



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

APPROVED MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CENTRAL CITY REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2025 – 6:00 PM
101 NE 3 AVENUE, 11TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301

Cumulative Attendance
September 2024-August 2025

Board Members	Present/Absent	Present	Absent
Kimber White, Chair	P	6	0
Antoinette Wright, Vice Chair	A	4	2
Edward Catalano	P	6	0
Linda Fleischman	P	6	0
Justin Greenbaum	P	5	1
Troy Liggett	P	6	0
Thomas Mabey	P	6	0
Thomas Manos	P	1	0
Jason Ross	P	4	1
Nikola Stan	P	6	0
Bobby Tinoco	P	6	0

Ms. Fleischman arrived at 6:12 p.m.
Mr. Jason Ross arrived at 6:44 p.m.

Staff:

- Laura Reece, Acting Asst City Manager
- Glenn Marcos, Chief Procurement Officer/Assistant Finance Director
- Karlanne Devonish, Principal Urban Planner , Development Services Department (DSD)
- Clarence Woods, CRA Manager
- Vanessa Martin, CRA Business Manager
- Benjamin Restrepo, City Engineer, DSD
- Cija Omengebar, CRA Planner/Liaison
- Tania Bailey-Watson, CRA Senior Administrative Assistant

Others:

- Jason Crush, Crush Law
- Bubba Kassal
- Randall Klett
- Christina Robinson
- John VanVlack
- K. Cruitt, Recording Secretary, Prototype Inc.

Communication to the City Commission:

None.

I. Pledge of Allegiance

Board members recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Call to Order & Determination of Quorum

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m. Roll was called, and it was noted that a quorum was present.

Chair White welcomed Mr. Thomas Manos, the newest member of the Board.

Motion by Mr. Catalano, seconded by Mr. Tinoco, to allow Vice Chair Wright to participate in the meeting virtually. The motion passed unanimously in a voice vote.

III. Chair Opening Remarks

Chair White proposed adjusting the agenda to move presentations by Mr. Glenn Marcos and Ms. Vanessa Martin to the beginning of the meeting; those items were planned under the "Old Business Update" of the agenda in response to previous requests for clarification on procurement and rollover funds.

Motion by Mr. Catalano, seconded by Mr. Tinoco, to adjust the agenda. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

IV. Old Business Update

1) Procurement

It was explained that Mr. Liggett questioned the procurement process in relation to the Corradino Group. Mr. Liggett expressed his dissatisfaction with their perceived lack of communication with the community and opined that they would be a poor choice for the development of the land use; he stated that neighborhood concerns were not incorporated, and he did not care about the procurement process.

Mr. Glenn Marcos, Chief Procurement Officer, provided a detailed overview of the procurement process. He highlighted the development process for Requests for Qualifications (RFQs); the handling of proposals by the Evaluation Committee (EC); use of weighted criteria in evaluations; shortlisting and scoring processes; and the role of public meetings. Mr. Marcos explained the definitions of "responsive" and "responsible" firms in the solicitation process, and that the EC would only submit qualifying firms for consideration by the City Commission. He stressed that any contact with firms going through the competitive process is strictly discouraged, and not within the purview of this Board. Mr. Marcos stated that discussion should take place on the dais before the Commission; he clarified that the public hearings are not public meetings, so public participation is not permitted.

Mr. Liggett asked how residents could voice their concerns about past performance to the Evaluation Committee. Mr. Marcos explained the need for transparency; and that some parts of the meeting are closed in compliance with State requirements to ensure fair competition and integrity of the process. He reiterated that resident input would be appropriate at the City Commission meeting. Laura Reece, Acting Assistant City Manager, acknowledged the concerns regarding public engagement. She clarified that Staff reviewed the contract and found that the Corradino Group complied with requirements; they were not found to be in default of a prior

contract. Ms. Reece highlighted the opportunity to draft a contract that defines the desired participation.

