

**APPROVED**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**NORTHWEST-PROGRESSO-FLAGLER HEIGHTS**  
**REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE**  
**8<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL**  
**November 14, 2017 – 3 :00 P.M.**

**Cumulative Attendance**

**May 2017-April 2018**

**Members Present**

	<b><u>Attendance</u></b>	<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Absent</u></b>
Ron Centamore, Chair	P	4	1
Leann Barber (arrived at 3:15 p.m.)	P	5	0
Brad Cohen	P	3	2
Alan Gabriel	P	5	0
Rhoda Glasco Foderingham	P	5	0
John Hart	NP	4	1
Mickey Hinton	P	3	2
John Hooper (arrived at 3:15 p.m.)	P	4	1
Dylan Lagi	P	4	1
Steffen Lue	P	5	0
Diane Randolph	P	2	0
Scott Strawbridge	P	5	0
Tina Teague	P	5	0
John Wilkes (arrived at 3:50 p.m.)	P	4	1

**Staff**

D'Wayne Spence, NPF-CRA Manager  
 Vanessa Martin, CRA Business Manager  
 Sandra Doughlin, NPF-CRA  
 Diana Alarcon, Director, Transportation and Mobility Department  
 Bob Wojcik, Housing and Economic Development Manager  
 Glendon Hall, Housing and Economic Development Manager  
 Jamie Opperlee, Prototype-Inc.

**I. Call to Order/Roll Call NPF CRA Chair**

Chair Centamore called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m. and roll call was called.

**II. Approval of Minutes NPF CRA Chair**

- October 10, 2017

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

**III. Nomination and Election of Vice Chair NPF CRA Chair**

**Motion** made by Mr. Cohen, seconded by Mr. Strawbridge, to nominate Dylan Lagi. By a show of hands there were four votes.

**Motion** made by Ms. Teague, seconded by Mr. Cohen, to nominate Ms. Glasco Foderingham. By a show of hands, there were five votes and Ms. Glasco Foderingham was voted as Vice Chair.

#### **IV. Project Funding Update**

**Vanessa Martin  
Business Manager**

Ms. Martin provided a brief project funding update and noted there is approximately \$5.9 million available for fiscal year 2018 and about \$5.2 million proposed for 2018. Two project managers are working on getting business and there are proposals that list businesses by category. Ms. Martin explained the dollars and numbers on the spreadsheet.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if there is anything for affordable housing efforts in the CRA in the upcoming 12 months.

Mr. Wojcik stated there was money for purchase assistance and down payment assistance; however, there is not any money for rehab this year.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that the construct the City operates under says, "We shall provide affordable housing in our activities and partner with housing industries or provide a written reason why we are not." He questioned why affordable housing is not being provided.

Mr. Spence advised there are eight years left within the program to finish everything that needs to be done. The City Commission, at the October 3, 2017 meeting, pushed to address the commercial corridor on Sistrunk Boulevard, particularly to the west. In looking at the priorities listed in the plan, those priorities must move forward. With regards to affordable housing, purchase assistance is not being limited. There is a limited budget and the CRA is moving forward with the priorities. Mr. Spence has been directed by the Executive Director to start attending the Broward County Affordable Housing Task Force Board, which is something that will be placed as a higher priority. The concern is understood and there are other ways to push for support of the program.

#### **V. Mosaic Update**

**Ann Marie Sorrel  
Manager**

NOTE: Ms. Barber and Mr. Hooper arrived at approximately 3:15 p.m.

Ms. Sorrel distributed a booklet and provided a brief update. From March through October a new Historic Sistrunk brand was launched including a new Progresso Village website, Progressovillage.org. Over 400 press releases were distributed and released. Seven advertisements were placed in different magazines and one they are most proud of is in the Economic Resource Guide for the Greater Fort Lauderdale Alliance. Utility wraps was a public art project and new signage was created to show available properties and what main CRA events are available. About 12 recommendations are listed on the back of the report. The top three projects need to be finalized and a proposal to continue services through March was submitted to Mr. Spence and Mr. Feldman.

