot store. There would also be a reduction in the residential development from two to one. Mr. Battle provided a map showing the proposed revised site plan, including some retail and commercial uses at the corner of Sistrunk and 7th Avenue. Mr. Battle noted the developer was also requesting the project be phased.

Mr. Williams asked, if the phasing was approved, if the grocery store would be included in Phase I of the project. Mr. Battle confirmed Phase I would include the grocery store and the other commercial development shown on the provided map. Mr. Battle also confirmed the phasing was requested for economic reasons.

Mr. Sterner attended the public presentation and expressed his disappointment with the proposed revision. Mr. Sterner noted the original implementation plan identified the intersection as a major development node and called for the creation of an urban village type environment at the site with eight to ten story buildings on the corners. Those buildings were later reduced to five stories. Mr. Sterner felt the plan had been reduced from an urban village to a parking lot on the corner, creating more of a suburban strip mall. Mr. Sterner felt there would be a very negative impact on the future development of the area, with no hope of meeting the original vision approved by the City Commission.

Mr. Sterner stated neighborhood services were to be a part of the mixed use vision, and the forty percent reduction in square footage in the proposed plan did not allow for services to serve the community, requiring residents to go to other stores to meet their needs. Mr. Sterner felt it was not appropriate to have residential development on the trash transfer site.

Mr. Sterner pointed out the plan went from “not great” to essentially a parking lot on a major corner that was identified as a very important opportunity to develop something to uplift the neighborhood. Mr. Sterner noted the plan also reduced the number of housing units, and one of the missions was to provide for low income and affordable housing. Mr. Sterner felt the original plan, while not great, was far superior to the requested amendment.

Mr. Hinton agreed with Mr. Sterner, and felt the public associations were not a part of the decision making for the reductions in services. Mr. Hinton also emphasized the timeframe was unrealistic and would take longer than estimated. Chair Ferber stated Save-A-Lot expressed a desire to move ahead quickly.

Mr. Centamore heard a lot of criticism from the residents at the Saturday presentation, including unhappiness with the decision to bring in Save-A-Lot. Mr. Centamore felt using a prime corner for a parking lot would contribute to the failure of the project. Mr. Centamore stated the residential area should have been established first, making the area more attractive to the grocery stores.

Ms. Adderley described the City took her family land in eminent domain at the site of the Saturday meeting and was disturbed and disheartened to see the area “just sitting there” after twenty years. Ms. Adderley asked about residential parking in the area. Chair Ferber stated the residential element would have a five story parking unit.

Mr. Battle confirmed for Mr. Lucas the RFP was driving the grocery store. Mr. Lucas felt that was “backwards” since the best use of the location was obviously not a grocery store or the stores would want to come in. Mr. Lucas suggested the developer amend the site plan. Mr. Battle stated the developer did not have the latitude to come in with an amendment. Chair Ferber stated “the die was cast” committing the site to be developed in a certain fashion years before.

Chair Ferber pointed out there were constraints in the choices available for development of the site. Mr. Battle stated there were constraints by the method of acquiring the site, and if a change were to be made now the City Commission would have to take away the site and redo the agreement, and would probably trigger going back to HUD. Chair Ferber suggested “throwing out” the agreement and coming back with more residential units would be a futile exercise, due to the City Commission’s recent decisions to maintain the five story maximum.

Mr. Williams noted the item was not actionable, and the Board was only being informed. Mr. Battle stated the Board could put forth a ceremonial type motion, however the existing agreement was still in place. Chair Ferber felt the only appropriate ceremonial

vote would be to authorize the City to negotiate amending the existing agreement, and anything beyond that was inappropriate.

Mr. Wilkes pointed out the Board did have the ability to make recommendations regarding an item going before the City Commission to modify an agreement. Mr. Wilkes felt that, based on what he had seen during his years of representing food store development, the site did not meet the criteria of any legitimate food store. Mr. Wilkes felt the new plan was “planned backwards.”

Motion made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Mr. Sterner, to recommend that the City Commission not renegotiate the existing contract with the developer based on the proposed revision.

Chair Ferber agreed with Mr. Wilkes, however noted, whatever the shortcomings were of the current plan, the one consistent request throughout the years was for a food store. Chair Ferber felt historically the residents were willing to sacrifice the best urban design for a supermarket. Mr. Wilkes stated the motion was not to do away with the supermarket but to keep with the original vision of the plan. Mr. Wilkes suggested the project be looked at with new eyes.

In a voice vote, the motion passed 6-4 as follows: Mr. Gabriel, yes; Mr. Centamore, yes; Mr. Wilkes, yes; Mr. Sterner, yes; Mr. Brady, yes; Mr. Hinton, yes; Mr. Williams, no; Ms. Adderley, no; Mr. Lucas, no; Mr. Ferber, no.

VI. Old Business

None.

VII. New Business

None.

VIII. Director's Report

None.

IX. Adjournment

Northwest Progresso-Flagler Heights
Redevelopment Advisory Board
January 27, 2010
Page 9

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

[Minutes prepared by K. Bierbaum, Prototype, Inc.]