

APPROVED
MEETING MINUTES
NORTHWEST-PROGRESSO-FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL
February 13, 2018 – 3 :00 P.M.

Cumulative Attendance

May 2017-April 2018

Members Present

	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Ron Centamore, Chair	P	6	1
Leann Barber	P	7	0
Brad Cohen	A	3	4
Alan Gabriel	P	6	1
Rhoda Glasco Foderingham, Vice Chair	P	6	1
John Hart	P	6	1
Mickey Hinton	A	3	4
John Hooper	A	4	3
Dylan Lagi (Arrived 3:15 p.m.)	P	6	1
Steffen Lue	P	7	0
Diane Randolph	P	4	0
Scott Strawbridge	P	7	0
Tina Teague	P	7	0
John Wilkes (Arrived 3:26 p.m.)	P	5	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
 Jaimie Opperee, 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**
 • December 12, 2017

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Ms. Glasco Foderingham, to approve the December 12, 2017 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 that nothing has changed for fiscal year 2018 and there will be remaining funds of about \$623,000.

IV. Discussion – CRA Incentives Program Proposed Modification

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

Mr. Spence indicated that in addition to the memo sent in the packets, a sheet with a proposed reformatted version of the Incentive Program, which will provide some clarity to the existing program as well as suggested changes, was distributed. The memo states general recommendations being brought forward as follows:

1. Extending the Administrative authorization to the Property and Business Incentive Program and a Streetscape Enhancement Program.
2. Clarification that commercial programs extend to non-residential uses rather than to limited commercial.
3. Modification of the Property and Business Improvement Program to permit funds for any renovations that address obstacles to occupancy.
4. One of the definitions of blight includes vacancies of both residential and non-residential uses and the desire is to help eliminate those factors.
5. Increasing the maximum amount of Board approval required to be equal or greater to \$100,000; currently that amount is \$50,000.

Mr. Spence made the following comments:

- There are five goals of the Non-residential Incentive Programs, formerly known as Commercial Façade Improvement Program, which is now a Non-residential Façade Improvement Program.
- The Property and Business Improvement Program.
- The Streetscape Enhancement Program.
- Development Incentive Program
- Property Tax Reimbursement Program.
- The Redevelopment Plan provides for certain target areas labeled 1, 2, and 3. There is an additional area identified in the program, the Progresso Commercial Revitalization Project, which is between Sistrunk Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard and between NE 9th Avenue and NE 5th Avenue.
- The area is the Blight Industrial Commercial area where there will be a lot of revitalization such as changing uses as called for in the Redevelopment Plan, which will provide incentives for individuals to make changes in that focus area.
- Funding restrictions are being added to the Incentive Programs. Now that the term extends to all non-residential, non-profit uses are included. Under the OIG Attorney General's opinion, socially benefitting programs cannot be funded directly so this makes it clear that funds will not be used to fund those types of programs. Following Federal Guidelines provided by HUD and CPD04-10, religious activities will not be funded. The document is a lengthy notice that provides specific guidelines when it comes to using government funds for faith based non-profit organizations. Non-profits can be funded within specific parameters set forth and used by the Federal Government.
- Administrative approval means the CRA Executive Director is authorized to administratively approve awards.
- The Agency may recommend increased funding limits on a case by case basis. Limits are set but if there is an outstanding program that exceeds funding limits it will be brought before this Board for consideration if it is a project worthy of going outside of the bounds of what was approved under the Incentive Programs.

Mr. Spence provided a brief Power Point presentation as follows:

- The existing program guidelines are placed in one document and reformatted to make the new look clearer as to what the incentive funds can apply to.
- The reason for extending Administrative approval to the Property and Business and Streetscape Enhancement Programs is because, particularly in the Progresso Revitalization area, there are many uses and no green space. Mr. Spence has met with the Department of Sustainability and they are now requesting, beyond code requirements, that a lot of people reinvesting in the area provide swales and trees. Some of the things requested is an added cost to those projects and the applicants are far in the permitting process to get these responses. The concern for very minor streetscape improvements under \$100,000 is that in order to provide the incentive to keep the projects moving forward in a timely fashion, the process would slow down if it had to go through the code approval process, which is four months.
- Similar things happen with the Property and Business Improvement Program. The State Statute also speaks of blight, addressing vacancies and low tenancy rates within the CRA. To eliminate those factors, incentives are being considered for lease tenants to occupy some of the vacant properties.
- The 7th Avenue Plaza was used as an example. This was a project that received funding and developed a very nice-looking project but is vacant. The tenant will be encouraged to get the landowners to move the project forward in a timely manner because it understood that time is money.

Ms. Barber thought those projects were addressed in the existing Incentive Program and questioned why a change is required.

