

**APPROVED**  
**MINUTES**  
**NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS**  
**REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE**  
**100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE**  
**8<sup>th</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**MAY 23, 2012 – 3:30 P.M.**

**Cumulative Attendance**

| <u>Members Present</u>        | <u>Attendance</u> | <b>May 2012 - April 2013</b> |               |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
|                               |                   | <u>Present</u>               | <u>Absent</u> |
| Steve Lucas, Chair            | P                 | 1                            | 0             |
| Ella Phillips, Vice Chair     | P                 | 1                            | 0             |
| Jessie Adderley (arr. 3:44)   | P                 | 1                            | 0             |
| Sonya Burrows                 | P                 | 1                            | 0             |
| Ron Centamore                 | P                 | 1                            | 0             |
| Nate Ernest-Jones (arr. 3:40) | P                 | 1                            | 0             |
| Alan Gabriel                  | P                 | 1                            | 0             |
| Mickey Hinton                 | P                 | 1                            | 0             |
| Brice Lambrix                 | A                 | 0                            | 1             |
| Richard D. Powers             | P                 | 1                            | 0             |
| Yvonne Sanandres              | P                 | 1                            | 0             |
| Vanessa Santiago              | P                 | 1                            | 0             |
| Scott Strawbridge             | P                 | 1                            | 0             |
| John Wilkes                   | A                 | 0                            | 1             |
| Samuel Williams (dep. 4:48)   | P                 | 1                            | 0             |

Currently there are 15 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  
 Steve Anderson, Director, Economic Development  
 Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA  
 Bob Wojcik, CRA  
 Diana Alarcon, Director, Transportation and Mobility  
 Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communications to the City Commission**

None.

**I. Call to Order / Roll Call**

Chair Lucas called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

Chair Lucas introduced new member Vanessa Santiago. Ms. Santiago is President of the Flagler Village Civic Association and was appointed to the Board by Commissioner Rodstrom.

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

**Motion** made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Williams, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Battle introduced new Director of Economic Development Steve Anderson. Mr. Anderson stated he was looking forward to working with the Board.

The following Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

## **V. Flagler Village Housing Proposal – Henry Square**

Chair Lucas recalled that as part of the Development Review Committee (DRC) process, proposed developments within the CRA are asked to make presentations to the Board. He noted that there was no funding request associated with today's presentation.

Robert Lochrie, attorney, stated that the proposed Flagler Village development would be located on the former Minto development site. A new developer has made some changes to the original plan and hopes to have the project underway in the fall.

The proposal is for 382 residential units with an additional 27,000 sq. ft. of retail space. Mr. Lochrie showed a diagram of the proposed project, noting that it would have one-story of retail and leasing offices. The site is presently a unified block; however, the developer hopes to put a new street in place to separate the project. A pedestrian plaza is planned for the center of the development. The streetscape will include 12 ft. sidewalks, parallel parking, and stairs on ground floor units.

Mr. Ernest-Jones arrived at 3:40 p.m.

Mr. Williams asked what retail outlets would be located within the development. Mr. Lochrie said this has not yet been decided, but both neighborhood retail and restaurants are expected. He noted that the corridor on which the development is

located presently sees increasing retail activity. He showed different renderings of the property to the Board, including both retail and residential areas.

Mr. Gabriel asked where retail parking would be located. Mr. Lochrie showed two points of entry on the master plan, stating that this is one reason the new roadway and pedestrian path are being developed. Cars may enter the site from either side and parallel parking is available behind the retail areas. Roughly one and a half floors of the garage will be available for retail and restaurant parking as well. He noted that the garage parking is expected to be free of charge. It is not known whether or not the street parking spaces will be metered.

Ms. Adderley arrived at 3:44 p.m.

Mr. Gabriel asked where parking for the retail storefronts would be located. Mr. Lochrie said they would face Federal Highway. Mr. Gabriel commented that this could make it difficult to access the retail sites. Mr. Lochrie said the retail establishments would have dual entry on the front and back sides. The development is consistent with the Downtown Master Plan.

Mr. Williams asked where the development currently stood in the DRC process. Mr. Lochrie said the developer is answering questions asked at the DRC meeting, which occurred roughly one week ago. He estimated that it would take 14 months to construct the project for initial occupancy and 16 months to complete. The project is presently budgeted at \$60 million.

Mr. Lochrie advised that he would likely present to the Board again in the future with regard to streetscapes, underground power lines, or other details.

