

DRAFT
MEETING MINUTES
NORTHWEST-PROGRESSO-FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL
March 13, 2018 – 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	7	1
Leann Barber	P	8	0
Alan Gabriel	P	7	1
Rhoda Glasco Foderingham, Vice Chair	P	7	1
John Hart	A	6	2
Mickey Hinton	A	3	5
John Hooper	P	5	3
Dylan Lagi	P	7	1
Steffen Lue	P	8	0
Christopher Murphy	P	1	0
Diane Randolph	P	5	0
Scott Strawbridge (Arrived at 3:09 p.m.)	P	8	0
Tina Teague	P	8	0
John Wilkes	P	6	2

Staff

D'Wayne Spence, CRA Manager
Vanessa Martin, CRA Business Manager
Thomasina Turner, CRA Project Coordinator
Sandra Doughlin, CRA Administrative Specialist
Bob Wojcik, CRA Housing and Economic Development Manager
Glendon Hall, CRA Housing and Economic Development Manager
Eleni Ward Jankovic, CRA Project Coordinator
Jaimie Oppерlee, Prototype-Inc.

Chair Centamore introduced Christopher Murphy, new Board member.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

NPF CRA Chair

Chair Centamore called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. and roll call was called.

II. Approval of Minutes

NPF CRA Chair

- February 13, 2018

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Wilkes, to approve the February 13, 2018 minutes. 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 there were no major changes. In April, \$1,050,000 will be transferred from the Mizell Capital Project into the Incentive Account so that would increase the remaining projected incentives to \$1.7 million.

Mr. Wilkes mentioned a concern in the previous minutes about funding religious organizations. In looking at the budget, it appears that about 70% is allocated to the YMCA, which is a Christian group, the New Hope Church, and the 15th Avenue Church of God. Mr. Wilkes questioned whether they meet the criteria of not being related to religious organizations.

Mr. Spence advised that the CRA has been operating under the understood governmental policies for giving to religious institutions. Changes are being brought forward and the Board is being requested to approve a formal adoption of the policy. Rather than staff reviewing and guessing at case law, Mr. Spence wanted to memorialize it in the document so it says, "This is the policy dealing with non-profit institutions."

Mr. Wilkes questioned if the policy is that the Board will deal with them as long as the criteria is met.

Mr. Spence indicated there is no prohibition. Ms. Martin mentioned the transfer of funds from Mizell Capital Improvement Project into the incentives account. The State Statute requires them to return the TIFF not assigned to a specific redevelopment project at the end of the year back to the Taxing Authorities. The significance of putting the money back into an incentive program means that they need to be aggressive in spending the dollars. The Board needs to keep this in mind as future projects are evaluated and be aware if the money is not used it will be lost.

Mr. Wilkes commented that under residential incentives there are no allocations and questioned if we are talking about allocating some funds. As he understood, the Board was going to focus on that last year; however, no dollars were allocated to that category.

Mr. Spence replied absolutely.

Note: Mr. Strawbridge arrived at 3:09 p.m.

IV. Action Items

**D'Wayne Spence,
NPF CRA Manager**

Disposition of Property

Mr. Wojcik stated that on May 9, 2017, Peter Flotz, of Lansing Melbourne Group, made a presentation to this Advisory Board expressing interest in purchasing a property at 835 NW 3rd Street in the CRA for the purpose of relocating an Anointed Body of Christ Church from 502 NW 7th Terrace. Anointed Body Christ Church is located in between the block on NW 5th Street, Sistrunk Boulevard, NW 7th Terrace, and NW 7th Avenue, which is being assembled by a developer for a large mixed-use project. At that meeting, the Advisory Board unanimously passed the motion approving the sale of the property to the developer. For this to occur, the Community Redevelopment Act requires that the CRA first publish a Notice of Intent to dispose of the property 30 days in advance of the proposal due date. That was done on January 3, 2018 and when the Notice of Intent was published in the Sun Sentinel it stated that proposals were due February 5, 2018. A proposal was received by Lansing Melbourne Group and no other proposals were received. They are offering the appraised value of the property, which is \$85,000 plus closing costs. The proposal stated that their ability to move forward

with the mixed-use project rests on the acquisition of this church and its successful location. Staff has reviewed the proposal and finds that it meets the requirements.

