

**APPROVED**  
**MINUTES**  
**NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS**  
**REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE**  
**100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE**  
**8<sup>th</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**FEBRUARY 22, 2012 – 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	9	0
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	A	6	3
Jessie Adderley	P	8	1
Sonya Burrows	P	8	0
Ron Centamore	A	8	1
Nate Ernest-Jones	P	7	2
Alan Gabriel	P	7	2
Mickey Hinton	P	8	1
Brice Lambrix	A	7	2
Yvonne Sanandres	A	6	3
Doug Sterner	A	7	2
Scott Strawbridge	P	6	0
John Wilkes	P	6	3
Samuel Williams	P	7	2

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

It was noted that a quorum was present at the meeting.

**Staff**

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA  
Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA  
Bob Wojcik, CRA  
Jonathan Brown, Director, Housing and Community Development  
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 3:40 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

## **II. Approval of Minutes from January 25, 2012**

**Motion** made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Williams, to approve the minutes of the January 25, 2012 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Chair Lucas noted that a new member would be joining the Board at the March meeting.

### **Action Items**

## **III. Disposition of City-Owned Properties in NPF CRA**

Mr. Battle noted that the numbers on the map now correspond with the spreadsheet. There is also a column showing the options recommended by Staff for the disposition of the properties, including:

1. Being retained by the City;
2. Being purchased by the CRA;
3. Working with the nearby community for a plan for the property's use; and
4. Selling the property outright.

In the case of properties to be sold, he pointed out that the Board would be allowed to vet any proposals received by the City Commission and provide a recommendation on the action to be taken.

He clarified that if the CRA purchased a property, they would have to pay the City for it using CRA dollars; the CRA may then dispose of the property for less than the purchase price if they wished. In most cases, these expenses would not be budgeted, which meant the Board would need to find the funds to use for these purchases.

Commissioner Bobby DuBose briefly joined the meeting at this time and thanked the members on behalf of the City Commission for their hard work.

Mr. Williams observed that the advantage of having the CRA purchase a property would be allowing the Board greater input on what is built on the lots. Mr. Battle agreed that the CRA would not have to comply with the City Charter for the disposal of the property if the CRA itself owned the parcel. He reiterated that the Board would retain an advisory role in the event that the City sold a property outright.

Mr. Gabriel asked if the CRA would need to bid against other prospective purchasers if they wished to buy a parcel from the City. Mr. Battle explained that there is a process by which the City could sell a property to the CRA without their having to bid against other entities. Mr. Gabriel commented that this would give the CRA an advantage in the event the property needed to be developed for a particular use. He also suggested that requiring CRA review of properties to be sold by the City could be included in the zoning Code.

Mr. Williams commented that if the Board was allowed input on City sales, it would accomplish the same purpose as the CRA purchasing the property itself. Mr. Battle added that the Board could also request that properties within the CRA be removed from the City Commission's agenda if they did not want the City to sell a particular parcel or parcels.

Mr. Wilkes stated that because there is no current zoning Code in place to require Board approval of a City sale within the CRA, the Board could make recommendations that development of these parcels must be in accordance with CRA plans. Purchasing properties from the City may allow the CRA to impose more restrictions on a parcel's development than the City would be allowed to make. He felt these were both good options for strategic development.

Mr. Battle advised that the Board may also ask the City to stipulate that a parcel's development must be consistent with the CRA plan when they advertise a property for sale. Mr. Wilkes added that the zoning Code requirement for neighborhood compatibility could be used to recommend that new development comply with the CRA plan.

Mr. Gabriel clarified that his suggestion meant having prospective developers come before the Board for review rather than having neighborhood compatibility determined by the Planning and Zoning Board or the Development Review Committee. Mr. Battle agreed that this was also his position, so the Board could ensure that a proposal is compatible with both the surrounding area and the CRA plan.