## **Discussion Items**

### **III. Reliance Housing Foundation Proposal**

Mr. Battle explained that this Item has changed since the Board's last discussion of it: the appraisal is significantly less than it was estimated to be in December 2011. There is limited ability to reuse the building for a redevelopment project. In addition, Mr. Battle advised that he had reached out to Reliance to determine whether or not they were interested in revising their proposal. He stated that he would bring their feedback to the Board at a later time.

The cost of demolition, site work, and improvements is roughly estimated at a minimum of \$100,000. Mr. Battle added that the seller has indicated there are a number of interested parties, and plans to evaluate what is in his best interest. He concluded that the seller will need to determine whether or not this is a good opportunity at the appraised cost, and if there is a new proposal from Reliance

with regard to the property. He offered to take the Board's comments to the parties involved.

Mr. Williams remarked that he would be very disappointed if the CRA paid anything near the original asking price. He suggested that Reliance add grass and benches to the parcel. Mr. Centamore agreed, stating that the parcel was too small for a larger investment.

Mr. Strawbridge added that he would like to know whether or not anyone has consulted with the City's Parks and Recreation Department to determine how the parcel fits into their existing system, and if they were interested in owning and/or managing the property.

Mr. Battle replied that he had discussed the parcel as a potential part of the Flagler Greenway; however, this was more of a political than an economic question due to the desire for a trailhead. No economic analysis has been done on the increased cost of maintenance if the parcel was added to the greenway. While Parks and Recreation felt it would be possible to include the parcel in the greenway, they did not offer additional information other than that the property would be maintained as part of the larger system.

Mr. Strawbridge observed that normally, the property owner would contribute the land and the CRA would contribute development costs; however, for the proposed Reliance parcel, they would have maintained both ownership and maintenance. He could not recall any similar examples.

Mr. Battle noted that Peter Feldman Park came to the CRA in a similar manner, as the City purchased the property and developed and maintained it as a park. He pointed out, however, that in that case, there had been a master plan that called for a park in that area, while in the case of the Reliance parcel, the opportunity for development as green space was brought to the CRA.

Mr. Centamore asked if funds were still available from what the City received to develop the greenway. Mr. Battle said there were no funds remaining, and recalled that the CRA had contributed to this effort.

Ms. Santiago commented that she felt a park could add value to the surrounding neighborhood, and pointed out that the neighborhood has discussed the possibility of maintaining the parcel.

Chair Lucas said he had also considered the property as complementary to the greenway; he felt it could be sufficient to purchase the property at the appraised price, demolish the existing building, and plant grass to make the parcel a part of the greenway.

Mr. Battle said without a partnership with Reliance, there was not another willing partner to purchase the parcel; at the same time, he felt the seller was entertaining offers higher than the appraised price. He added that there are some existing Code liens on the property that have accrued to a significant amount, although the seller believes these may be negotiated down.

He stated that the Board may vote to defer the Item until the next meeting, after Mr. Battle has discussed the issue further with both Reliance and the seller, or they may abandon the idea unless a new proposal is made.

**Motion** made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Ms. Adderley, to defer to the next meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

## **Information Items**

### **VI. Director's Report**

Mr. Battle referred the Board members to fliers for an upcoming business education seminar on June 6. This will be the last business seminar event of the year, and will focus on business marketing and branding.

On June 16, Interblock Fort Lauderdale, an urban design exhibit demonstrating temporary streetscape improvements, is being organized by a number of organizations, including the Flagler Village Civic Association, Florida Atlantic University, and the Flagler Arts and Technology District, among others. The CRA is helping secure the necessary permits for this event.

Ms. Santiago added that the exhibit will rent trees from a nearby tree farm, and food trucks and pop-up businesses will attend. The intent is to show the potential for the area in a single day.

Mr. Battle continued that the CRA's annual report is also included in the members' packets. It was prepared in March 2012 and submitted to the State Office of Economic Development. He noted that the format is significantly different from past annual reports, and includes marketing documents and several pictures from within the three CRA districts: the Central Beach, the Northwest, and most recently the Middle River area.

He recalled that the Board had recently discussed the moratorium on convenience stores within the Northwest CRA. The City has expressed a desire to make changes to zoning Code to eliminate this use, as statistics show these stores have a large impact on crime and other social issues in the neighborhood. There is now consideration of creating an entirely new zoning district for the

Sistrunk corridor, which would allow certain uses while eliminating others. This would also create a district that is more complementary to the Master Plan.

