

APPROVED
MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
JULY 28, 2010 – 3:30 P.M.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative Attendance May 2010 - April 2011	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Michael Ferber, Chair	P	2	1
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	P	3	0
Phyllis Berry	A	1	2
James Brady	A	1	2
Ron Centamore	P	3	0
Mickey Hinton	P	2	1
Bradley Hubert	P	3	0
Doug Sterner	P	2	1
Alan Gabriel (arr. 3:59)	P	2	1
Samuel Williams	P	2	0
Jessie Adderley	A	2	1
Steve Lucas	P	3	0
John Wilkes	P	2	1
Brice Lambrix (arr. 3:38)	P	2	0

Staff

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA
 Thomasina Turner Diggs, CRA
 Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA
 Scott Strawbridge, Housing Authority
 Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to the City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 3:34 p.m. by Vice Chair Phillips. 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.

Chair Ferber welcomed Mr. Lambrix back to the Board, and told the newer members Mr. Lambrix served on the Board six years ago. Chair Ferber noted Mr. Lambrix was an architect and a property owner in Flagler Village.

II. Approval of June 23, 2010 Minutes

Mr. Hubert requested a change on Page Four to read, “ ... and allow suggestions to come from the developer and/or the property owners.”

Ms. Phillips noted Chair Phillips was present in the May meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Hubert, seconded by Mr. Lucas, to approve the minutes of the June 23, 2010 meeting as corrected.

In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

III. Officer Election

Mr. Battle opened the floor to nominations for Chair. Mr. Williams was pleased with the “current team” and nominated the current Chair, Mr. Ferber. Mr.

Motion made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Mr. Hubert, to close the nominations for Chair.

In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Battle congratulated Chair Ferber on being re-elected as the Chair.

Mr. Battle opened the floor to nominations for Vice Chair. Mr. Hinton nominated Mr. Williams. Mr. Williams declined the nomination in favor of Ms. Phillips remaining as Vice Chair.

Motion made by Mr. Hubert, seconded by Mr. Wilkes, to close the nominations for Vice-Chair.

In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Battle congratulated Vice-Chair Phillips on being re-elected as the Vice-Chair. Mr. Battle also thanked the Board for keeping the current team intact.

Chair Ferber noted the term limitation in May would require a change in the leadership, and thanked the Board members for their confidence.

IV. Information Item – Fort Lauderdale Housing Authority – Northwest Gardens
III

Ms. Nectaria Chakas, with Lochrie and Chakas, representing Carlisle Development and the Housing Authority, described a proposed new project behind the Sunnyland Elementary School and the John Carter Park off of Sunrise Boulevard. The project would include demolishing existing structures and building a new affordable housing development. Ms. Chakas provided a site plan of each of the blocks being discussed.

The most eastern parcel would be two-story with their own driveways with a large green area for gardening. The units would be three to five bedroom units.

The next block to the east would also be a townhouse development with three bedroom units and parking in front of each unit.

“Grapefruit Corner” would also be a townhouse style project including green spaces for gardening, a clubhouse, and multi-family units.

“Lime Tree Chase” and “Tangelo Groves” would be two and three bedroom multi-family units with surface parking and connectivity between each of the developments. Considerable green space was being incorporated into the plans.

Ms. Chakas expressed excitement over the \$28 million project with allocated stimulus funds of about \$5 million. Ms. Chakas stated the project needed to be “shovel ready” by November 1, 2010.

In response to questions by Ms. Phillips, Ms. Chakas pointed out Carter Park to the north on provided drawings. Mr. Hubert asked why more flats were not included in the project. Ms. Chakas felt due to the location, the multi-family homes were selected. Mr. Scott Strawbridge, Fort Lauderdale Housing Authority, pointed out the zoning was also a factor in the decision to build multi-family units. Chair Ferber asked how many units were currently on the site being demolished. Mr. Strawbridge stated it was 86 to 88 units, to be replaced with 150 units.

Chair Ferber asked if the existing housing authority projects were not on the tax rolls, and Mr. Strawbridge confirmed they were not. Mr. Battle stated Staff was exploring the tax issue to gain an understanding of whether or not the new construction would be on the tax rolls. Mr. Williams felt the construction being on the tax rolls was a part of the decision making process with the Dixie Court project. Mr. Battle explained the additional tax money requested never went to the Board for approval.