Mr. Wilkes mentioned the contract to purchase the existing property of the church with a purchase price of \$150,000. He questioned if that was an estimate or if the actual numbers were based upon special terms.

Mr. Flotz advised that is the actual price and they have also committed to take the new parcel through DRC. The church is small and does not have a lot of extra funds to go through the process. It is their hope that they will have a continuing positive reaction from the City and once they have a purchase contract formalized they will take it through DRC on behalf of the church and will start building a new church.

Mr. Wilkes questioned if the church is buying the property or if Lansing Melbourne Group is buying the property for the church.

Mr. Flotz stated that the Lansing Melbourne Group is buying the property.

Mr. Wilkes questioned if that was part of the obligation on top of the \$150,000 or part of the \$150,000.

Mr. Flotz replied that it was in addition to the \$150,000.

Mr. Wilkes questioned if the Lansing Melbourne Group was also paying the mortgage off or if that was a credit.

Felipe Yolale, partner with Mr. Flotz, advised that Lansing Melbourne Group is paying the mortgage and buying the land.

Mr. Wilkes commented that they are paying a lot more than \$150,000 for that lot. He questioned if arrangements were already made to buy the City and CRA lots located at 536 NW 7th Terrace and 714 Sistrunk Boulevard.

Mr. Flotz stated there have been discussions with CRA staff but no arrangements have been made. They have represented that those parcels are necessary for the development proposal they have come up with. Since the time the graphics were done, the parcel they have in the City is now in the CRA's hands as part of a transfer the City made internally, which makes the process slightly easier. In the center of the project is parking and that is where the parcel is that the City owned and the CRA now owns. Until they finalize how the City might participate in the parking, they may or may not need that parcel. They may deed their parcels over to the City or the CRA. It is a centralized parking pool that they see some public benefit to as a public use. This has not been addressed specifically by contract but the intent is that the land is going to change hands one way or another, they just don't know which way.

Mr. Wilkes questioned if plans are designed for the use of the parcels to the north and south of the parking structure.

Mr. Flotz indicated that there are two parcels they have not been able to obtain and at this point they have designed the project around them. Numerous attempts have been made to purchase the parcels; however, the owners are not interested.

Mr. Wilkes questioned if anyone was present on behalf of the church. If there were any restrictions on the deed that goes to the church that is something that could not be commented on because it would be going on their deed.

Mr. Flotz replied no one from the church was present and correct.

Mr. Murphy commented in response to the request for additional information, which mentioned first class market rate rental housing at a fair price and questioned the price point for the units that are going to be placed here.

Mr. Flotz advised that they do not know the "chunk" price, the absolute price; however, they do know the relative price. They are trying to beat the price by 25% below the "chunk" price. They have to be very competitive and do not know if that would be bigger square footage for the same money or less money for less square footage, but that is the target that has been set.

Mr. Murphy questioned the current "chunk" price.

Mr. Flotz indicated that the "chunk" price in Flagler Village, heading north, is \$2 per square-foot. They would like to advertise a unit under \$1,000.

Motion made by Ms. Glasco Foderingham, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, to accept the recommendation from staff to recommend that the CRA Board accept the proposal for the property at 835 NW 3rd Street, Fort Lauderdale, 220145 LLC Lansing Melbourne Group. **Motion** carried on the following roll call vote: 11-1.

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

Ms. Barber questioned if this development is across from the Save-A-Lot.

Mr. Flotz replied that this parcel is not right across from the Save-A-Lot but the development is close to the Save-A-Lot area.

Ms. Barber mentioned that the plaza has been vacant for five or six years and questioned the strategy for occupying those retail spaces.