He advised that at the next meeting, information would include a copy of the draft zoning Ordinance and Staff reports that would accompany this issue before the Planning and Zoning Board. Mr. Battle encouraged the members to attend this upcoming meeting and speak on this issue. Public purpose statements and the existing Master Plan will also be presented. The first reading of the draft Ordinance is expected to take place in July. If it has not been approved by the time the moratorium expires in August, the moratorium may be extended.

Mr. Strawbridge asked if rezoning would simplify the permitting process for business owners. Mr. Battle said the intent is to create a list of permitted uses for the district, which would be consistent with the kind of development the CRA would like to see.

Mr. Battle continued that the Flagler lighting improvements are now up and lit, and he had received several emails from members of the community expressing their pleasure with this project.

He recalled that the Board had discussed a business incubator project some months ago, and advised that there has been some movement on this program. The City has reached out to a number of prospective university partners, and is evaluating potential locations and the cost of such a program. The intent is to provide services that will help small businesses grow, within both Fort Lauderdale in general and the Sistrunk corridor in particular. The incubator program would not be limited to a single business base, such as retail, manufacturing, or technology, but would provide "a la carte services" for a variety of small businesses.

Mr. Battle advised that the entities who had approached the Board some months ago seeking relief from the expense of fire Code violations were no longer in need of this assistance. The CRA had worked with some of these businesses to help them reduce these costs. One of the businesses was unable to overcome the issue and may address it again at a later time.

He recalled that at the April meeting, the Board had discussed issues related to trees in the Northwest area. Since that time, an inventory of all trees planted in rights-of-way by the City or CRA in the last few years has been completed, and a meeting has been scheduled with the City's Urban Forester. He observed that in some cases, the issue has been lack of maintenance from adjacent property owners, who are responsible for trees planted in rights-of-way; in some locations, adjacent properties in the CRA may be abandoned or vacant. One potential

solution may be to find trees that are more tolerant of a lack of regular maintenance.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that the CRA is becoming one of the more pedestrian-friendly areas of the City due to the shade tree canopy. He added that Northwest Gardens recently became the first LEED-certified neighborhood in the state, which is due in part to the creation of the tree canopy. He agreed that a program must be developed to maintain the trees in the long term.

With regard to the Sistrunk construction project, paving is underway in the western section and work is being done with Florida Power & Light (FPL) in the eastern section. The western section is expected to be complete by the end of the month, although Mr. Battle said he could not estimate a completion date for the eastern section at this time. The middle area has not yet been connected.

#### **IV. Citywide Parking and Loading Requirement Revisions**

Mr. Battle explained that a parking study was conducted in the beach area to address some questions related to infrastructure projects, including the renovation of a beach parking lot and the reconfiguration of traffic along A1A. The City Commission was concerned with respect to parking as an overall issue for residents, visitors, and businesses on the beach. A consultant was retained to conduct an overall parking analysis for the area.

The result was a number of recommendations about how parking is used on the beach, both at present and for new developments that are coming online. The consultant arrived at both an existing parking inventory for the beach and a second inventory that would be “over and above the need” of current and future development. Staff then worked to reduce parking requirements for the beach and take the new requirements to the Planning and Zoning Board for approval. However, the consultant also determined that the City’s overall parking Code requirements were excessive, and concluded that a reduction could spur additional investment and development throughout the City.

Mr. Battle advised that when changes for the entire City were presented to the Planning and Zoning Board for approval, that Board had expressed concern with the level of public outreach outside the beach area. This is the reason behind a recent workshop on this topic. Other City advisory entities are also asked to provide comments on parking requirements and how they affect business development and community redevelopment.

He noted that the Board members were provided with background materials on the proposed parking amendment, including Staff reports. Should the Code amendment pass, it would reduce parking throughout the City by a small amount.

Mr. Battle also advised that he had walked a portion of Sistrunk Boulevard with the City Manager to discuss parking issues. The City Manager is of the opinion that there should be no parking requirements in redevelopment areas.

Mr. Battle concluded that the parking amendment would go before the Planning and Zoning Board within the coming months, although it was not likely to occur earlier than July. He advised that he would inform the members when a date has been set for this discussion.

Chair Lucas observed that he applauded the City's efforts to compare current parking requirements with those of other cities, and the resulting amendment that would bring these requirements more into line with the standard. He stated the proposed changes were not sufficient in the redevelopment areas.

