

APPROVED
MEETING MINUTES
NORTHWEST-PROGRESSO-FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL
December 12, 2017 – 3 :00 P.M.

Cumulative Attendance

May 2017-April 2018

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Ron Centamore, Chair	P	5	1
Leann Barber (arrived at 3:15 p.m.)	P	6	0
Brad Cohen	A	3	3
Alan Gabriel	A	5	1
Rhoda Glasco Foderingham, Vice Chair	A	5	1
John Hart	P	5	1
Mickey Hinton	A	3	3
John Hooper	A	4	2
Dylan Lagi	P	5	1
Steffen Lue (arrived at 3:11 p.m.)	P	6	0
Diane Randolph	P	3	0
Scott Strawbridge	P	6	0
Tina Teague	P	6	0
John Wilkes	A	4	2

Staff

D'Wayne Spence, NPF-CRA Manager
 Vanessa Martin, CRA Business Manager
 Sandra Doughlin, NPF-CRA
 Bob Wojcik, Housing and Economic Development Manager
 Glendon Hall, Housing and Economic Development Manager
 Lian Chan, Prototype-Inc.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call NPF CRA Chair

Chair Centamore called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. and roll call was called.

II. Approval of Minutes NPF CRA Chair

- November 14, 2017

Mr. Lagi referenced Page 3 and noted that \$350,00 should be \$350,000.

Mr. Hall mentioned Page 3 and stated that the funding request is \$350,000 not \$365,000.

Motion made by Mr. Lagi, seconded by Mr. Hart, to approve with corrections. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**III. Project Funding Update Vanessa Martin,
Business Manager**

Ms. Martin provided a brief project funding update and noted that nothing has changed. Approval was received for the Sistrunk Market project at the last Commission meeting; \$400,000 this fiscal year and moving forward the other portions will be disbursed. There is still \$698,000 available.

IV. Update Draft RFP – River Gardens Single Family Residences

CRA Staff

Mr. Wojcik tried to incorporate comments from Board members and members of the Civic Association.

Mr. Spence indicated that as Mr. Wojcik mentioned, the redlined changes will reflect changes to the document to incorporate changes. The first change was the 2.25 award of contract. The pages are not numbered; however, that is the paragraph number. This explains the awarding of the contract and the CRA's intent to enter into the development agreement with the top rate developer and carry on negotiations regarding the benchmarks and it tells the process of the negotiation. The language is standard. Section 3.1 was referenced. Mr. Spence clarified that the residences are owner occupied so the language will be corrected. Section 5.1 of the development plan was one of the concerns of neighbors with regard to specifying areas. The language in Section 3.2 was basically the same type of changes. There were some editorial changes regarding the legal description. Section 3.5 was mentioned and feedback was requested on this area. Currently, this agreement requires the developer to submit for building permits within 90 days of execution of the development agreement with the CRA and to close project financing within 180 days with commencement of construction within 60 days thereafter. The initial goal was to have a quick turnaround on these lots; there are about 12 lots and only 11 are buildable. There has been some feedback from community small builders suggesting that they would like to have an easier "bite at this apple" and that the carrying costs of these homes and turnaround would not be advantageous to them. Mr. Spence requested whether the time period should be removed and let it be a part of the proposal or if it should be left as is.

Mr. Lue questioned if it would hurt if it were extended.

Mr. Spence advised it is a question of how long the CRA wants to carry these lots. There is an eight-year limitation; seven years ten months. The chief concern was that the lot would remain vacant for an extended period of time; however, the desire to be more open to local builders is understood.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if having a fixed schedule and a process for extensions would help. Mr. Strawbridge would like to see some fixed deadlines and if the builders need an extension they could come back to the CRA Board to make a public record as to why an extension is needed. Extensions would have to be granted by the CRA Board. If there is a clear path, that question should be asked six to eight weeks ahead of time and then get on the agenda.

Mr. Spence asked if Mr. Strawbridge would be opposed to the development community having this as one of those items that the Evaluation Committee evaluates to determine whether to go with that developer and how long of an extension is needed.