Mr. Williams asked if Mr. Battle was recommending that the Board accept Staff's recommendations for disposal of the properties, which include all four options. Mr. Battle said if the Board did not feel option 2, CRA purchase of properties, was not feasible, he saw no difficulty in accepting the other three recommendations. He pointed out that he could not comfortably predict what some parcels might cost.

Mr. Williams asked if the Board lost the ability to construct revenue-producing properties if they purchased parcels themselves. Mr. Battle said most of the lots recommended for Board purchase were residential infill lots.

Mr. Gabriel asked if there was any possibility the City might transfer a property to the CRA rather than selling it. Mr. Wojcik said the City could pass a resolution to transfer the title of a property if they wished. The exception would be if a property had been purchased with special funds, in which case a transfer would be unlikely. Mr. Battle pointed out that many of the properties on the list had been purchased using Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.

Mr. Ernest-Jones asked what would happen to CRA-owned properties once the CRA has completed its term. Mr. Battle said these properties would revert to the City.

Jonathan Brown, Director of Housing and Community Development, joined the meeting at this time. Mr. Battle stated that many of the properties on the list are maintained by this Department. Mr. Brown explained that some of the lots were purchased 15 to 20 years ago with HUD funding, and HUD requires that the City now either build housing on the lots or return the funds. The City Commission wanted to ensure that before these lots were surplus, the CRA Board did not have any interest in using or developing them.

Mr. Battle asked Mr. Brown if any qualified purchasers are seeking to buy a house but cannot due to lack of inventory. Mr. Brown replied that Housing and Community Development partners with a number of nonprofit agencies that work with individuals who want to become homeowners. Once the individuals are prepared to make a purchase and have secured financing, these agencies would request help from Housing and Community Development, which would apply down payment assistance or another applicable program.

He advised that in the past, the Department had used State Housing Initiatives Partnership (SHIP) funds to construct infill housing; however, the State Legislature has decided that SHIP funds would no longer be distributed to municipalities, which meant several remaining lots could not be built upon. He added that the Department has not approached the development community to find out if anyone is currently interested in the construction of new housing. Once they can determine which lots are not of interest to the CRA Board, they can then reach out to developers or nonprofit agencies to partner with them in the construction of homes on these lots.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that most of the properties on the list are small sites in single-family housing districts, with a very few locations where there is an existing aggregation of property. For this reason, he asked how much more control the Board could exert over these properties, such as whether or not they would like to buy some of the lots in order to have greater jurisdiction over their use. He felt it could be an oversimplification to expect they could stipulate what is

built on CRA-owned lots, as the zoning Code affords developers some rights as well.

He suggested that if the Board elected to invest in some of the properties, they should consider making a lump sum offer to the City to purchase several lots for a set price. However, he noted it could be wiser to use the same amount of money to establish a program that will stimulate development and partner with the City, which will retain ownership of the lots. He felt the latter option would move the properties to the marketplace more rapidly.

Mr. Hinton stated that there are both large and small lots within his neighborhood, and residents would prefer to see these lots continue to be owned by the City or the CRA, as they did not know what might be developed on them. He noted that particular lots could be sold to the owners of neighboring properties rather than continue their maintenance by the City.

**Motion** made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Ms. Burrows, to approve the recommendation of the four categories for the description of how [the Board is] going to treat the 134 parcels of land that are owned by the City, for which they have been asked for a plan of disposition by the City Commission.

Mr. Gabriel stated that he would be more willing to maintain a property that the City transferred to the CRA at no cost; however, he stated that he was not interested in buying land from the City. Mr. Wilkes observed that there is no description of a sale price for category 2 items; they could be very high or very low. He suggested that the **motion be amended** to modify category 2 to include transfers or assignments of properties to the CRA by the City in lieu of sale.

Mr. Williams said this did not seem likely, and the Board would need to learn how such a transfer would take place. Mr. Gabriel added that this could also vary from one lot to the next, depending upon the value or purpose of the lot. Mr. Wilkes added that there are also restrictions on what the City may do with public land, and he was not certain that parcels could be transferred in this way.

