

DRAFT
MEETING MINUTES
NORTHWEST-PROGRESSO-FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL
October 8, 2019 – 3:00 P.M.

Cumulative Attendance
June 2019 – May 2020

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Rhoda Glasco Foderingham, Chair	P	5	0
Dylan Lagi, Vice Chair	P	4	1
Leann Barber	P	4	1
Sonya Burrows	P	4	1
Kenneth Calhoun	P	5	0
Lisa Crawford	P	4	1
Matt Habibi	P	4	1
John Hooper	A	3	2
Michael Lewin	P	4	0
Steffen Lue (arrived at 3:32 p.m.)	P	4	1
Christopher Murphy	P	4	1
Michelle Nunziata	P	1	4
John Qualey	P	5	0
Tina Teague	P	4	1

Staff

Vanessa Martin, CRA Business Manager
Bob Wojcik, Housing and Economic Development Manager
Clarence Woods, III, NPF CRA Manager
Lizeth DeTorres, Sr. Administrative Assistant
Eleni Ward Jankovic, Housing and Economic Development Manager
Corey Ritchie, CRA Project Manager
Jamie Opperee, Prototype-Inc.

Guests

Steven Dapuzzo, Jr., Northwest 6th Investments, LLC
Steven Dapuzzo, Sr., Northwest 6th Investments, LLC
Tommy Bolden, V & R Family Enterpriser, Corp.
Merdine Mitchell, V & R Family Enterpriser, Corp.
Amelia Beasley-Pittman, Historic Dorsey Riverbend
Robert Lochrie, Attorney
Alan Hooper, Master Developer
Brian Poulin, Principal in Fat Village Limited Partners
Doug McCraw, Principal in Fat Village Limited Partners
Marcus Borges, Artist

Currently there are 14 appointed members to the Board, which means eight would constitute a quorum.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Foderingham called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and roll was called.

II. Approval of Minutes

- September 10, 2019

Motion by Mr. Lewin, seconded by Mr. Calhoun, to approve the minutes of September 10, 2019. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed. (13-0)

III. Project Funding Update

Ms. Martin indicated that at the last meeting there was discussion that approximately \$10 million would be available for incentive funds. Previously discussion and present multi-year incentives will be provided during the next update.

IV. Request for Funding – Northwest 6th Investments, LLC Sistrunk Station – 616 NW 2nd Avenue - \$350,000

Mr. Wojcik summarized the project and noted that this is a funding request for \$225,000 to Northwest 6th Investments, LLC from the PBIP program and \$125,000 from the Façade Program. The project will connect to the Sistrunk Market to create communal workspace, retail, cultural space and art stalls and the estimated cost of renovation is around \$750,000. As a community benefit, reduced rent is being offered to CRA residents for all space offered. There will also be a monthly Farmer's Market and outdoor art displays as well as complimentary outside yoga meditation classes. Approval of the project is recommended.

Chair Foderingham asked if any of the Board members were approached by anyone prior to this meeting regarding this project. No disclosures were made.

Steven Dapuzzo, Jr., indicated that the front of the Sistrunk Market is nearing completion and in acquiring the second property for Sistrunk Station, they feel there is a huge demand for co-working space and lifestyle businesses. The Sistrunk Market has smaller kiosks, which are driven towards food and beverage. The Sistrunk Station is a market for smaller retailers, artist kiosks, etc. Part of the approved money would go towards additional parking in the rear, which would alleviate pressure from the surrounding area, outdoor space for an artist area, garden, places to paint, and a monthly Farmer's Market as well as other day events. That area would be used by local citizens and space would be offered for local communities and there would be no charge for local non-profit organization meetings.

Mr. Murphy asked what was the anticipated occupancy and time of opening.