Mr. Liggett cited an incident where the Corradino Group was invited to an Association meeting but was unprepared and never returned prior to the proposal being released. Chair White agreed that communication should come from this Board to highlight the need for better community participation. Mr. Marcos appreciated the insight on expectations, and said they should be incorporated in the scope of work solicitation. Ms. Omengebar clarified that the Corradino Group was hired to take the proposal created by the last consultant through the approval process; they were not expected to redo the project. She added that the scope did not include an expectation for community outreach and presentations to be done. Ms. Omengebar also stated that the same presentation made at the CCRAB was shared with each neighborhood.

Mr. Manos recommended that the Board communicate the desired criteria they wished to see included in the new RFP. Mr. Catalano noted past presentations were consistently scheduled at the last minute, and that should be avoided. Mr. Woods advised that the solicitation had gone out the week prior, and the concerns expressed by Mr. Liggett were addressed; the posting would run until March. It was clarified that public meeting requirements for this solicitation were above the minimum mandated by the City. Mr. Marcos stated that he would share the link to the solicitation through Ms. Omengebar, and reiterated that the appropriate place for the public to testify would be in front of the Commission.

2) Rollover Funds

Vanessa Martin, CRA Business Manager stated that approximately \$1.9 million remained from fiscal year 2024. She and Mr. Woods proposed adding \$700,000 towards Incentives, \$1.1 million to CIP, and \$100,000 to Operations. Board input was requested so that she could do the budget amendment. Mr. Woods explained two current requests for funds would deplete the allocation and reduce their ability to support a third project. Discussion ensued regarding the remaining balance in the incentive budget for fiscal year 2025, accounting for Call of Africa which is scheduled for February 18, 2025.

Mr. Liggett inquired about the \$100,000 allocation for Operations. Ms. Omengebar reminded Members that they are waiting for the rollover to fund trees for the median; she provided examples of other operational expenses, which included County application fees, and advertising. Ms. Martin added that salaries and other administrative costs had to be funded.

Ms. Martin clarified that \$200,000 was allocated for a sculpture, which was a previously allocated CIP item. Discussion ensued on the total available funds including rollovers and CIP funds; it was estimated to be around \$4.5 million. Chair White requested a comprehensive overview of all available funds from previous years to be able to see the big picture.

Motion by Mr. Liggett, seconded by Mr. Catalano, to ask for a big picture analysis of the finances and consider the appropriation for the rollover funds at the March meeting. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

V. Rezoning Project Phase II:

1) January 13, 2025 Motion Recap

Karlanne Devonish, Principal Urban Planner, reviewed the motions approved on January 13, 2025 to ensure that Staff captured all of the recommendations made by the Board prior to moving forward. A copy of her presentation and those motions are part of the public record. Benjamin Restrepo, Engineer, DSD was also present. Ms. Devonish provided a recap of the motions that had been approved; highlights included:

- Adjustment of CC-CMU zoning district boundaries as documented in the revised map on Page 3 of her presentation. Ms. Devonish was given verbal confirmation that the map reflected exactly what was voted on. She then pointed out that some properties will have split zoning which could be challenging for the affected properties.
- An increase in the CC-NMU zoning district height from 55 feet to 80 feet; it was noted that height would be limited and restricted to 80 feet.
- The proposed dimensional requirements table was presented. Ms. Devonish highlighted that the building streetwall length for the CC-CMU district was amended to 150 feet to be consistent with the other zoning districts as had been discussed; she received a verbal acknowledgement of that change.

2) Rezoning Parking Options

Ms. Devonish reviewed existing parking regulations in the Unified Land Development Regulation (ULDR) prior to presenting modifications being proposed by Staff: reducing the parking requirement by 2,500 square feet for any property; parking to 60% of the standard requirement for legal non-conforming uses; and residential parking at 1.50 spaces per dwelling unit. Proposed parking mitigation options were also presented as detailed on Page 9 of 14 in her PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Greenbaum requested an example of a non-conforming use. Ms. Devonish referenced the reduction to 60% for commercial uses; Mr. Restrepo clarified that all the exemptions referenced by Ms. Devonish were for non-residential uses; an exemption would apply for the first 2,500 square feet of a proposed use or an existing building. It was clarified by Ms. Devonish that “legal non-conforming” referred to structures not meeting the dimensional requirements of the new zoning district, as opposed to the uses. During the discussion that followed, Mr. Restrepo clarified that parking would be reduced to 60% of the standard requirement for existing buildings; this is a 40% reduction after the first 2,500 square feet.