Mr. Strawbridge mentioned the CRA social media WaWa blast and noted that WaWa is not in the CRA.

Ms. Sorrel advised that WaWa is a private business; however, the Commission was present for the ribbon cutting so it was featured as part of activities happening within the area.

Mr. Cohen referenced stickers being placed on Sistrunk open spaces and questioned if it makes sense to put some sort of notification on buildings where CRA dollars are available.

Ms. Sorrel indicated that the opportunity is there if property owners want to have any type of signage saying their property is available. The specs would probably have to be resized based on the building.

Last year three different sizes of plywood signs were created that could be placed on available land. The design is there and staff has access to all the files.

**VI. Funding Request – CHDS LLC/1134 LLC - \$350,000  
1134 Sistrunk Boulevard – Smitty’s Wings on Sistrunk**

**CRA Staff**

Mr. Wojcik advised this is a funding request for development of a family restaurant. The request is for \$350,000 including \$125,000 from the CRA Façade Program and \$225,000 from the CRA Property and Business Improvement Program, which is the maximum funding that can be requested for both programs. The property is owned by Desiree Giles Smith and Chris Smith, who are residents of the CRA. The building is 1,200 square feet and parking is exempt on Sistrunk Boulevard. The City eliminated parking in the front of the property when Sistrunk Boulevard was widened; therefore, the business relies on the public parking lot next door.

Mr. Smith indicated that parking was taken away on the front of the property; however, there will be outside seating on Sistrunk Boulevard. There will also be special events such as music on Sundays.

Mr. Gabriel mentioned that 12 tables are listed in the report and questioned if that included the tables outside. There was also a question as to how parking would work. Shade around the tables was suggested.

Mr. Spence advised that there will be a parking presentation later in the meeting.

Mr. Smith indicated they are working with the designers and two concepts are umbrellas or a type of shading. The problem is that permanent shading becomes an issue at night. Mr. Smith believes in second chances and plans and is committed to hiring neighborhood people who are hard to hire.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham questioned if the parking will be done in terms of parking on 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and if the City would make a commitment to complete at least that parking lot.

Mr. Spence commented that from the CRA perspective, if there is enough pressure, funding will be provided to get this project done.

Ms. Alarcon stated that there will be on-street parking. As far as prioritizing the 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue parking lot, the engineering and design plans are almost finished and are ready for permitting and bidding. The parking lot may not be done by summer; however, she will make a strong commitment that this will be made a priority to get it done as close to the Smith’s opening date as possible.

Mr. Spence advised that the Smiths have been through the DRC process, staff has reviewed the project and has given a greenlight. It was noted that there is a slight risk of opening prior to the additional parking being available but the Smiths are confident with a lot of the amenities around the neighborhood that there will be a lot of foot traffic and individual needs of transit.

**Motion** by Ms. Glasco Foderingham, seconded by Mr. Cohen, to approve the funding request for CHDS LLC/1134 LLC - \$350,000. The **motion** carried on the following roll call vote:

- Ayes: Barber, Cohen, Gabriel, Glasco Foderingham, Hinton, Hooper, Lagi, Lue, Strawbridge, Teague, Randolph, Centamore
- Nays: None

**VII. Funding Request – DALE’S PROPERTIES - \$350,000  
300 West Sunrise Boulevard**

**CRA Staff**

Mr. Cohen disclosed that he does business with Dale, not contract business. He stated that it would prevent him from participating in this item.

Mr. Glendon Hall, CRA Housing and Economic Development Manager, mentioned business leaders in the northwest. Dale Saunders has been here since 1991. Mr. Saunders' business is basically an institution through employment, activities, annual backpack giveaways for the children, annual giveaways for Christmas, and employing some of the people who are difficult to employ. Mr. Saunders' is requesting a \$350,000 assisted package from the CRA to complete additional renovations to a 12,000-square-foot retail center west of the FEC Railway and in proximity of the new WaWa on the corner of Andrews Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard. The proposal is to make a \$1.5 million investment in the CRA not only with the purchase of the building but with redevelopment of the retail property, and to add more retail opportunities and increase and improve tenancy.