Mr. Dapuzzo, Jr. stated that the Sistrunk Market has been fully subscribed for nine months. There are invitations of interest for the Sistrunk Station and about 8,000 square feet out of 20,000 square feet has already been subscribed. As far as style, one of the proposed tenants is a tech company that makes apps on phones, and they are looking to take about 3,000 square feet. Rentals are being done in multi-sizes so they can foster start-ups who need a single office. They are doing more of a Google-style workplace, so the middle is earmarked to be very communal driven; a conference can be signed out, there is a kitchen, places to do music at night, etc.

Mr. Lewin mentioned that knowing there are smaller suites makes it easier for the CRA to make sure the 20% discounts are being given to the residents, which is a great benefit.

Chair Foderingham asked about the estimated timeframe for completion of this portion and noted that something was mentioned about doing Restrictive Covenants for five-year periods.

Mr. Dapuzzo, Jr. advised that their goal for completion is within six months. He was not familiar with the Restrictive Covenants.

Mr. Wojcik indicated that the standard loan provision is a five-year forgivable loan.

Chair Foderingham mentioned that the Restrictive Covenants should be long enough to maintain viability of the neighborhood because of certain uses currently allowed in that zoning district that you do not want to reappear in five or ten years.

Mr. Woods questioned if Chair Foderingham was talking about restricting the use and not having certain businesses.

Chair Foderingham clarified that she was talking about restricting the use to the first five years to the type of businesses proposed. She questioned what kind of analysis was done to show the viability of this type of project.

Mr. Dapuzzo, Jr. responded that public demand shows the viability of this project. Sistrunk Market is fully leased and has been for quite a while; motivation is based on demand.

Chair Foderingham mentioned that light industrial was shown on one of the diagrams versus retail and she questioned the light industrial use envisioned.

Mr. Dapuzzo, Jr. advised that they are zoned for light industrial. The current visual of the property is horrible, but operable. They are trying to make the façade look better and pictures where shown in the Power Point. The loading dock is being moved, the front is being painted, landscaping and parking is being added, and everything needed for curb appeal is being done.

Mr. Lagi mentioned parking and asked about the total number of spaces created.

Mr. Dapuzzo, Jr. stated that parking has to go for design. The front has 25 to 30 spaces, but there is an additional area on the other side of the garden, which is 1st Avenue, where there will be additional parking. He did not know how many spaces would be on 1st Avenue.

Ms. Crawford questioned if office spaces and prices were discussed.

Mr. Dapuzzo, Jr. advised that a preliminary estimate was in the package. Cohort offices tend to go from \$150 to \$200; the market rate is about \$500 for cohort offices.

Ms. Nunziata questioned if those would be triple net rents including the common work space.

Mr. Dapuzzo, Jr. responded yes for the cohort space. Some parts will be divided for a few larger units, perhaps 2,000 square feet.

Motion by Mr. Lewin, seconded by Ms. Crawford, to approve staff recommendations for Northwest 6th Investments, LLC. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed. (13-0)

Ayes: Lagi, Barber, Burrows, Calhoun, Crawford, Habibi, Lewin, Murphy, Nunziata, Quailey, Teague, Foderingham

Nays: None

**V. Request for Funding – V & R Family Enterprise, Corp.
1227 Sistrunk Blvd. - \$350,000**

Mr. Wojcik summarized the project and noted that this is a request for \$350,000 from both the PBIP program and Façade Program for a renovation project. The property is owned by the Bolden family, long-time residents of both the CRA and Dorsey Riverbend for 50 years. The primary family business is residential rental property, which is managed by V & R Family Enterprise Corp. The property was purchased in 2007 and they were unaware of the extensive costs it would take to put the building and site back into service. It was noted that the building failed to pass the 40-year inspection. The City Housing and Community Development Division awarded the Bolden's \$295,000 in 2017 to help renovate the building. After a thorough review by CRA Staff, it was determined that the costs would be approximately \$725,000 including permitting and design fees to put it back into service. The Bolden's would like to put five rental units on the second floor and use the first floor as a banquet hall for the community. The community benefit is the five affordable rental units on the second floor, which rents are set by HUD rental limits to lower income individuals and to provide a much-needed rental hall space for weddings and other events that currently do not exist in the neighborhood. It is important not to lose more buildings in the corridor to demolition and to assist stakeholders in the community to be a part of the redevelopment effort. The 40-year inspection requirement cannot be satisfied unless improvements are done. There are running fines associated with this property and the Code Compliance Division is working with the CRA and the Boldens. Approval is recommended.

