

**APPROVED
MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
JULY 27, 2011 – 3:30 P.M.**

Cumulative Attendance

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>May 2011 - April 2012</u>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Steve Lucas, Chair	P	3	0
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair (arr. 3:42)	P	3	0
Jessie Adderley	P	3	0
Sonya Burrows	P	2	0
Ron Centamore	P	3	0
Nate Ernest-Jones	P	2	1
Alan Gabriel	A	2	1
Mickey Hinton	P	2	1
Bradley Hubert (dep. 5:04)	P	3	0
Brice Lambrix	P	2	1
Yvonne Sanandres	P	2	1
Doug Sterner (arr. 3:39)	P	3	0
John Wilkes	A	1	2
Samuel Williams	P	3	0

Currently there are 14 appointed members to the Board, which means 8 would constitute a quorum.

Staff

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA
Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Lucas called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes from June 22, 2011

Motion made by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Hubert, to approve the minutes of the June 22, 2011 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Chair Lucas suggested that the Board hear Action Item VI at this time as a courtesy to the presenters. He noted that no vote or approval would be required. The Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

Action Items

VI. Review Site Plan – North Broward Hospital District

Mr. Williams asked if the Board was expected to give an opinion on the project, which could affect the Development Review Committee (DRC) process. Mr. Battle confirmed this. Chair Lucas added that while no vote will be held, comments by the Board may be carried forward to the DRC.

Nectaria Chakas of Lochrie & Chakas introduced the team present from Broward Health. She explained that the project is a development proposal for a new clinic at Broward Boulevard and 11 Avenue. There is an existing specialty care center, a research center, and a new overflow parking lot. The existing clinic will be demolished and the new clinic will be built on that parcel.

She showed the Board a site plan for the proposed facility, noting that an alley that bisects the site will be preserved to allow for access to other parcels. Ten parking spaces will be provided on-site, and an additional 31 spaces will be available off-site.

The new facility will provide the same services currently offered by the existing facility. Broward Health received a grant to construct the new clinic, which will be twice the size of the current facility and will have a pharmacy inside the building.

Ms. Chakas showed a rendering of the building's exterior, noting that CRA Staff had asked Broward Health to install pedestrian lighting. This request has been accommodated in the site plan and the lighting will be installed on 11th Avenue. The existing sidewalk will remain, and the facility will be more heavily landscaped.

Mr. Sterner arrived at 3:39 p.m.

Ms. Chakas concluded that because the project lies within the CRA, Broward Health had wished to apprise the Board of the development. It has also been presented to the Dorsey Riverbend Association.

Chair Lucas asked what the project's timeline would be from approval to opening. Joe Handley, representing the project, said they are expected to open by September 2012, as the project has received a Federal grant. This means they have "an aggressive timeline" and are hoping to break ground by January 2012.

Mr. Williams asked if the project has received site plan approval. Ms. Chakas said it has gone before the DRC, and the developer has addressed all comments from that meeting.

Mr. Williams asked if using the overflow lot for primary parking created an issue. Ms. Chakas stated that there are 10 spaces on-site, and the additional spaces in the overflow lot will be subject to an offsite parking agreement that will link the two parcels. She explained that a City Code provision allows an offsite lot to be linked to the development if it is within 700 ft. and there is an offsite parking agreement.

Vice Chair Phillips arrived at 3:42 p.m.

Mr. Ernest-Jones asked what the clinic's hours of operation would be. Nadine Reeves, Nurse Manager, said the hours are expected to remain the same as for the current facility. Mr. Ernest-Jones asked if the project will be actively lit at night and on weekends. Scott Bakos, architect, said a photometric package was submitted to the DRC, although it was not included in the Board's information. He said the DRC did not have questions or issues regarding photometrics.

Mr. Ernest-Jones noted that the plan shows sabal palms would be planted along 11 Avenue, and advised that the CRA's Master Plan requires live oaks in that area. Mr. Bakos said live oaks, crepe myrtles, and Montgomery palms would be used for street planting, both of which match nearby plantings.

