

APPROVED
MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FEBRUARY 24, 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	8	1
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	A	7	2
Phyllis Berry (3:45 arr.)	P	5	4
James Brady	A	7	2
Ron Centamore	P	8	1
Mickey Hinton	P	6	3
Bradley Hubert	P	6	3
Doug Sterner	P	7	2
Clare Vickery (3:50 arr.)	P	2	7
Alan Gabriel	P	5	4
Samuel Williams	P	9	0
Jessie Adderley	P	7	2
Steve Lucas	P	9	0
John Wilkes	P	7	1

Staff

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA
Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA
Jennifer Picinich, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 3:33 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 January 27, 2010 Minutes

Mr. Hubert noted on page four, the phrase, "... imminent domain," should be replaced with, "... eminent domain."

Mr. Sterner noted on page six, the phrase, "... more appropriate," should be replaced with, "... not appropriate."

Motion made by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, to approve the minutes of the January 27, 2010 meeting with the change noted.

In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

III. Request for Funding – DeAngelo Development In-Fill Single-Family Project

Mr. Battle gave a brief history of the DeAngelo Development. DeAngelo Development was requesting funding assistance of \$200,000 for a new project just south of the intersection of Sistrunk and NW 15th Avenue. A copy of the project budget was provided to the Board members. Mr. Battle also provided documentation to the Board members comparing other projects with the proposed project, including funding granted to those comparable projects. Mr. Battle explained DeAngelo Development has consistently built single family projects over the past couple of years.

Mr. Battle stated there were \$750,000 in construction costs, and estimated the TIF to be between \$65,000 and \$75,000, depending on the homestead exemptions taken on the properties. Mr. Battle provided market and demographic information comparing the 1995 market data to the 2007/2008 market data and noted no significant changes, however, there were a number of vacant lots and an appearance of slum and blight. Mr. Battle emphasized the continued interventions required to maintain the area. He also pointed out a previous statement made by the Chair regarding the necessity of a deliberate block-by-block approach in the more intensive neighborhood areas due to the differing property ownership issues.

Mr. Battle outlined Staff's analysis of the request compared to the return on investment, and the planned selling price of \$175,000 to \$205,000 per unit, and provided the Staff recommendation of \$125,000 to be paid upon completion of the project.

Mr. Battle indicated the developers were present to answer any questions.

Motion made by Mr. Sterner, seconded by Mr. Williams, to approve Staff's recommendation for a funding request in the amount not to exceed \$120,00 to continue providing housing opportunities in the CRA area.

Mr. Wilkes emphasized the importance of stakeholders in order to promote sustainability through ownership. He agreed more single family homes were needed in the CRA to be successful, also expressing concern regarding funding requests being granted to a house without owners with committed time frames being identified.

Mr. Willie McNair, President of DeAngelo Development, explained the developer contacted Community Development and other non-profits to target first-time home buyers. Mr. McNair provided the following information requested by various Board members:

- CRA monies would be used to reduce the prices on the homes to make them more affordable for buyers.
- Four units were under construction, with potential buyers identified for the units.
- Completion expected in May, 2010.
- The stated price of the units included subsidies, therefore if the request was denied the prices would need to be raised, eliminating potential buyers.
- The buyers qualify for financing (with the assistance of "non-profits"), which qualifies the buyer for various subsidies.

Mr. Battle stated the application process for buyers, including income restrictions, would be monitored by either Broward County or the City Housing and Community Development Division. Mr. Battle confirmed a deed restriction would be placed on the homes for fifteen years, restricting the sale of the home without peak repayment penalty if down payment assistance was used.

Mr. McNair described four comparable affordable homes sold and occupied by first time home buyers.

Mr. Williams noted statistics showing declined ownership in some of the target areas, and felt the cause was the socioeconomic environment. Mr. Williams noted the non-profit process could take twelve to eighteen months, and provided reasonable success rates to receive the loans. Mr. Hubert asked if development of the homes would spur redevelopment within three or four blocks around the property. Mr. Battle pointed out the land was one of the few contiguous larger parcels in the area, and felt the project could indeed raise interest in the area.

There followed a discussion of the area using provided aerial photographs. Chair Ferber asked if the other structures on the block were maintained well enough to be acceptable to home buyers. Mr. McNair hoped the improvement in the neighborhood would encourage the neighbors to also "take pride" in their homes, take advantage of City programs, and help improve the area.

Mr. Gabriel asked if the recommended \$120,000 would be sufficient versus the \$200,000. Mr. Battle explained Staff tried to make a recommendation balancing potential return on investment and not allowing undue enrichment to the project. There

followed a discussion regarding the dollar amount difference, acceptable profit levels, and the City's desire to not "overspend" on a development project.