Mr. Saunders stated that he has owned warehouses in the industrial area since 1991. It is believed if the property is cleaned up that the vagrants and drug activity would go away.

Mr. Hall showed a current photo of the building and a rendering of the proposal. Phase 2 is to redevelop and renovate the existing Dale's Tires building, which is part of the larger plan for the area. The color scheme will blend with other new development within this corridor. This is an opportunity to change the flavor of the entire corridor, not only for convenience, but service. Mr. Saunders is trying to bring back tenants who previously left the area.

Greg Brewton, with the CRA, commented that Mr. Saunders has made a significant investment in this area by purchasing properties and creating business and job opportunities for a lot of people. Mr. Saunders is intending to partner with the City so what he is doing will be consistent with the City's overall plan for the area. This is the beginning of a three-step process. The area will change in a few years.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham mentioned leases that will expire next year and the following year and questioned if Mr. Saunders plans to change the tenant mix.

Mr. Saunders advised that some of the good businesses left when the economy went bad and he has not re-rented and will not until this project is complete.

Mr. Lagi indicated that he was in support of the project and questioned if there were any type of staff-tenant requirements.

Mr. Cohen stated that Mr. Saunders has a business directly next door to the place he wants to improve and is sure there would be a high-end client and/or a client that fits well in the neighborhood. It was Mr. Cohen's belief that Mr. Saunders would know the people renting from him.

NOTE: Mr. Wilkes arrived at 3:50 p.m.

Mr. Lagi believed that the language in the contract should not be too restrictive.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham commented that there are zoning limitations.

**Motion** by Mr. Lagi, seconded by Mr. Lue, to approve the Funding Request – DALE'S PROPERTIES - \$350,000. The **motion** carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Barber, Cohen, Gabriel, Glasco Foderingham, Hinton, Hooper, Lagi, Lue, Strawbridge, Teague, Wilkes, Randolph, Centamore

Nays: None

### **VIII. Project Update – Sistrunk Off-Street Parking (P-12166)**

**TAM**

Ms. Alarcon advised that bid packages are being put together for the parking lot and funding requests.

A brief update was given on the three parking lots as follows:

- NW 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- 16 parking spaces are being added.
- Lighting, drainage, and landscaping are being brought up to current code.
- \$15,000 was budgeted for engineering and permitting. Stormwater permitting must go through the County.
- The total estimated cost is \$257,000.
- Three months was allotted to get the permit from the County, six months to construct, and one-month for the final inspection.
- The timeline is 12 months and they are hopeful it will be completed within seven to eight months.
  
- NW 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- This project is between Sistrunk Boulevard and NW 6<sup>th</sup> Court
- There will be ingress and egress off NW 6<sup>th</sup> Court.
- There will be a water retention area included as well as a rain garden.
- This will include lighting, landscaping, and drainage requirements.
- The total estimated cost is \$394,500.
- Three months was allotted to get permits from the County, six months for construction, and one month for a final inspection.
- The timeline is 12 months; however, it is believed this can be narrowed down to six to eight months.
  
- NW 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue
- Additional parking is being added.
- There is a retention area paid with community grants.
- The estimated cost is \$329,600.
- The timeline is 12 months; however, it is believed this can be done within a six to eight-month period.

The recommendation is to put all the projects out to bid at one time because there is some savings involved.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham questioned how many spaces there are for NW 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and NW 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Ms. Alarcon stated there are 30 spaces for NW 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 24 spaces for NW 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It was noted that parking is free. The spaces can be metered but that is up to the CRA.

Chair Centamore commented that metering allows all day parking and takes away from the businesses that need the parking.