Ms. Burrows asked if the limited on-site spaces would all be designated for patient parking. Ms. Reeves said employees would use the offsite lot.

Mr. Battle asked if the on-site pharmacy would be open to the general public. Ms. Reeves said it would be open to individuals receiving prescriptions and other services from Broward Health.

Mr. Hinton noted that it can be difficult to get in and out of the current site. Ms. Chakas advised that the public right-of-way cannot be changed; the new building will be located in a slightly different area than the existing building, and is not expected to impede access.

Chair Lucas thanked the team from Broward Health for presenting to the Board.

III. Recap of June 28, 2011 Workshop

Mr. Battle thanked the Board members for attending the City Commission workshop. He explained that some members had wanted to know what would be done next.

He recalled that the CRA budget will be discussed at the August City Commission meeting, where it is expected to be approved. The budget is slightly more than what was approved during the past three years; some of these dollars are intended to go toward professional planning services. Mr. Battle said he would prepare a schedule for both the Board and the Commission, which would prioritize some of the planning activities discussed at the meeting. They would attempt to define uses in a "more deliberate way" to determine what uses are preferred or should be sought after. Two other important discussion topics are design guidelines and looking at the area in terms of "other zoning interventions."

Mr. Battle noted that the CRA has already engaged with a prospective vendor to study parking on the Sistrunk corridor; this work is expected to begin during the next one to two weeks. He said when this report is complete it will be brought back to the Board for their review and comments. This project will hopefully be complete by the end of the year.

Another initiative over the next few months is to review the incentives offered by the CRA with the intent of adding and removing some incentives. The last project, which must wait until the budget has been approved, is to look at borrowing more money, which was a major part of the discussion with the City Commission. This initiative will look at the CRA from a revenue standpoint and perform some in-depth projections.

At the beginning of August, a memorandum will be sent to the City Commission, stating a recap of the recent meeting and laying out a work schedule for the next six months. This will include the projects previously noted, along with other projects the CRA is trying to complete, and will establish benchmarks for these efforts.

Mr. Williams commented that he felt it was a very successful meeting in this regard, as the Board had learned the Commission values their time and advice. He recalled, however, that while there were several comments about what needed to be done and what had not been done, little was said to emphasize what had been done.

He added that although the intent was for the City Commission to provide the Board with feedback about what more the Commissioners hoped would be

accomplished, a great deal of the discussion was being driven by the Board itself. He concluded that the Board had not seemed to present a united front.

Mr. Sterner said he had felt the City Commission wished the Board to be more proactive, noting that they had spent a good deal of time reviewing the list of short-, medium-, and long-term goals and discussing how more of these goals could be met.

Chair Lucas said he agreed with Mr. Sterner, stating that he also felt the Commission wanted the Board to be more proactive. He suggested that in order to move forward, a simplified plan should be developed to attract investment.

Mr. Sterner added that the existing parking issue has been a "stumbling block" to further progress, and a solution has not been offered to address this problem. He proposed that the Board try to figure out how to address this issue, or it would remain an impediment to attracting businesses and further development.

Ms. Phillips said she agreed there were at least two items discussed that had experienced ongoing problems. She also felt the Commission expected the Board to provide some direction to Staff regarding how to address these problems. She stated that the Board should emphasize that they are "all on the same page."

Mr. Williams said he also believed no one is pleased with the existing DRC process, which is a major issue that may not be within the Board's purview. He said he did not know how the Board might be able to influence this process, which he characterized as "broken."

He noted that there needs to be two separate sets of parking guidelines: one for the City in general, and one for specific areas inside the CRA where there may not be sufficient room for parking. He concluded that the general rules cannot work within the CRA if progress is expected.

Mr. Centamore said he also felt it was necessary for the Commission to hear about the difficulties of the DRC process, as they are the body that could ultimately address these concerns.