Mr. Flotz indicated that is the biggest challenge in the project; it is ground floor and retail. It is believed that the areas labeled as amenities will get bigger so residents would be using amenity spaces on the ground floor. The purpose is to try to make the street level alive. Currently, the project shows about 30,000 feet of retail. The economics of the project must work on residential alone. It is believed that retail owners may be a little ambitious in the rent they want; however, there is a lot of demand in the City for commercial space. If the rent was different they would be full. If they can get a pricing structure put together so whatever rate they get is a gift as opposed to a need then they could rent that space. They will have to be creative; it is an untested market. Mr. Flotz did not believe that the person across the street has proved that the market works over there but they have no fear.

Mr. Wilkes mentioned that there are inquiries on a regular basis for rentals in that location. There is a demand but the right match has not been found for those vacancies. He questioned if the lots have houses on them.

Mr. Flotz advised that one is a house and one is vacant.

Mr. Wilkes commented that there is a lot of amenity space and questioned if the demand becomes a need if some can be changed back to retail.

Mr. Flotz replied yes. Amenities are built just like retail; there is a glass door and a loading area behind it. Currently, 100% of the frontage along Sistrunk Boulevard is leasing and they have taken the back street that faces the neighborhood and tried to make that an amenity so they are kinder in terms of noise.

Mr. Wilkes mentioned that the entity is the grantee of the proposed deed and questioned if it is an intermediary entity that would then be transferred to the church or if the church is an entity itself.

Mr. Flotz did not recall. He believed their intent was to create the purchasing document, show up for closing with the check, and transfer at closing. The Lansing Melbourne Group is not interested in taking title or paying double closing costs. They will seek to make the contract assignable to the church during negotiations and then provide the funds.

Mr. Wilkes expressed concern that the parcel being acquired is of less value than the parcel located in the spot and if that needs to be dealt with as a separate issue. Perhaps a covenant should be imposed that if the property is not built upon within two or three years that the CRA would have the option of buying the corner lot back for the \$85,000 plus closing costs because it is being sold with the incentive that it is helping this project.

Mr. Flotz understood the intent and assured that they would work with the church to make it happen. They are prepared to start the DRC process on their behalf tomorrow. Mr. Flotz would appreciate if they could move from site plan approval so it gives them a realistic amount of time.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham requested clarification. She understood that it did not have to do with the building of the church but once they buy that property the project should be done in a certain period of time.

Mr. Wilkes commented that the church is getting a deal.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham expressed concern that the Board does not have any control of the church.

Mr. Wilkes indicated that there is control; it is a covenant. That is why his suggestion was to put a covenant in the deed.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham commented that the Lansing Melbourne Group is not getting money from the CRA to build the church.

Mr. Wilkes stated that indirectly they are because they are getting a discounted price.

Mr. Wojcik advised that the property was one of 55 properties transferred and the CRA paid the City its costs plus \$3,000. The CRA purchased the property from the City for \$9,620.42.

Mr. Spence advised that this action is to facilitate the development of the site. The City has agreed to swap the land. Whether that corner lot is used for a church or not, it does not further redevelopment efforts. The church is kind of a tangent because they are in the way of a redevelopment effort. Mr. Flotz stated that they already have a site plan for the church and they have met with staff. They are ready to submit the plan and will probably be in DRC within 60 days. It is believed this would be a staff level approval and permitting could start by summer.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham would not amend the motion because once the title to the other property is transferred it is an agreement between the developer and the church.

Mr. Wilkes questioned what is adjacent to the property.

Mr. Spence stated it is a multi-family structure owned by New Mount Olive.

Mr. Flotz mentioned that the City owns the parcel to the north, which is triangular shaped.