Chair Foderingham questioned if any of the Board members were approached prior to this meeting by the applicants regarding this project. No disclosures were made.

Tommy Bolden, applicant, explained that his mother and father purchased the building to be used as a banquet hall so weddings and events could be held in the neighborhood. He noted that his family also owns property behind the building.

Mr. Wojcik advised that there is a large parking lot in the rear, which would be resurfaced and landscaped. Once the project is complete it will look like new.

In response to Ms. Teague, Mr. Wojcik indicated that there was not a picture of how the property would look. This is a small business owner and unlike larger developers, the owner does not have the funds to generate \$5,000 renderings. The project will be managed by the CRA and the CRA is already in the process of securing pricing. There is a complete set of plans and it was noted that there may be some tweaks to the plan, but otherwise, the architectural plans are done and have been paid.

Mr. Murphy mentioned the \$295,000 from the City and the \$350,000 from the CRA, for a total of about \$650,000 to create a banquet hall and five rentals. He stated that it appeared that the banquet hall would only generate about \$24,000 to \$30,000 a year.

Mr. Wojcik stated that they are going to start slow; a couple thousand dollars a month in revenue was figured and after that it could increase 25% a year for a five-year period. Rents for the residential rentals are set by HUD and will be very affordable, which will provide a steady stream of income.

Mr. Bolden advised that they are moving their home offices to this location as well.

Mr. Murphy expressed concern about spending \$350,000 from the CRA for a business that will not add a lot and maybe break even.

Mr. Wojcik has been approached by many residents over the years with an idea of setting up a rental hall, which apparently has a large need. They are trying to renovate this building to save it; everything else has been torn down. This building has a demolition order, so if it does not get repaired it is gone. The space downstairs is flexible; it is not going to have a total commercial kitchen, but there will be a warming kitchen and two handicap restrooms. It could be converted into a full restaurant if necessary, with some additional expense by the tenant.

Mr. Murphy questioned if there was anything special or unique that warrants saving this building.

Mr. Wojcik stated that the architecture along Sistrunk Boulevard is not standout architecture, but is important to the community, providing history and neighborhood compatibility. It is part of the fabric of what used to be the street. These are the features of what used to be the Sistrunk corridor and the CRA would like to see this building saved.

Mr. Lewin questioned if the sound of the banquet hall would somehow be buffered from the residential units upstairs.

Corey Ritchie, construction manager, stated that the architect went through the building, which has metal joist systems with a metal deck that should be poured with concrete.

In response to Mr. Habibi, Mr. Wojcik stated that there is no recorded mortgage on the property.

Ms. Nunziata mentioned the \$490,000 fine and questioned if it is a possible issue.

Mr. Wojcik indicated that the only issue is that Code fines cannot be removed unless the property passes the 40-year inspection. The fine was placed by the Special Magistrate and it is unknown if the entire fine would be reduced, but it would be recommended the fine be zero or significantly reduced. The fine is currently \$490,000 and the fine is \$300 per day.

Mr. Wojcik stated that the Code fines have been running about a year and a half to two years. Mr. Murphy mentioned sources of capital and questioned if the \$80,000 the developer is contributing is new money or if that was money used to acquire the property.

Mr. Bolden advised the money is for construction. The applicant provided financials and bank statements and noted that there is money available.

In response to Mr. Habibi, Mr. Bolden stated that the building was purchased in 2007 for \$326,000.