Chair Lucas recalled that there had been mention of commissioning a study for parking along the Sistrunk corridor. He recalled that the Board had discussed parking issues not only along this corridor but in FAT Village as well, and asked if these could both be explored at the same time. Mr. Battle said both areas are being studied. He explained that without the data generated by a study, there is no evidence to substantiate how much parking is available and how the existing parking requirement might be changed.

Mr. Sterner observed that the lack of parking in the area makes a strong case for the necessity of more public transportation. Mr. Battle said the study will look at not only a parking inventory, but alternative modes of transportation as well, such as the WAVE, more bicycle lanes, or other strategies.

Mr. Ernest-Jones said he felt the City Commission's message for the Board to be more proactive was "loud and clear." He interpreted this as working within their own unique relationships and skill sets within the community, such as appointing a few members to a parking subcommittee and asking them to work with Staff and other participants. Mr. Battle advised that the Board does not have the authority to establish subcommittees, so the entire Board serves as a subcommittee on any given issue. He noted that special meetings with Staff could be held on particular topics, but the entire Board would be invited to attend and the meeting would be noticed.

Mr. Williams suggested that Staff could direct the Board to take a more "hands-on" approach to various issues, so the Board could be of more assistance to Staff and accelerate the progress of certain projects. Mr. Battle said he felt the best approach would be to engage the Board so Staff could receive feedback. He cited the parking report as an example, stating that he would provide this report to the Board members as soon as it is available so they could come to the next meeting prepared to ask questions and provide input.

He noted that some projects are already in process while others may be just starting, and pointed out that members could offer their expertise in reviewing RFPs to help determine if anything has been missed. He felt this was what the City Commission was seeking when they asked the Board for its input. This would also mean a greater level of feedback would be presented to the CRA Board and ultimately the City Commission when a given project goes before either body.

Mr. Hubert said he felt the best thing the Board could do in the near term is to help Staff establish priorities for the coming year. They should also keep in mind that situations and priorities may change over time. He felt establishing subcommittees could actually detract from progress, and it would be best to continue to work within the Board's established framework.

Mr. Battle said there were merits to establishing a year's worth of priorities, as well as having more conversations about issues and opportunities. He stated that Staff was there to provide the Board with information and get their input on how to solve these issues.

Chair Lucas proposed that a next step to follow the June 28 workshop would be preparation of the memorandum to the City Commission. Mr. Battle said this memo would retain the same format, and might raise "horizon issues" that are more important for discussion than ongoing or almost complete projects. He said he could send this memo to the Board as soon as it is finished.

Action Items

IV. 2011-2012 CRA Budget

Mr. Battle noted that the members had been provided with a copy of the budget, and pointed out that revenue has decreased from the previous year. Revenues and operating budgets from the past three years were listed as well. The budget includes projected revenue, based upon property appraisals; he advised that this figure is subject to further change in August. The 2011-2012 operating budget is just over \$2 million, a 5% increase from the previous year's budget.

Chair Lucas requested further information on professional services. Mr. Battle said these include architectural, engineering, advertising, marketing, consulting, and other services. Architectural and engineering services alone came to approximately \$307,000. He clarified that the budget under discussion was the operating budget rather than capital dollars.

Mr. Battle called the Board's attention to new commitments and capital expenses in the upcoming fiscal year; payments for ongoing projects will be authorized once the City Commission approves the budget. There are also neighborhood enhancements for which grants are available this year. A funding request from the grocery store developer is also expected. He concluded that other requests would be dealt with as they are received throughout the year.

Mr. Hubert noted that the CRA is in a declining revenue situation with regard to property assessments. Mr. Battle said he hoped they were at or close to the end of the decline, as this would be a difficult year. He felt upcoming projects would have an impact on the bottom line.

Motion made by Mr. Sterner, seconded by Ms. Adderley, to endorse the proposed 2011-2012 budget. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

V. Review Carlisle Housing Proposal – Pocket Park

Chair Lucas recalled that this project had been presented at a previous meeting, and the Board had requested that some revisions be made.