Mr. Wilkes suggested amending the motion to include a restriction on the sale of the property to buyers under terms similar to those in the first-time home buyer programs. Mr. Battle expressed concern regarding disrupting the process when a buyer was not yet identified, and confirmed processes "friendly" to the developer and the buyer, while still protecting the City's investment.

Mr. Williams agreed the purpose was to incentivize the builder, and warned against "boxing in" the builder and reducing the available buying market. Mr. Battle confirmed Staff wanted to see the money protected and did not wish to see the properties rented rather than owned. Mr. Wilkes suggested a deed restriction be placed on the transaction prohibiting the home from being rented. Mr. Gabriel questioned the legality of such a restriction. There followed a discussion regarding possible deed restrictions being placed on the properties.

Discussion continued regarding accepting the proposed amendment to the motion on the table. Chair Ferber clarified the original motion was still on the table.

In a voice vote, the motion passed, with Mr. Wilkes opposed.

IV. Director's Report

Mr. Battle provided a handout with updates to the following projects:

- Groundbreaking and Grand Opening, NW Gardens and Dixie Court III – groundbreaking on the Dixie Court project was completed.
- Downtown Development Authority Quarterly Market Report, 3rd Quarter 2009 – copies provided to the Board members, with several CRA-related projects in the larger downtown housing market being tracked.
- Eula Johnson House Project – project scheduled on the DRC agenda on March 9, 2010. The next step would be to apply for the building permit, then return to the CRA to appropriate monies for the project.
- Dorsey Riverbend Neighborhood Enhancements – project expected to complete in mid-March. Mr. Battle noted the improvements included roundabouts tied directly to concerns expressed regarding the narrowing of the roadway.

- CRA Expansion – CRA Board requested research into development of a new CRA, and the same area previously considered for expansion was being looked at to set up a new, standalone entity. The process was being studied to establish the new CRA. Mr. Battle did not expect any new money being provided by the County. On the plus side, a new 30-year term would be established for the new entity, allowing for potential long-term borrowing.
- Midtown Commerce Center, Sheryl Dickey building – completion anticipated soon, and tenant recruitment efforts were underway.
- Northwest Neighborhood Improvement Project – connected to the NW Gardens project, and would provide similar improvements to the “Home Beautiful” neighborhood north of Sistrunk between 9th Avenue and NW 13th Avenue, up to Sunrise Boulevard. Mr. Battle explained the Housing Authority was the largest property owner in the area. The project would be out for bid in approximately 30 days, with construction beginning in the summer.
- Northwest Commercial Project – The City Commission received the communication and motion provided by the Board in the last meeting and is supporting renegotiation of the contracts.
- Sistrunk Streetscape Enhancement Project – Mr. Battle explained the Florida Department of Transportation was the final step in allowing the project to go out for bid. The documentation for the Department of Transportation has been completed, and an RFP for construction management services was released. Once the Florida Department of Transportation completes the review of the final bid specification documents, a notice to proceed would be released. Chair Ferber asked about deadlines on the RFP for construction management. Mr. Battle stated responses were due in 30 days, and would take an additional two months to select from the RFP responders.

V. Communication to CRA Board

Mr. Williams asked if the CRA Board was aligned with the goals and objectives of the City Commission, and if the CRA recommendations were taken “seriously” by the City Commission. Chair Ferber referred to an earlier DeAngelo project in which the CRA recommended an incentive to the City Commission. Chair Ferber explained there was a “contentious discussion” amongst the newly elected officials, and felt the City Commission, without fully understanding the history of the Agency, was reluctant to follow the CRA Board recommendations.

Chair Ferber then sent an email explaining the CRA Board was not the “maker of policy,” and evaluated requests based on Florida Statute 163, the consistency with the adopted CRA plan of the City, and the precedence going back through the history of the Agency. Chair Ferber suggested, although it might be appropriate for the precedents and standards to be revisited, the Board was going by long-standing precedents and standards.

Chair Ferber continued that two Commissioners responded to the email agreeing the re-evaluation might be appropriate, further suggesting that the Advisory Board and City Commission could sit down in a workshop-type setting. Chair Ferber emphasized the City Commission is the “policy makers,” and the CRA Board evaluated every matter before them, and felt it necessary to defend the process. Chair Ferber felt although the Commissioners understood, the ball was in their court to proceed.

Chair Ferber felt as time went by the City Commission could see the Board did a diligent job, with well thought out and sound recommendations. Mr. Williams suggested further exploring the possibility of a workshop-type meeting with the City Commission. Mr. Williams expressed concern that the time they spent on issues was not important to the City Commission. Mr. Battle felt that issue was very much a point of discussion. Mr. Sterner did not feel the discussion emphasized the viewpoint of the Advisory Board. Chair Ferber did not feel it was a violation of the Sunshine Law to have individual conversations with City Commissioners. Mr. Battle felt the current City Commissioners were reading the minutes and paying attention to what was being discussed in the City’s advisory board meetings.

V. Old/New Business

None.

VI. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

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