Mr. Ritchie stated that it would take six to eight months to complete the work. The drawings have already been approved by the Building Department and it is currently out for bidding.

Ms. Nunziata mentioned parking and commented that only eight spaces are going in the rear parking lot.

Mr. Bolden stated that there is City parking on 6th Street as well as parking down the street and across the street.

Pamela Beasley-Pittman, Historic Dorsey Riverbend, was recognized by the Chair. She stated she was in support of the project. Ms. Beasley and others would like to see the building preserved in the corridor and they would like the banquet hall.

Chair Foderingham commented that this project shows that the CRA is doing what it can to revitalize the Sistrunk corridor.

Motion by Mr. Lewin, seconded by Ms. Burrows, to approve staff recommendations for Northwest 6th Investments, LLC. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed with Mr. Murphy opposed. (12-1)

Ayes: Lagi, Barber, Burrows, Calhoun, Crawford, Habibi, Lewin, Lue, Nunziata, Quailey, Teague, Foderingham

Nays: Murphy

**VI. Request for Funding – Fat Live Limited Partnership/Evergreen
Partners III LLC/Urban Street Development
Fat Village – NW 5th Street at NW 1st Avenue - \$5,000,000**

Mr. Wojcik summarized the project and noted that this is a funding request for \$5 million. The CRA is financing an affordable housing project in Fat Village. The proposal is for a 13-story, 125-unit housing project in Fat Village with 31 market rate units and 94 Affordable Housing units. The developer is applying for 9% low income housing tax credits from Florida Housing Finance Corporation, and \$5 million from Broward County under its Multi-Family New Construction RFP. The developer's first mortgage will be a loan in the amount of approximately \$10.5 million; tax credits will generate approximately \$27 million and County money and CRA funds will fill the gap. All gap financing, both CRA and County, needs to be committed by November 7, 2019, which is the application due date for the loan for the Housing Tax Credit offering. The loan must be approved by the CRA before then, so funding is contingent upon the award of the 9% tax credits and the \$5 million loan from Broward County. Approval is recommended.

Chair Foderingham questioned if any Board members were approached by any applicants regarding this project. No disclosures were made.

Attorney Robert Lochrie, Alan Hooper, Master Developer, Brian Poulin and Doug McCraw, Principals, were present.

Attorney Lochrie explained that the specific request is for gap financing assistance with Affordable Housing to be included in the overall Fat Village project. It is an important component because it serves as the anchor to everything else that will be happening within the project. A brief Power Point presentation was provided, and the following was noted:

- The concept is that there will be a place for all walks of life and all income levels to live, work, eat, socialize, grow into additional businesses, and potentially grow out of an Affordable Housing project into an all market rate project all within the same two-block area.
- Fat Village stands for food, arts, entertainment, and technology.
- The area currently does not have good pedestrian connections, sidewalks, parking, or drainage and there is no landscaping.
- Existing warehouse buildings will be restored and kept as part of this project and will be incorporated within the overall design.
- The Fat live project is an Affordable Housing project where there is a mix of income with people at 30% median income, 60% AMI, 80% AMI, and market rate all within one building.
- In addition to residential, there is another office building that includes collaborative office space and working space that different people can occupy and there is a more traditional office building on the north side.
- To the south is another office building, and a hotel will be incorporated as well as a central parking garage. Market rate housing is to the north.

- 1st Avenue will be completely reimagined with wide sidewalks, large plaza areas, outdoor seating, ground floor retail and restaurants.
- There will also be a chef incubator where people who want to start their own enterprise can rent space and practice their skills.
- There will be an art gallery space on Andrews Avenue.

Chair Foderingham commented that #1 on the Conceptual Master Plan is the area the Board is concerned about.