Mr. Battle recalled that the earlier proposal provided to the Board would have used a portion of land located outside the western entrance to the building; however, Code does not allow for openings to exist across properties not owned by the same developer. This was discussed with the City Attorney's Office, and the developer was asked to give the CRA a proposal to deed a portion of the property to him, so he would have ownership of the adjacent piece of property. The CRA would retain ownership of roughly 85% of the park, and would make improvements so it could be used as public space.

He continued that the proposal for artwork in the park would be funded with Northwest CRA funds. The Board had asked to see different price alternatives for the land and artwork: these were presented as \$200,000, \$155,000, and \$135,000. Staff's recommendation is to select option 2, or the \$155,000 option. Mr. Battle noted that the artwork would not be located on the property but would be physically located on the building owned by the Housing Authority.

Mr. Centamore noted that the cost of the mural itself had originally been higher. Mr. Battle explained that the costs were determined by the method to be used in creating the mural; there were less expensive alternative methods to create the artwork. The mural in option 2 would cost \$20,000.

Chair Lucas also recalled the original cost of the mural as considerably higher, and noted that option 2 was estimated at \$20,000 for the artwork and \$110,000 for "landscaping/hardscaping." He asked if the amounts listed were not-to-exceed figures. Mr. Battle said when the selected funding amount is approved, the mechanism for payment would be "in the form of an agreement" rather than in cash. The agreement would be set up at a maximum price, with the developer to make up any costs that go over budget.

Mr. Sterner suggested if the cost of the mural was eliminated and picked up by the Housing Authority instead, the Board could "get option 2 for the price of option 3," with a savings of \$20,000.

Mr. Centamore said he had a problem with paying for artwork on a building when it would not contribute any taxes back to the City; he felt there was not a great deal of sentiment in favor of spending tax money on art in public spaces. He proposed that artwork could be placed on the building at a lesser cost if a contest, for example, could be held at the Art Institute to develop a rendering to place on the wall.

Mr. Ernest-Jones pointed out that the artist who would create the proposed artwork has done work on other parts of Sistrunk Boulevard, which would create a consistent style in the area. Mr. Centamore said he felt it would be better to

place this artwork in the park or on a monument rather than on a building owned by the Housing Authority.

Mr. Battle advised that the proposed style of artwork and its images were intended to reflect connectivity with Sistrunk Boulevard's Centennial monument. Even if artwork was provided through a contest, he felt that individuals would need to be encouraged to look at connectivity of themes. He added that while the artwork would be on the Housing Authority's building rather than in the park, it would frame the park space, which is CRA property.

Mr. Ernest-Jones asked if the Board would be willing to allocate a certain amount of money toward the park and the landscaping but not the proposed mural. The price of the artwork could be deducted from the funds.

Mr. Sterner reiterated that he felt option 2 was the best choice, and that the price could be reduced if the mural was eliminated from the proposal. He felt the addition of the mural should be left up to the Housing Authority rather than the CRA.

Motion made by Mr. Sterner, seconded by Mr. Centamore, to endorse option number two minus the cost of the mural, up to a maximum price of [\$135,000]. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

VII. Housing and Community Development Properties in the NPF CRA

Mr. Battle explained that this discussion resulted from the City Commission meeting held in July. The City owns several properties within the Northwest CRA, some of which are controlled by Housing and Community Development, some by the City's Real Estate Department, and some by the CRA. Housing and Community Development- and Real Estate Department-owned properties have been discussed for sale as a way to bring revenue to the City. As a result of the recent workshop, the City Commission wished to ask the Board if they had a preference on how to dispose of the properties.

He provided background information on the locations of the properties for disposal, as well as what might be involved in the process. Mr. Battle noted that most of the properties are very small and are located outside the CRA's core area. The intent is to work jointly with Housing and Community Development to bring buyers to them, as well as marketing the properties to get them into the proper hands. An alternative approach would be transferring the properties to the CRA, which would market them as part of the overall redevelopment effort. This would allow the CRA to have some control over who purchases the properties, and help them prevent the properties from being purchased to "[stand] in the way" of progress. He continued that the CRA could also ask the City to refrain

from disposing of any properties at present until they have been discussed by the Advisory Board, so it can be determined how the properties might fit into the redevelopment effort of the area.