Chair Ferber asked if the Board could do anything to help move the process along. Ms. Chakas explained the information was presented to the Board as a courtesy and to make Board members aware of the project. Chair Ferber asked if the developer would come back to the Board in the future for streetscaping or enhancements. Ms. Chakas confirmed there was a possibility a request would be made for pedestrian lighting.

Mr. Hinton pointed out the Homeowners' Association needed to be made aware of the project. Mr. Hinton stated the people living in the old apartments wanted to know where they would be going and when they would be coming back. Mr. Hinton did not feel it was fair for the residents to not have the opportunity to voice their opinion before a decision was made. Ms. Chakas stated there was a meeting the prior week with the homeowners. Mr. Strawbridge described a meeting with Mr. Hinton and the Vice Chair of the School Board where arrangements were made to have a meeting at the school. The meeting was held, and another meeting with the Homeowners' Association was scheduled for September.

Ms. Chakas confirmed the DRC process was completed and approved, and as a part of the DRC process meetings were held with the neighborhood associations. Mr. Strawbridge explained the Housing Authority would lose approximately \$5 million if the permitting was not accomplished by October 1st, which is why the project was moving along with some speed. Mr. Williams felt the displacement issue needed to be addressed. Mr. Strawbridge confirmed there were meetings with the residents, and there was no requirement for public hearings other than the DRC.

Ms. Joan Hinton stated the meetings were held with people living in the Sunnyland Park project, however no meetings were held with the Homeowners' Association. The Commissioner then instructed the Housing Authority to meet with the Homeowners' Association on September 2, 2010. Ms. Hinton stated she took some past residents of Dixie Court to apply for apartments, and they were not allowed to return without a salary of at least \$34,000. Ms. Hinton stated the residents of Dixie Court did not have the required income, and wanted to set the record straight. Ms. Hinton stated the residents who attended the meetings expressed confusion over the information given. Mr. Hinton stated Mr. Strawbridge only provided one day's notice for the meeting.

Mr. Hubert asked if Carlisle would oversee the contractor and manage the property upon completion. Mr. Strawbridge confirmed Carlisle would oversee the contractor, and would co-manage the property with the Housing Authority.

V. Information Item – Progresso Point Project

Ms. Chakas provided drawings and maps of the project, a 76 unit, eight story building along Andrews Avenue. All units would be studio or one bedroom units ranging from 500 to 650 square feet. Ms. Chakas provided drawings of the garage, lobby, and building entrance, explaining the garage was “wrapped with units” so the garage was not visible from Andrews Avenue.

Ms. Chakas stated a presentation was made to the Flagler Village Civic Association, and the project was received positively. Ms. Chakas explained the project was required to close by November 1st due to the stimulus money of \$3.8 million in the deal. The project would go before the City Commission in August for allocation of the RAC units.

In response to questions by Mr. Sterner, Ms. Chakas confirmed the property would be rental, and there were no plans to convert to condos in the future. Ms. Sandra Seals, Vice President, Reliance Housing Foundation, explained due to the tax credits, the units were committed to be affordable rental units for at least 30 years. Mr. Sterner asked about the projected rent. Ms. Seals provided 10% of the units would be affordable for families with earnings at 28% of the area median income, and 90% of the units would be affordable to families and/or individuals at 60% of the area median income. Mr. Battle pointed the rent would vary from year to year as the median income varies. Ms. Seals confirmed the median income was set by the Federal government, and was also based on family size, and would range from, very roughly, \$375 to \$800. Mr. Sterner asked for a projected completion date. Ms. Seals projected a 12 month construction period, hopefully to begin November 30, 2010.

Mr. Centamore asked if there would be retail or mixed use on the ground floor. Ms. Seals stated there would not be retail, but there would be amenities including a clubhouse and pool on the fourth floor. Ms. Seals showed the Board members drawings of the proposed ground level views from Andrews Avenue. Ms. Chakas confirmed there would be a lobby and administrative offices on the ground level.

Mr. Wilkes asked how the density would compare to the surrounding density, and how the building would fit into the master plan for the urban village. Ms. Chakas stated the DRC and the Master Plan Committee processes were completed, and the plan was in compliance with the downtown master plan. In addition, the County may allow for some additional parallel parking along Andrews Avenue.