Attorney Lochrie advised that is the first phase of the project. The next slide showed all uses with a color code. Even though this is a unified project, each of the buildings identify themselves. The Affordable Housing project will cost the same and have all the same external treatments as all the other buildings. The next few slides showed a typical Andrews Avenue and a view towards the south. The next view was along Andrews Avenue to give a feel how that would play out with artist studios. There is a north view looking south towards the Affordable Housing project and the fat iron building, which is a placeholder for art. Another slide showed outdoor seating and restaurants and an area showing the chef incubator. One important component that will be anchored with the residential portion is a State-of-the-Art Walk, which will occur once a month. All the space along 1st Avenue will be shut down for special events and extend along Andrews Avenue where the galleries are located. It is believed that having an affordable component in this project is important and that is why they are requesting assistance to bring that component to go along with all the other market rate portions of the project.

Mr. Lewin commented that there appeared to be a lot of office, about 190,000 square feet, and questioned if market studies were conducted to show that it would absorb well.

Mr. Hooper stated that the project would be done in phases. The first building would be part of the warehouses growing out of the back and two stories of that would be collaborative. It was noted that one office user wants 30,000 square feet to start. It is believed that with so much young talent within the area as well as new things coming on Sistrunk Boulevard, there is a real attraction for office users and businesses to locate where they can cultivate some of the existing young talent. There are some spaces on the other side near the Himmarshee District, and many calls are received from people who want to be in that area. Calls are also received from people who want to open businesses and still be close to the Brightline Train Station.

Mr. Murphy questioned the cost of the first phase and of the entire project.

Attorney Lochrie advised that construction costs on this one building is \$34 million and the overall construction cost is \$246 million.

Mr. Murphy questioned if the applicant anticipates coming back to the CRA for other components of the project in the future.

Attorney Lochrie stated that at this point that is undefined. The key component is the Affordable Housing component, which is their request.

Mr. Lewin questioned how the warehouses would be maintained.

Mr. Hooper stated that there are three warehouses that look like airplane hangars. They are going to cut into the back of those warehouses and grow out of the back with an office building.

Mr. Habibi questioned if the affordable side of this project is part of the CRA grant and if so, what the alternative is.

Attorney Lochrie advised that the alternate would be market rate housing. The gap that Broward County estimates is what is needed for this project. There is a need; 50% of all households in Broward County are strapped for housing.

Mr. McCraw indicated that he is overseeing the arts program. The workforce housing component is very important for Fat Village because they want to allocate a substantial portion to artists. It is a critical component to create and keep artists in that area.

Mr. Lewin questioned if there would be an urban downtown metro street feel.

Mr. McCraw stated that there would be a curated art experience on the street and inside the buildings. There would also be an art space like the project space on Andrews Avenue.

Mr. Hooper stated that they do not want to lose what the artists provide to this neighborhood. Fat Village is going to go through a change whether they are here or not. It is this groups intent to preserve the nature of the art and to infuse it throughout the entire project.

In response to Mr. Lue, Mr. Hooper stated that it is rental property.

Ms. Teague questioned how many Affordable Housing units there would be.

Mr. Hooper advised that the building is 125 units; 15% are going to be at 30% AMI, 40% and 60% AMI, 20% and 80% AMI, and then there will be market rate as well; 94 units are Affordable. Mr. Hooper explained that AMI is Area Median Income. The 30% means in order to live in that unit, someone must make 30% of the Area Median Income or less and rent is based on that income.

Mr. Lewin commented that he has talked to existing tenants and questioned if there has been any complaints or support.

Mr. McCraw stated that there is always trepidation as to what is happening.

Mr. Borges indicated that he is an artist and he wants to live here.

In response to Mr. Lewin, Attorney Lochrie advised that not getting tax credits would not hold up the rest of the project and he presumed they would probably try again.

Ms. Crawford questioned if the subsidized artist space is already there.

Mr. McCraw referenced the Sailboat Bend project for artists, which was probably done some years ago.

In response to Ms. Nunziata, Mr. Poulin advised that parking is in the workforce building.

Mr. Habibi questioned the timeline of the entire project.