Mr. Battle emphasized that there is “no rush” in terms of the need to dispose of the properties. The easiest solution might be for the CRA to take ownership of the properties, but he pointed out that they would need to pay Housing and Community Development for the properties. The appropriate prices are listed on the documentation.

Chair Lucas said he felt it would not be wise to proceed without a plan for these properties. He noted that he was not aware of the locations of all sites, or whether or not they would be considered strategic to redevelopment efforts, but felt a plan should be in place for the properties’ disposal. He said option 3 listed in the documentation would be his first preference, followed by option 2.

The Board discussed some of the specific locations of the properties, the zoning districts in which they are located, and some of their potential uses. Mr. Battle pointed out that if a property is sold by the City, it does not matter whether or not it is located within the CRA: it must be sold at the established minimum purchase price.

He added that if the Board wishes to table the discussion until their next meeting, Staff can perform some due diligence with adjoining or nearby property owners and report back on their interest. This could provide a better idea of whether or not the CRA should consider purchasing the properties and creating incentives around them.

Chair Lucas asked if there was consensus among the members to allow Staff to perform due diligence and make recommendations at the next meeting. The Board agreed by consensus.

Chair Lucas expressed concern that selling properties to the adjacent property owners “just to raise money” and get the properties off the books would not guarantee that those owners would put the properties to appropriate or wanted uses. He cautioned that the properties should fit into the CRA’s plan, not the prospective owners’ plans.

Discussion Items

VIII. Director’s Report

Mr. Battle asked if the Board wished to meet in August, noting that they have typically taken either July or August off during the summer. The Board agreed by consensus to hold no meeting in August.

IX. Communication to CRA Board

None.

X. Old / New Business

Mr. Hubert left the meeting at 5:04 p.m.

Bernadette Norris-Weeks, guest, stated that the Midtown Business Association hoped to work with the Board during the moratorium and have further discussions on the types of zoning to put in place in the CRA. She suggested that the Board and Association prepare themselves regarding what kind of zoning and parking changes should be enacted to attract more businesses to the area. The Association was also willing to work with Staff if that was the Board's desire. Mr. Battle clarified that this issue had been discussed by the Planning and Zoning Board at a recent meeting; the moratorium was upheld at the City Commission meeting as well.

Mr. Battle advised that the Board was likely to revisit this issue as an ongoing Agenda Item in the future, as well as other issues and details related to zoning changes. He said he would send the City Commission a list of the items the Board will work on in the near term, including planning issues such as parking, zoning uses, design guidelines, and neighborhood planning. In addition to providing information on these issues to the Board members between meetings, Mr. Battle stated he would also keep the Midtown Business Association apprised of progress. He invited the Association to provide input on the report as well as the Board.

Mr. Lambrix requested an update on the work on 6 Street, recalling that the original completion date for section 4 was the end of July. Mr. Battle said this segment of the project was a couple of months behind schedule, primarily due to the undergrounding, which took longer than expected. He did not expect that the overall project would go over budget.

Mr. Sterner recalled that the Northwest tour offered as part of the Florida Neighborhoods Conference was the most popular of Fort Lauderdale's tours. He thanked Ms. Norris-Weeks for her hard work during the conference. Ms. Norris-Weeks recognized Mr. Battle's contribution as tour guide.

Mr. Battle provided the Board members with a memo on the New River Condominiums, which are located on NW 23 Avenue. A demolition order was issued for the structures in November 2010; however, one of the lien holders of the property appealed the order, which has delayed the demolition. At this point nothing can be done until the appeals process has run its course. He stated he would keep the Board apprised of any progress with regard to this property. It is hoped that a decision will be reached by the end of this year.

XI. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

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