Ms. Alarcon indicated that parking could be limited to three hours. It was noted that the CRA owns the three lots.

Mr. Spence advised that the lots are not being sold to the City. Once the CRA is concluded, the City will take them over. The CRA will maintain the lots until that time and the estimated annual cost of maintenance was unknown.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if parking were metered if the CRA would retain the revenue from the meters or if the revenue would go into the parking fund.

Ms. Alarcon commented that those questions were recently raised with the City Commission. If the Board would like meters with the money set aside as a trust fund, that could be done. Usually maintenance of the meters costs around \$750 per space annually. It typically includes the costs of lighting, landscaping, striping, etc.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned what the parking deficit would be in the business district.

Ms. Alarcon did not have an answer to that question. Her task was to take the lots and prepare engineering drawings to construct parking lots. There was no data to show this parking was needed.

Mr. Strawbridge believed these efforts were important but also thought it was important to consider that it would take almost \$1 million of cash; take the properties off tax rolls; pay to maintain them; give the properties to the City when the CRA sunsets; and there was no proof they were needed in the first place. He would be more comfortable if he had seen some demonstration. Without that type of backup information, he was not comfortable voting in favor of this.

Mr. Cohen stated if parking is built it would be used. People do not want to open businesses on Sistrunk Boulevard due to lack of safe parking and it is believed this would encourage businesses to open. Funding is coming 100% from the CRA current funds. There are not any other funds available from the City to pay for parking other than the CRA money. Mr. Cohen questioned if these lots were donated to the City if the City would consider, under their budget, to open them as parking lots.

Ms. Alarcon reiterated that the City does not have any funds available to construct the parking lots.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if revenue received from metered parking would go into a parking fund once the CRA is done. There was also a question as to whether the parking lots would be deeded to the City once there is no more CRA.

Ms. Alarcon indicated the money would go into the Enterprise Fund and the City would be responsible for maintenance of those parking lots. Ms. Alarcon did not have an answer as far as whether the parking lots would be deeded to the City.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned how this conforms, complies, and moves forward the redevelopment plan.

Mr. Spence referenced Section 5L that deals with transportation and mobility concerns in the plan.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham commented that the CRA should consider meters initially because it would be better to put them in and if necessary, take them out at some point.

Mr. Spence mentioned the narrow lots on Sistrunk Boulevard and noted that parking cannot fit. The City needs to work with businesses to see what helps their model.

Mr. Gabriel indicated that Smitty's Wings went through the process with the understanding that parking was going to be next door. The need is this is a corridor with no parking and a parking study would stop everything.

Mr. Spence advised that the City created a hardship by removing the back-out parking. More information will be available in the future.

Mr. Strawbridge thought that spending \$1 million on parking without a study was not an effective way to move forward.

Mr. Spence hesitated to respond initially because he did not have the paperwork and documents readily available. Studies have been done but there is nothing to provide at this moment. There are vacant lots within the corridor and people are not investing because of a lack of parking.

Mr. Lagi suggested installing meters but keeping bags over them for now.

Ms. Alarcon believed it would be good to get input from the businesses regarding meters and timing. She was not comfortable recommending meters until these conversations have taken place, at which time she could give her best professional opinion. The cost of a meter installed is about \$12,000. It is not difficult to retrofit. Usually meters are installed when there is a demand that is more than a supply. There is a cost associated with the meters as well as a monthly cost. It might be better to converse with businesses. If there are problems with people using the lots for something other than parking there are plenty of ordinances that would protect that.

Ms. Barber questioned if there was a plan for a traffic and parking analysis on Sistrunk Boulevard.

Mr. Spence advised there was a study prior to when he was the CRA Director.

Ms. Alarcon indicated that the Sistrunk design was to deter people from using the road as a cut-thru. On-street parking was designed to support the businesses and was very intentional. The design has not necessarily deterred the traffic. A lot of interior boulevards are under construction and are pushing traffic over. Mid-block crosswalks to parking spaces to support the businesses on the opposite side are being considered. That was not included because an analysis must be done to show that the crosswalks are warranted.