Mr. Greenbaum asked if properties that are now considered legal non-conforming uses were likely to become permitted uses once the rezoning and amendments are done. Ms. Devonish said that it depends on the proposed uses for the zoning districts.

Members raised concerns with the impact on traffic and availability of parking. Ms. Devonish indicated that the proposed changes should be viewed, not with existing conditions, but with the future mixed use developments and increased local density. Mr. Restrepo clarified that those reductions were applied in the Southern half of Flagler Village. Chair White affirmed that he never had an issue finding a parking space in that area which is busy. Mr. Restrepo clarified that the northern half of Flagler Village has a lower residential parking requirement and that the 2,500 square foot exemption was based on the average size needed for the use to be successful.

Mr. Restrepo also clarified that the one space per unit applicable to an affordable housing project would primarily be vertically integrated into the allowed heights. He explained that currently, a proposed one bedroom dwelling unit is allowed 1.75 parking spaces; a two bedroom unit is 2. spaces; and a three bedroom is 2.2 parking spaces. They proposed reducing that to 1.50 parking spaces per dwelling unit, regardless of whether it will be a one, two or three bedroom unit. Mr. Manos highlighted that the 2,500 square foot reduction for non-residential uses encourages retail and commercial, and is “pro-development”; he cautioned that if they make development harder, it will be limited.

Ms. Devonish noted that with reduced heights, the same parking standards cannot be required because it is necessary to have the space; a compromise is needed when seeking development density, and parking.

Mr. Liggett proposed the idea of linking parking incentives to the payment of parking impact fees. Ms. Devonish and Mr. Restrepo explained the limitations on the use of parking impact fees; they must be used for parking-related improvements. Mr. Restrepo then explained that traffic studies would be done, and payment in lieu of funds would be used in the general area so mitigation was likely to extend beyond the boundaries of the CRA. Alternative forms of transportation that would likely come with development were also discussed by Members and Staff.

Mr. Mabey requested more information on properties that would fall under two zoning districts. Ms. Devonish acknowledged the problem exists currently, and they had hoped to eliminate that issue. Those owners could apply for rezoning once an alternative use was chosen.

Mr. Manos proposed moving the “red line” all the way to NE 13th Street as there was no residential surrounding any of those properties. Mr. Restrepo stated that it would not be desirable to have a wall on NE 13 Street much higher on the South side than on the North side. Chair White reminded the Board they agreed to stagger height back, and up, to be more aesthetically pleasing and as a compromise.

Discussion on mitigating the split zoning resumed with both Mr. Mabey and Mr. Stan expressing concern for affected properties. Ms. Devonish clarified that zones are not typically defined by parcel, but by street; owners could split or join properties over time. With regards to height concerns, she added that from a pedestrian level, it would be mitigated with 55-foot podiums and step backs.

Mr. Jason Crush highlighted the difference between taxing lines and platted property lines and suggested that Staff review the plat lines; Ms. Devonish agreed to would look into that. Mr. Crush added that from a developer standpoint, he felt that the plan gave the desired consistency along NE 13 Street, and density in what is now B-3, provided they contemplate step backs for abutting properties in the same district. He suggested the plan could be tweaked if they look at land uses; Ms. Devonish stated she would have to double check.

Mr. Crush offered that the 2,500 square foot parking exemption is used throughout the City, and when doing a mixed use project, it is beneficial for commercial uses; he found that in his experience, the 60% suggested was a good idea for non-conforming uses.

Ms. Olga Zamora observed that a lot of the discussion was focused on the Eastern section of the CRA, and inquired about parking requirements for the area west of Andrews Avenue. Ms. Devonish advised it would be the same; she confirmed that from a design standpoint, parking garages would be veiled and more trees as well as lighting are planned for the area West of Andrews Avenue. Chair White reminded everyone that these recommendations are subject to Planning and Zoning review, public comments, and Commission approval; they could be tweaked.