Mr. Hooper stated this project is progressing through steps; the entire project is in review with DRC at this time. If awarded the credits, the project will go to HUD for review.

Mr. Poulin stated that construction would begin in January 2021 and would be finished 18 months later.

Mr. Hooper stated that with HUD approval, entitlements and plans could be put together and in for permit at about the same time. He described the progression and stated that the hotel would come last in 2024 or 2025.

Chair Foderingham questioned what would be left for the year if \$5 million was recommended.

Mr. Woods indicated that the funds would be spread over five years, so it would be a \$1 million commitment from the \$10 million Ms. Martin spoke about earlier. There are different pots of money and this would be taken from DIP pot.

Chair Foderingham did not disagree that workforce housing is needed, but she thought other areas in the CRA needed the funding more than the projected location. She expressed concern about money going into the Sistrunk corridor west of 7th Avenue even though there is a need for Affordable Housing in that area. There is so much residential construction that has already been done in Flagler Village and Progresso. There are several projects currently under construction and there is still an additional number of approved apartment projects under construction. She felt the 94 affordable units are needed elsewhere.

Mr. Habibi stated that 94 affordable units cost \$5 million.

Attorney Lochrie advised that it comes out to about \$53,000 per unit. Broward County recently came out with a report that stated that the gap was about \$100,000, but that is a different funding model. Compared to the 613 project further to the west, which is workforce housing, but not restricted to Affordable Housing, this is an Affordable Housing project that will be restricted for 50 years. He noted that the Sweeting Estates project was at about \$60,000 per unit.

Mr. Poulin mentioned the economic report and stated that \$5 million was coming into this community with the idea of \$37 million worth of economic improvements for the City.

Mr. Hooper commented that there are 29 permanent jobs just from that piece and 980 jobs overall for the entire project. Currently, the way the State law has been set up, each cycle year one project gets awarded by the County. It is believed that they are a good situation for that and

if this is not awarded, that means some other community would get the Affordable Housing project.

In response to Mr. Habibi, Attorney Lochrie advised that the apartments being constructed on the side of Andrews Avenue is one large block project with about 400 market rate unit rentals.

Ms. Nunziata questioned if job creation, permanent and temporary, was previously discussed by the Board as far as putting it in the agreement and not making it goals.

Attorney Lochrie stated that is usually done when giving contributions for a business to create jobs and an obligation is created and tied with it. CRA assistance is not being requested to create jobs, they are asking for funding. He thought the stipulation that needed to remain for Affordable Housing for 50 years was something they would agree with and the stipulations they must get funded through the State.

Chair Foderingham questioned the status of approval with the County

Mr. Poulin stated that an application was submitted a week ago and there is a fast track process to get the approval done by the November 7, 2019 application date; he thought announcements would be made within two weeks.

Mr. Habibi questioned if anything could change if this money was spread out over five years.

Attorney Lochrie indicated that if funding was not received from one of the other sources the funding would not be there, and terms would be negotiated in the loan document.

Mr. Hooper stated that they are applying with Florida Housing Finance for tax credits. Once they apply and credits are awarded everything is locked. Florida Housing Finance will make sure all their rules are being followed.

Ms. Barber commented that she lives two blocks away and noted that all new development has been market rate and it is changing the nature of the neighborhood. She would like more low-cost housing in the area to accommodate.

Motion by Mr. Murphy, seconded by Mr. Lue, to approve staff recommendations for Fat Village – NW 5th Street at NW 1st Avenue. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed with Chair Foderingham opposed. (12-1)

Ayes: Lagi, Barber, Burrows, Calhoun, Crawford, Habibi, Lewin, Lue, Murphy, Nunziata, Quailey, Teague
Nays: Foderingham

VII. Communication to CRA Board of Commissioners

None.

VIII. Old/New Business

Chair Foderingham announced that “Finally Friday” will be on October 25, 2019.

IX. Public Comments

None.

X. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20 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.]