Greg Hyson, Vice President of the New Mount Olive Baptist Church was present. The response to the immediate question is that the existing building is owned by the church; it is 819 NW 3rd Street and they also own the property immediately east of that as well, which is part of their parking facility, and there is a vacant lot beyond it. The initial lot directly adjacent is used for church parking. They are interested in learning more about this particular parcel and its development. They do have their own campus development plans and, by virtue of their desire to do more with respect to community development, expect to develop parcels they currently own. They own other assets in the neighborhood as well. They discovered this site was put out for an RFP on February 1, 2018 and learned about it shortly after; it certainly was a parcel they would have been interested in acquiring. Their goal today is not to interject something in the middle but if there was no development their plan would be to expand where they are and move forward. Mr. Hyson questioned whether the church has concluded that was the right site for them. From Mr. Hyson's perspective, he saw other and higher best uses for the site and felt that the site would be more for the benefit of the community and not necessarily a community based church. The New Mount Olive Baptist Church would like an opportunity to speak to them about the prospects in terms of landing there ultimately. It was questioned if this was the choice of the church or just an opportunity that was presented.

Mr. Flotz advised that they have gone through 32 or 33 different parcels of land with the church. The church had a great desire to be very close to where they are right now. They have been shown everything from Cypress Creek Boulevard to Hollywood. They worked with CRA staff to try to identify parcels in the CRA or the City that might be appropriate and out of all those, they liked very much being in the neighborhood. They saw being close to New Mount Olive as a benefit. The important thing was to make sure they found a home.

1. Ratification of Property & Business Improvement Program (PBIP) Awards

Mr. Spence explained that this item was a clean-up item. On June 7, 2016, the CRA Board approved a new incentive program. When the new incentive program was approved, Administrative approval of \$50,000 was thought to apply to all the incentive programs. Recently, while preparing modifications, it was discovered that the vote during the discussion was unclear whether the \$50,000 applied to all the programs or not. It is clear that approval applies to the commercial façade, residential rehabilitation, and property purchase assistance programs. In an abundance of caution, ratification of three of these incentive awards is being requested, as they were previously approved and have

entered into contracts. Those projects are the Wine Watch, Italian Artisans on Sunrise Boulevard, and Boodhwattie Persaud on Sistrunk Boulevard. Photographs of improvements that were made were attached.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham questioned why Boodhwattie is on hold.

Mr. Spence stated that Boodhwattie was in the midst of improvements when the issue was discovered; therefore, a hold was put on the project until ratification was taken care of.

Motion by Mr. Strawbridge, seconded by Mr. Hooper, to approve and move these three projects forward in one bundle. The **motion** carried on the following roll call vote: 12-0.

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

Nays: None

V. OLD/NEW BUSINESS

**D'Wayne Spence,
CRA Manager**

1. Modification of Incentive Programs

Mr. Spence advised that the text is being reformatted, which was believed to have caused some confusion during the last meeting. At Ms. Barber's request, a chart with a side by side comparison was provided. Most of the language was the same and to make it easier to read it was moved from paragraph format to a numbered list for a bullet point list format with the addition of the Progresso commercial revitalization project area, clarification of the funding restrictions were not for profits, the adoption of Federal guidelines with regard to awards to take base organization, the extension of Administrative approval to all incentive programs funding in excess of \$100,000 being needed to be approved by the CRA Board of Commissioners, and providing flexibility for applicants to propose performance indicators.

The following changes are being proposed:

On the residential side the only change is to the residential focus area to be consistent with the Redevelopment Plan. On the non-residential side, the language out of the Community Redevelopment Plan is highlighted on the Progresso commercial revitalization project. It specifically calls out for the redevelopment of this deteriorating industrial area and says that the concentration of undesirable uses such as junk yards, salvage operations, and undesirable uses invested in the area. and encourages us to focus on that area. This is the plan outlining the area, which is Commercial Industrial area between Sistrunk Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard, 9th Avenue, and 5th Avenue.