Motion by Mr. Manos, seconded by Mr. Greenbaum, to adopt the City Staff recommendations for parking regulations. In a roll vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Liggett requested that transition zones be discussed further at the next meeting; Ms. Devonish stated that they were already “baked in” as indicated on the dimensional table.

Discussion ensued on design guidelines for factors such as light pollution; it was agreed that Ms. Devonish would share design criteria with the Board once the rezoning was moved forward.

Mr. Liggett recalled discussion in March where Staff was to have the ordinance ready by June and expressed a desire to see the ordinance before it was finalized. Mr. Woods reiterated that Ms. Devonish would provide the design document and there was nothing further that they could provide. Chair White requested that the Board immediately move forward by confirming the decisions made on both zoning and parking, and that design be addressed in the coming months.

Motion by Mr. Greenbaum, seconded by Mr. Ross, to move forward the zoning plan which was approved last month, and the parking as approved tonight, to the CRA board. In a roll vote, the motion passed 8/2.

In the discussion that ensued, Mr. Liggett expressed concern that the public did not have an opportunity to speak about the decisions being made; Mr. Greenbaum observed that the

majority that attended the last meeting did appear to not understand there is already an area that can go to 150 feet in height.

Chair White stated that this Board had to make decisions for the future of the entire community, and members should not be discussing opinions with the public. He felt this Board had been “undermined to make decisions”; Members should not move the decisions forward if they are not in favor. He added that while there are 13,350 residents in the CCRA; less than 1% showed up at the last meeting and they appeared to be mis-informed; his research revealed that many were not owners. Chair White stated that he heard opinions from both sides; compromises had been made, and they cannot afford to “miss the boat” a fourth time.

VI. Communication to City Commission

None.

VII. Old Business Update

Ms. Omengebar referred the Board to Page 6 of the back-up; she highlighted that Items 11 and 12, the Land Use Plan Amendment and Capital Improvement Master Plan, were published the week prior and will close in March.

Mr. Liggett inquired about the status of Item 6, the street lights on NE 4 Avenue. Ms. Omengebar advised that after funding was approved, the project manager was required to follow the procurement process because the scope of the project exceeded \$80,000; the bid closed on January 21, 2025 and they are negotiating with contractors. Ms. Reece clarified that the length of time the process could take would depend on litigation of the contract.

Mr. Liggett asked when Item 9 would be completed; he understood there was no need for a design phase. Ms. Omengebar provided background information on that section of the sidewalk on NE 4 Avenue between NE 11 Street & NE 12 Street, and explained why she is waiting for a response from Public Works. Ms. Reece stated that Staff would provide an update at the next meeting; she would review funding with Ms. Omengebar, and she believed the rollover was delayed.

Ms. Omengebar stated she would follow up on the removal of the structure on NE 13 Street. Mr. Stan requested that she inquire whether the process of securing proposals and other due

diligence tasks could begin prior to removal; Chair White agreed that would avoid having an empty space for an extended period.

VIII. New Business Suggestions

Following group input on future topics, Ms. Omengebar recapped the following subjects for the next meeting:

- Budget prioritization.
- Expanding the landscape and façade program.
- Marketing of CRA funding availability.
- Code of Conduct.

IX. Approval of Minutes – January 13, 2025 Regular Rescheduled Meeting

Motion by Mr. Tinoco, seconded by Mr. Catalano, to approve the January 13, 2025 Regular Rescheduled Meeting minutes as presented. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Liggett requested that the three amendments that he passed out, and were unanimously passed in the September meeting, be uploaded along with those minutes. Ms. Omengebar noted his request and was to follow up.

Motion by Mr. Liggett, seconded by Mr. Catalano, to post all meeting videos online from March 2024 and forward in the future. In a voice vote, the motion passed with nine in favor; Mr. Manos abstained.

X. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.