Chair Lucas introduced Diana Alarcon, Director of Transportation and Mobility. Ms. Alarcon explained that the parking study originally considered supply and demand on the barrier island; the consultant was also asked to look into the City's overall parking requirement, as the City has been told over the years that their requirements more than exceeded what was necessary. Retail, office, nightclub, bar, and restaurant uses were studied. Ms. Alarcon noted that residential parking was not currently included in the study.

When the parking study was completed, it was determined that the City was "overparked," with a larger supply than demand of parking for everyday use. The rate of use was approximately 54% against an industry average of 80%, although Ms. Alarcon noted that the Sunrise Lane area was at 89%, which meant this area did not have enough parking. At the same time, the University of Florida conducted a supply and demand analysis for future demand management of the downtown area. This analysis also determined that downtown is overparked.

The results of the barrier island study were broken into three separate segments: the central beach, Sunrise Lane, and the Galt area. Staff then applied the parking elements specified for the central beach and applied them throughout the City. These are the elements currently being presented to the public.

Ms. Alarcon stated that there has been a good deal of feedback thus far. She pointed out that the industry standard for applying parking requirements shows the entire City is above average in its parking requirements, and would continue to be above average even after the proposed reductions are made.

Mr. Gabriel commented that parking requirements do not typically take transit development into account, and suggested that property owners might receive credits or other benefits for providing either money or space toward transit-supportive facilities. Ms. Alarcon said she was working with the Department of



Sustainable Development to determine these trade-offs: for example, Code changes could result in property owners being able to trade parking spaces for secure bicycle storage facilities.

She cautioned that the proposed parking amendment was the first minor step in the big picture, and it would be necessary to follow this up with other steps to address overparking throughout the City.

Mr. Gabriel suggested that any such credits or trade-offs be included in the Code amendment rather than added at a later time. Ms. Alarcon said while this was not considered as part of the parking study, it is under consideration for future use.

Mr. Strawbridge asked if the proposed amendment could consider subsets of residential zones, such as affordable housing and senior citizens' housing. Ms. Alarcon replied that the existing City mechanism for a parking reduction requires that a study must prove overparking. This can be time-consuming for both developers and Staff. Shared use analyses such as proximity of transit and bus stops will now be applied as part of the DRC process.

Mr. Williams left the meeting at 4:48 p.m.

Mr. Ernest-Jones asked if the proposed parking amendments would go before the Planning and Zoning Board. Ms. Alarcon said the barrier island parking reduction was unanimously approved by the Planning and Zoning Board and has been advanced to the City Commission, with its first reading scheduled for June. The parking amendment for the entire City will go before the Planning and Zoning Board in July.

Mr. Ernest-Jones asked if it was too late for the Board to offer a motion in support of a parking exemption for the CRA. Ms. Alarcon said a separate study would need to be performed for the CRA; however, she agreed it was not too soon to begin looking at a study of this type to add to "the overall big picture" of parking in Fort Lauderdale.

Mr. Ernest-Jones continued that there are elements of the proposed amendment which he felt would be of interest to the CRA, such as shared parking, and asked if it would be appropriate to convey this to the City Commission in the form of a motion. Ms. Alarcon said this would be very helpful.

Mr. Battle noted that the CRA has recently gathered information that would be shared with Ms. Alarcon, including the City Manager's recent comments regarding exemption. He recommended that the Board delay a motion of support until this information has been shared with Transportation and Mobility.

Mr. Powers said he had recently gone through the parking reduction process for a project, and advised that it was difficult and expensive. He agreed that anything that may streamline this process would be helpful, and noted that the results may be very subjective. Ms. Alarcon said she expected that allowing this to be done through the DRC process would result in a less subjective process.

Mr. Strawbridge added that the City engineer is autonomous in the DRC process, and asked how this process would influence his statistical findings. Ms. Alarcon said when parking reductions are moved to the DRC level, multiple members of Staff are involved in the process, including planners.

Chair Lucas requested an update on the Complete Streets program. Ms. Alarcon explained that this is a Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) initiative that would allow multiple modes of transportation on one street. A standard design to be adopted by the different municipalities is underway. The program is expected to go before the MPO Board in the fall, after which time it would be adopted into the City's Code.

## **VII. Communications to CRA Board**

Chair Lucas recalled that in 2011, the Advisory Board held a joint meeting with the CRA Board, and asked if this should be considered for 2012. Mr. Battle said he would compile a list of potential items for discussion between the two Boards and they could then determine if the topics warranted a meeting.

## **VIII. Old / New Business**

None.

## **IX. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

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