Chair Lucas said he would suggest the Board approve use of three categories rather than four, removing consideration of the option for the CRA to purchase parcels from the City. Mr. Wilkes said he would only retain this option if the CRA might be able to purchase a lot for less than market value or have the lot transferred to them rather than sold.

Mr. Gabriel suggested that the language of option 2 could be changed to "sell or assign the property," which would allow for greater flexibility.

Mr. Williams asked if the Board was committed to purchasing any properties if they accepted option 2 as a possible means of disposal. Mr. Battle said there was no such obligation.

Mr. Wilkes stated his **amended motion** as follows: to expand the definition that was recommended by the Staff memo of February 22, 2012, option 2: that the City of Fort Lauderdale should sell or assign the property to the NPF CRA. Ms. Burrows seconded the **amended motion**.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Gabriel suggested separating out the smaller parcels on the list that could be sold to an adjoining property owner, as these would have more value to a neighbor than to an outside entity. Ms. Burrows agreed that some of these properties, while currently categorized under options 2 and 4, should be reconsidered for sale to adjoining owners. Mr. Strawbridge clarified that the minimum lot size on which a residential structure can be built is 6000 sq. ft. in an RS-4.4 or RS-8 zoning district; in multi-family districts, a single-family home can be built on a lot as small as 5000 sq. ft.

The members discussed the spreadsheet and identified properties of sufficiently small size that they could be reconsidered under option 3, or sold to nearby property owners. Chair Lucas suggested that they review the documents and bring a revised list of recommended options to the next meeting. Mr. Battle proposed that the Board make a second motion dealing with properties of less than 5000 sq. ft., stating that they would make a follow-up recommendation for these lots.

Mr. Brown advised that he has an upcoming meeting with HUD with regard to many of the properties, and stated he would report the results of this meeting to both the City Manager and Mr. Battle. This could help the Board members make determinations on some of the lots.

Mr. Wilkes advised that the Board not focus on those parcels identified in category 1 at this time, but would initially look at non-buildable lots of less than 5000 sq. ft.

**Motion** made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, that the recommendations [by Staff] are not binding upon the Board but are accepted for the purposes of moving forward, and [the Board] were not going to deal with those items that are identified as number 1; they will move forward in dealing with those parcels that are 5000 sq. ft. or less.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Wilkes requested that any parcels on the list acquired with HUD funds be identified.

### **Discussion Items**

#### **IV. Director's Report**

Mr. Battle requested that the members provide updated contact information, noting that some emails have been returned from existing addresses.

He continued that in upcoming meetings, the Board will see a presentation from a new restaurant planned for Federal Highway, which may make a request related to the façade grant program. The business will add 10 to 12 new jobs in the area. Other upcoming applicants include a company that trains individuals for jobs in green industries.

He noted that the members' information packets contained information from the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA), which discusses the possibility of using the FEC corridor for passenger rail service. This service would add two to three stations in Fort Lauderdale, one of which would be located in the CRA.

Mr. Battle reported that the Sistrunk project is now over 70% complete, with work remaining on the north side of the street. Once Florida Power & Light (FPL) utility poles have been removed and a final coat of asphalt added, the street can be reopened.

The Sistrunk Festival will be held this weekend, with a parade on the south side of the road. Areas under construction will be barricaded.

Chair Lucas requested an update on the streetscape project proposed for 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and Andrews Avenue. Mr. Battle said the City will apply to a County program for context sensitive corridors, and has spoken with County representatives to learn what the application will need to include.

#### **V. Communication to CRA Board**

None.

#### **VI. Old / New Business**

Chair Lucas noted that a project at Progresso Point has added grass and hardscaping but does not appear to have included trees. Mr. Battle noted that this may be part of the Flagler Greenway, and stated he would look into this.

## **VII. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

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