Mr. Wilkes questioned if businesses with less than the required parking are being given credit for the use of these spaces.

Ms. Alarcon stated that was discussed previously and those businesses were going to be grandfathered in because of the infrastructure project since they were not required to provide the parking.

Mr. Wilkes questioned if the ability of other businesses is being limited.

Ms. Alarcon could not speak to that, it has not been discussed with her. There is a parking requirement and she believes the CRA has a discount they allow in the northwest district. If anyone wants less parking spaces than what code will allow they must go through a parking reduction process.

Mr. Wilkes commented that perhaps businesses could contribute and eventually buy the lots instead of giving them to the City.

Ms. Alarcon was asked to look at the three properties and do engineering drawings that could develop the parking. She would have to defer to CRA staff.

Mr. Hinton mentioned parking issues and noted that Walmart, to the south of Sistrunk, are making businesses obsolete on Sistrunk Boulevard. He believed townhouses should be built instead.

**Motion** by Ms. Glasco Foderingham, seconded by Mr. Cohen, to approve Sistrunk Off-Street Parking (P-12166). The **motion** carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Cohen, Gabriel, Glasco Foderingham, Hooper, Lagi, Teague, Randolph, Centamore  
Nays: Barber, Hinton, Lue, Strawbridge, Wilkes

## **IX. Draft RFP – River Gardens Single Family Residences**

## **CRA Staff**

Mr. Wojcik mentioned the RFP and noted that between 2006 and 2008 there were nice plans but due to the drop in the market the plans languished. The most recent site purchase was Sweeting Estates. The CRA is offering purchasing assistance for buyers with up to 160% income. Even though there is no money in the program right now, there are funds that could be available from the Housing and Human Development Division, which also has purchasing assistance that provides up to \$75,000. The RFP does not restrict income; however, it provides incentives. One issue the CRA is dealing with is that the purchasing office does not like the idea of the CRANWP Board as the Evaluation Committee, which is typically reserved for five people. Mr. Wojcik questioned if the Board thought the entire Board should be part of the Evaluation Committee or if a Sub-committee would be preferred.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham questioned if the intent was to have one developer. She was not sure it was clear, specifically on the Purchase Proposal page.

Mr. Wojcik stated most developers are limited to the number of sites.

Mr. Strawbridge proposed that the Selection Committee should be three City staff members and a person selected by the City Manager or people from the CRA staff. He mentioned the first criteria that says, "25% of the employees for the proposal being in the best interest of the CRA plan and most responsive to the goals of the project area and RFP."

Mr. Wojcik indicated that it gets more specific.

Mr. Spence advised that the draft is being presented to this Board and to Sweeting Estates to get comments. The redevelopment plan says Sweeting Estates targets single-family. There are two paragraphs that outline what the Sweeting Estates redevelopment should look like.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if the Committee would have a common definition.

Mr. Wojcik stated that if it is felt that the definition should be different then they want to hear it. The CRA is spending a significant amount of money for this project; they are not giving away the land and want to find out what people are willing to pay.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham questioned if the RFP requests the developer to specifically address how their project will aid in goals of the CRA since that is being used as part of the criteria.

Mr. Wojcik advised that the developer must include a narrative.

Ms. Barber questioned if the CRA was confident they could get local developers.

Mr. Wojcik indicated that there have been meetings. The timeline is approximately two years.

Mr. Wilkes questioned if there was a market value summary and conclusions from the Property Appraiser.

Mr. Wojcik advised that the July appraisals were \$1.7 million for the large site.

**X. Communication to CRA Board**

**NPF CRA Board**

None.