Ms. Barber questioned the reason for choosing one developer and if there has been any response from local developers as to whether they think this is making it suitable for a larger builder.

Mr. Spence stated it was the idea of getting it done quickly. One developer, Anything Bob, believes that would be the case.

Mr. Wojcik stated there was a series of meetings and this project has always been marketed as a single development project. The intent is to get a uniform product. A lot of nice proposals were received. Having one developer with a lot of models from a consistent product makes a big difference and it is believed that is what the CRA is looking for.

Ms. Teague questioned if that is the normal timeframe it takes a builder to get the project done, small, medium, or large.

Mr. Wojcik believed there would be many proposals and the developers will give a timeframe. In the end, the agreement would be a negotiation. The timeframe is consistent with what the CRA had last time and with what has been seen in the past.

Mr. Spence stated that the only variable heard from the development community is whether there is a purchaser for the home site. The timeframes can be met easily but the question is whether they can sell the home, which is the chief concern. Some developers prefer to have the home sold prior to constructing. Meeting the timetable is not an issue, the concern is whether there will be someone to occupy the residence or if there will be a vacant home on the parcel.

Mr. Hart questioned if there will be a pre-qualification process available.

Mr. Spence replied there will be.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned what would happen if the successful bidder failed to deliver timely.

Mr. Wojcik advised that the developer would be operating under the parameters of the bank in terms of construction. Perhaps that can be put into the agreement. It is not uncommon for things to take longer than anticipated.

Ms. Teague suggested giving a range, 180 days, and if the developer could not work within the parameters then an explanation would be required.

Mr. Lue did not believe the timeframe would be changed for one company.

Mr. Strawbridge mentioned Mr. Spence's first suggestion to take the specified timelines out and ask the developers to come up with their own proposed timeline. There is value in getting done quicker. These parameters are kind of boiler plate and it was suggested that the boiler plate be removed and ask the developer what their best offer is time and cost.

Ms. Barber questioned if that is done it would have to be part of the evaluation criteria.

Mr. Spence agreed.

Mr. Strawbridge thought it would be a good thing to have the developers compete on their time schedule.

Mr. Spence mentioned the next area, 3.6, which is the area where neighbors said this Board was unimaginative in providing criteria. Many proposals were reviewed and everyone's criteria was in line with what is being presented except for some going into details with the bedrooms and restrooms. One change inserted is the suggestion of two and a half restrooms. Mr. Spence believed the Board should go with the minimum and let those who know the market decide. Mr. Spence would like to see more flexibility and what the market can entertain. The concern is creating a project that will not sell in the market.

Mr. Lagi questioned if any other cases covered the details of restrooms.

Mr. Spence advised that Miami Dade went into depth as to the dimensions of the restrooms. Perhaps the size of the sink should be discussed as to whether it is a single or double.

Mr. Lagi mentioned the better than minimum required landscaping and questioned minimum required in what.

Mr. Spence clarified better than the City minimum imposed requirement.

V. Old/New Business

(a) July 10th Meeting Date Change

Mr. Spence mentioned a conflict with the City Commission meeting date; therefore, action is needed from this Board to change the July 10th date. Mr. Spence recommended July 17th.

Motion made by Mr. Hart, seconded by Mr. Lue, to change the July meeting date from the 10th to the 17th. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Hall advised that a few projects are coming. Hoover Awning was moving some of their operations to a location in Palm Beach and after discussion, a decision was made to stay and expand. Details are being worked on. There is a possibility of creating 15 technical jobs. Staff is trying to convince businesses to stay and reinvest. A couple of projects in the \$50,000 range such as churches in the area and a family owned business that does car refurbishment are next.

Mr. Lagi questioned if the area could be enhanced in a different way if people are trying to buy.

Mr. Hall provided a few examples of rundown properties that are purchased and cleaned up. Hoover Awning is something to retain as there are high tech jobs and they have been around for a long time and are sustainable.

VI. ~~Communication to CRA Board~~ None NPF CRA Board

VII. Public Comment – None.

XII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 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.]