The Implementation Plan that was adopted calls for the mitigation of noxious uses in the area, creating a buffer between housing and industrial retail areas, creating a positive redevelopment opportunity to the development between the 7th Avenue to 9th Avenue connector and targets and attracts specific industries to establish a presence in the area. The connector project is not defunct and the Redevelopment Plan has been amended to reflect that but this was also something identified in the Implementation Plan that concluded the connector project that would have created a fragmented collection of awkward spaces and frontages. It is recognized that it is no longer viable. When talking to property owners within this area, there has been an issue with them coming forward in redeveloping because they still have that connector in the back of their minds and do not want to invest in their projects with the thought that the City will come back and take their property. We need

to push an effort to get people on board to redeveloping. Redevelopment efforts in that particular focus area will be focusing on the uses we want to encourage in the area; commercial, retail, mixed use development, and some light manufacturing, and not refunding any of the noxious uses that are specifically called out for the salvage yards, etc. Redevelopment efforts will not be funded for people to continue those uses.

On the funding of non-profits, as mentioned earlier by Mr. Wilkes, this is in recognition of the existing policy. They follow the Florida Attorney General's Advisory Opinion, 20-10.40, which states, "Non-profits providing beneficial programs and funding those programs would be outside of the scope of the Community Redevelopment Act." Facilities and things of that nature can be funded; however, we want to be clear about the funding prohibitions when it comes to non-profits.

With regard to faith-based organizations, they are looking at adopting the stance of The Federal government through the HUD Office of Community Planning, Notice CPD0410 Guidance. That Guidance states that we cannot fund inherently religious activities. They can fund auxiliary activities that religious institutions are putting forward but not their primary inherently religious functions.

As far as Administrative approval, an action was recently taken to ratify some approvals. It was clear that the commercial façade and the Housing Rehabilitation and Purchase Assistance Program were authorized under Administrative approval. The remaining programs are the Property Business & Improvement and Streetscape Enhancement. What is necessary for the Administrative approval on this level? This is a project on NE 4th Avenue and NE 8th Avenue. They are currently in the DRC review process and Planning staff is looking for them to make these kinds of enhancements. Planning staff brought this to our attention and they have concern that as other developers are coming forward they are going to be seeking and requiring this type of streetscape improvement. Someone who is going to make these types of improvements to their property needs to wait four to six months to get minor funding to stymie their projects. Time is money to get a small business that is ready to go waiting on funding for this type of streetscaping improvement. It was requested that Administrative approvals extend to these programs so we can help facilitate some of those dollars to these areas.

Funding in excess of \$100,000 requires City Commission approval. This change is consistent with the City Procurement Code amended on September 6, 2017, which requires every contract that exceeds \$100,000 to be approved by the City Commission. Based on the last meeting's discussion and issues raised by Mr. Gabriel, at the time of application acceptance a breakdown of each of the projects to be approved will be provided in the form of a memo for the Board to review for initial thoughts and recommendations. A lot of programs have job creation and retention as a performance indicator. It is believed it is a good performance indicator for a lot of the projects brought forward but there are cases where some industries are not that personnel intensive but may bring other benefits to the area. He would like the applicant to present to the CRA and to the Board and state performance measures they would like to demonstrate to the CRA if their project is funded. Job retention and creation is still going to be a strong component at what is looked at but if there is a better idea it will be considered.

With regard to residential, the residential incentive programs currently mention the same focus area along Sistrunk Boulevard, a block north and a block south. The Plan calls for a broader area called the Northwest District area from Sunrise Boulevard, Andrews Avenue, Broward Boulevard to corporate City limits as an area where these particular programs will be focused. That is the residential infill development and the residential rehab, which they plan to work in conjunction with each other.

Mr. Lue questioned if \$50,000 projects would affect the decision making and if a summary would be provided for those projects.

Mr. Spence advised that the Board would receive a summary of everything. Some of the items in gray are not yet approved; they are awaiting a green light to go ahead. If something captures your interest it will be pulled and questions will be asked.

Mr. Lagi questioned if this is an offline format.

Mr. Spence stated that the process can be discussed but if it is a Board decision it would have to be raised at the Board meeting. The City has an expedited call-up process where they email the Commissioners individually and ask if they are going to pull the item and they are to advise the Clerk's office if they are. Mr. Spence was not opposed to doing it that way; it makes it a lot quicker to continue. If an objection is raised the item is put on the next agenda.