**XI. Public Comment**

Lucy Harding, President of Sweeting Estates, commented that the project did not leave a feeling of inspiration or imagination and it did not appear that the Board tried very hard. This project was evaluated on how much was paid, which does not work. The developer has a big challenge; they are building a quality house into a questionable neighborhood. The City overpaid for the land and that should not be used against the developer; the developer should not have to pay. The first criteria is how well the project meets the CRA plan. Criteria #3 is meeting fiscal criteria. They must have the ability and financials to do the project as well as the experience. The most important thing is the features. The amenities list needs to be expanded. Residents want this to be an inspiration for the CRA and they want Sweeting Estates to have a representative on the Selection Committee.

Bernadette Norris-Weeks, resident and business owner in the CRA, would like the document to appear on Manstar and more opportunities for minority contractors to participate. The CRA Director said the document would be changed to support the market rate, not affordable housing. The objective part of the document makes it sound like this is a low level, low income work force type housing, which might lead to a lack of income diversity. Anything in the CRA area is affordable and residents want it to be something special and different. Ms. Norris-Weeks would like the Sweeting Estates Homeowners' Association President to be on the Selection Committee. She referenced language in 3.6-20 of the agreement that says, "The design should contain historical precedence", and questioned what that means. For the homeowners to have a \$45,000 loan forgiven, they should be required to live in the home for no less than five years. There are some homes in the neighborhood that already have some criteria that requires those people to live within the homes. She mentioned an old and inappropriate contract and expressed concern about the quality of the home. Residents would like the home to be at least 1,600 square feet under air.

Sharon Woods mentioned the number of developers and noted that one would be continuity. There are only 12 lots and three homes directly across the street. She questioned the impact on the existing homes. The developer must have a commitment to the area. It was noted that outsiders take risks. She mentioned the cost of the homes and stated that the homes should have at least two and a half baths.

Lauren McGee, on behalf of commercial properties in the warehouse districts, Flagler Village, and Progresso Point, questioned who the contact is regarding street beautification and lighting. She would like to schedule a meeting with the contact person.

Mr. Wilkes stated that conflicting input was received from the public; however, there were big messages. The best value will be if an end user can be found who wants something bigger and better. A standard design is needed. It was noted that builders who compete do a better job.

Mr. Spence questioned how to marry reality and vision. In a free market world, the lots are put out for sale and developers build a product they think will be sold in the community but that might not be what the community wants. Developers are being asked to take a chance that people will come if the home is built. The City is working within those parameters in terms of getting the best product. A written comment from the Homeowners' Association has already been received and a lot of the comments are related to amenities, which can be addressed. Mr. Spence mentioned the procurement issue in 2004 and the Selection Committee. The entire CRANWP Board would like to sit as the Selection Committee and Procurement has an issue with that because that is too many people. Guidance was requested from the Chair.

Mr. Wilkes suggested a Sub-committee.

Frank Schnidman, retired FAU Professor, questioned if it is anticipated that the developer will build spec houses or seek buyers first.

Mr. Spence advised that the developers would be looking for buyers before building. The proposal is what the Selection Committee is going to approve for these homes and the building is going to find buyers.

Mr. Schnidman stated that perhaps there should be a process to market to people who previously lived here and want to come back.

Mr. Wilkes commented that there would be a better product if there was an end user in mind.

Ms. Norris-Weeks advised that residents are interested in a diverse income community that can continue along the lines of what they have helped create. The community is small with only four blocks.

Ms. Teague believed the community should be involved in making the developer decision. There needs to be marketing to make the community more appealing. The residents have put in a lot of time and effort; give them quality.

Mr. Spence stated that the comments will be reviewed.

Chair Centamore recommended that a small Sub-committee be formed at the next meeting and that the neighborhood be involved.

Ms. Barber questioned if the Sub-committee would create the criteria or if it would evaluate people against criteria.

Chair Centamore thought the Sub-committee should develop the criteria.

Mr. Spence agreed to bring this back with the input received.

## **XII. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:21 p.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.

[Minutes prepared by C. Guifarro, Prototype-Inc.]