Ms. Chakas agreed the site was dense, however the building was designed so as not to appear so dense from the street. Mr. Lambrix felt the purpose of the urban village was to create density and a critical mass of housing to encourage retail and other activities in the area. Mr. Wilkes felt there was inconsistency in the height of the buildings in the area. Mr. Wilkes also felt there would be parking issues. Chair Ferber acknowledged a

“wide spectrum of point of view” on the parking issue, and noted the discussion had gone on for years.

Mr. Gabriel asked about family size limitations due to the small square footage of the apartments. Ms. Sears felt the limit would probably be three residents per apartment. Chair Ferber asked about the tax structure of the building. Mr. Battle confirmed the structure would be similar to the Eclipse project, and would, in its entirety, go on the tax roll. Mr. Gabriel noted the property was bounded by the railroad, and asked what the view from the railroad would be. Ms. Chakas provided drawings showing the different views of the building.

Mr. Williams asked if input could be taken under consideration as a part of the design before the project went to the DRC. Ms. Chakas stated normally there would be time before going to DRC, however due to the limited timeframe, the DRC review was already completed and would be going to the City Commission on fast track. Mr. Sterner stated a presentation would be held in August for the Progresso neighborhood.

Mr. Sterner asked about a turning lane for the parking garage on Andrews Avenue, due to the curve in the road. Ms. Chakas explained Andrews Avenue was in the jurisdiction of the County rather than the City, and the County did not require a turning lane as the speed of the road did not warrant the change. Ms. Chakas also felt there was not really room for a turning lane.

Mr. Sterner felt the triangular piece to the north would be almost worthless, and asked if the City could encourage the owners of the parcel to make the land available to the CRA. Chair Ferber noted there were certainly other areas of development where a small piece was left out of the development plan due to the owners not being willing to sell.

VI. NWP CRA Budget

Mr. Battle stated the budget was submitted for approval on July 7, 2010. As a part of the process, the budget was brought to the Board for feedback. Revenues were expected to decrease by about 14.5%. Based on the decrease, the expected TIF revenue would be approximately \$5.16 million, down from last year’s \$6.13 million.

Mr. Battle noted a portion of the TIF revenue generated would be used for operating budget, estimated at approximately \$2 million, a 6% decrease from last year. Mr. Battle explained the decrease was partially due to a position being eliminated from the Agency. Summarized breakdowns of the revenue and the budget were provided to the Board members.

Mr. Wilkes inquired about the additional funds noted as available for the CRA. Mr. Battle confirmed the amount was the difference between what was spent in the bond debt service and the revenue, on an annual basis. Chair Ferber requested something looking more like a balance sheet showing the retained surpluses from prior years, the bond monies available to the CRA to demonstrate a more “global sense” of the money. Mr. Battle stated the requested report would be available following the reconciliation process.

Motion made by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Centamore, to accept the financial recommendation of the Staff.

In a voice vote, the motion was approved unanimously.

V. Director’s Report

Mr. Battle asked if the Board would hold an August meeting to see the details of the budget. Chair Ferber asked if the final budget could be sent electronically. Mr. Battle agreed to send the materials electronically, then meet in September.

Mr. Battle announced the Peter Feldman Park dedication was well done. Improvements started on the Northwest Neighborhood Improvement project. In addition, the contract award for the Sistrunk Boulevard/Northeast 6th Street streetscape project was formally awarded at the July 7th City Commission meeting. The winning bid was approximately \$12.9 million, with an estimated construction time of 16 months. The winning contractor was FDOT certified, and the contract was due to be executed in a few days. Mr. Battle pointed out during the long wait for the project to begin, construction costs dropped by approximately 40%. Chair Ferber requested construction drawings be made available to Board members. Mr. Battle stated Board members were welcome to contact Mina to see the drawings.

VI. Old/New Business

Mr. Lucas asked for an update on the parking proposal on Sistrunk. Mr. Battle stated a couple of meetings were held, and a presentation was made to the Board. Staff would move forward with the Planning Department to make a formal recommendation on August 17, 2010. Mr. Battle requested a meeting with Mr. Lucas and Mr. McGraw to finalize planning.

Chair Ferber inquired about the Trammel street lamps. Mr. Battle said Staff was putting together a spec package, progress was still being made, and completion was still expected in the fall.

Mr. Centamore noted the construction on 6th Street from Andrews to Federal, and asked if there would still be two lanes. Mr. Battle stated there were different lane cross-sections, and the area in question would remain two lanes, and no attempt was made to widen the area.

VII. Communication to the City Commission

None.

VIII. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

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