Mr. Wilkes believed that should be part of the process. He referenced streetscaping and would like the City to work together. If there is a design concept for the area, perhaps approved contractors could be available to do that. This would encourage consistent development.

Mr. Spence indicated that they have spoken with City staff and they are discussing doing the streetscaping internally with Engineering staff.

Mr. Wilkes expressed concern because the extra money not currently allocated could get used up before it gets to the residential component.

Mr. Spence commented that Mr. Wojic will spearhead the residential side. They want to get the RFP's ready for the infill housing and when they are sure of the timeline it will be funded. We have to record to the County as well as to the State and if the funds are not used they are lost. It looks funny to them if money is being moved around in the incentive programs as if we are trying to keep the money away from them. It is one of the things on the priority list and we are going to get to it before this fiscal year is done.

Mr. Murphy questioned if many applications are coming through for the Purchase Assistance Program from non-developers.

Mr. Spence replied not yet.

Mr. Murphy stated that many people attended the forum and several came up to him afterwards that seemed very interested in those programs.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if anyone is marketing those programs.

Mr. Murphy replied no.

Ms. Barber mentioned that Mosaic put together a business start-up fund that was going to be \$5,000 or \$10,000 for seed capital for businesses. She questioned if that was anywhere.

Mr. Spence stated it is not a fund. They put together, in conjunction with Mosaic, a start-up weekend program funded by our operating budget.

Ms. Martin did not recall a fund for start-ups.

Mr. Spence commented that it was part of the event budget.

Ms. Barber questioned how to get that going again; it seemed to be something that would seed a lot of little businesses in the area. Her biggest concern was that massive chunky projects are being done but we are not creating an environment where residents and people living in the community can actually start their own business or enhance their business. Even with housing, to do \$4,000 or \$5,000 grants would allow people to paint their homes and do a little landscaping, which would go a long way towards reducing some of the blight.

Mr. Spence understood.

Mr. Lagi mentioned Dale's Tires and noted that was a big request. That might be a good case study as he is looking to revitalize several buildings.

Ms. Barber noted that there was previous discussion about housing, how many houses are substandard and what the cost would be to do a 50/50 fund on every one of those houses for a tidy up.

Mr. Spence stated those would be great programs. We need a balance for the big picture items and others.

Motion by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Ms. Glasco Foderingham, to approve the incentive changes, including the input the Board provided. The **motion** carried on the following roll call vote: 12-0.

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

Nays: None

VI. Communication to CRA Board

NPF CRA Board

Mr. Spence advised that there is a grant from Kaboom for playgrounds and there has been some talk about doing something at Lincoln Park. Commissioner McKenzie has complained about the types of uses and activities going on at Lincoln Park. The people looking to do the grant have, as a thought, of completely changing the park into a Kaboom type of a play area with the hopes of moving those types of activities out of the park and making it more family friendly. Mr. Spence questioned if there was a desire for the CRA Board to take on a project; it would be more of a Neighborhood Capital Improvement type match; the CRA would match the grant funding probably anywhere from \$25,000 to \$50,000. If there is an appetite, a formal presentation can be provided to the Board for a recommendation.

Mr. Murphy mentioned that he works for Equity One and stated that there were a number of financial issues with Kaboom.

Chair Centamore believed this should be done by the neighborhood for a NCIP grant or by the Parks Department. He did not think this Board should get involved.

Mr. Spence advised that the information would be sent and put on the agenda as a discussion item.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham commented that after Hurricane Katrina, Kaboom went into neighborhoods in New Orleans and State Farm partnered with them. What they do is great for the community and they hit some pretty intense areas; the makeover was very nice. Kaboom usually asks for volunteers to help build the park and a park is done in a day.

Chair Centamore stated that the Board should support something like this; however, he did not want to write the grant.

Mr. Wilkes believed it was a slippery slope; our fund sources are already tapped. In his opinion, the City should not fund it; this is a Parks Department obligation.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that Lincoln Park is in the Redevelopment Plan so it might be good to take a look.

IX. Public Comment – None.

X. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:19 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.]