Mr. Spence indicated there are not incentives in that area. It was understood to be that way but the language did not provide for what is being offered. This is a clarification of that language to allow for what was thought to be permitted.

Ms. Barber requested a comparison of the current language and the changes as to how it will be.

Mr. Spence advised that the old Incentive Program was in the packet. With the reformatting, Mr. Spence pointed to the elements that have not changed. It was noted that nothing has changed in the slide except for Area 4 as a focus area, which allows projects within the focus area an opportunity to get the additional benefits such as 90% of project costs and the Non-residential Façade Program.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham questioned the background of what has transpired to have the change proposed.

Mr. Spence stated that he transpired the change. There is a very aggressive time schedule, seven years, to complete work the City has. While reviewing the programs, they very much model some of the old HCD and HUD but did not tackle the slum and blight issues. The directive is to get a handle and tackle the slum and blight concerns and get that moving. It was believed that the changes and modifications would allow for more robust programs, get the dollars out the door quicker, and projects in the ground faster. The five points outlined above reflect the changes. The purpose of reformatting is so the language is easier to read and understand.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham referenced Focus Area 4 and thought something was being done to look at the commercial industrial area. Ms. Glasco Foderingham questioned if anything has been done to look at it in a more comprehensive way.

Mr. Strawbridge liked the idea that the area was being considered and stated that the same area was addressed in 1991 and updated with the 2000 Census data; however, it was not updated in the plan when it was rewritten. The Redevelopment Plan says that \$28 million was supposed to be invested in building a vehicular bypass through that community and it still stands that way. Mr. Strawbridge did not know if there was anything formally in the Redevelopment Plan that described a vision for that area.

Mr. Spence mentioned the Progresso Commercial Revitalization project was identified in the plan, which would concentrate on improvements in the commercial industrial area, which was the directive. The connector project has been abandoned but as stated, it is still in the plan; however, funding is not available.

Mr. Strawbridge did not think there was any substitute vision from the community. The community got together and approved the CRA with a vision, which is now bordering on 30 years old and reflects a complete other generation of desires. Mr. Strawbridge questioned if there was a community consensus as to the changes because he has not seen it.

Mr. Hall stated that there was a charrette ULI study about reprogramming that area. It may not be part of the official plan but the ULI study outlined that the area was going to be programmed for different uses.

Mr. Strawbridge commented that one might say if it is not in the plan it cannot be done. That is one interpretation of the law. It was questioned how far reinventing the neighborhood could go with a 30-year-old vision.

Mr. Hall advised there was community information.

Mr. Strawbridge clarified that he was talking about the Redevelopment Plan and being informed by a community process. There is a statutory process for amending the plan. The plan was amended and that area was not addressed. Residents were promised that the plan was going to be rewritten but the promise to engage was never kept.

Mr. Spence indicated that the plan was broad enough that the activities suggested were within the guidelines and nothing would be suggested outside of the guidelines. The plan did not call for specifics; it was very general and was looking for the elimination of what is called undesirable uses and to move towards a Commerce Park type of use in that area. The mandate is to get the area moving. This Board has responsibilities and mandates and if the expansion of these increased incentives is not something that that is found desirable, that is fine. There would still be incentive dollars but not at generous levels that a focused area would get. It was believed that this sends a message to the property owners and uses in that area that they are not a point of focus or interest. The message is that there should be more deliberate planning involved.

Mr. Strawbridge mentioned that the plan was very broad and stated all the things not wanted. It did not get into what the community wants; other than the Industrial Park. The plan and its board language basically contemplate what the community wanted 30 years ago and that should not be forgotten. It was questioned how the vision would be articulated to developers.

Mr. Hall stated that articulation comes from the Planning side; the funding side. The City must want the process and then an adopted land use plan amendment for the area dictates what can be built in this area. This is a vision the community has approved and this is what the Board is charged with moving forward.

Chair Centamore referenced churches and non-profits and did not believe in giving money to people who do not pay taxes.

Mr. Hall explained that a Community Redevelopment Agency deals with the elimination of slum and blight. A lot of Community Redevelopment Agencies have lost that focus and have taken to one component, which is Economic Development. Economic Development is a tool in the elimination of slum and blight. There are a lot of properties that do not contribute to TIF but do contribute to slum and blighted communities. The philosophy is that the funding should be used to eliminate slum and blight regardless of whether the agency contributes to TIF with the exception of the property tax incentive, which is strictly based on the contribution that the project has to the TIF so a tax rebate is given based on the increased contribution to the TIF. Slum and blight is being eliminated regardless of where it is found. The guidelines provided under the HUD Notice are very general; nothing can be funded that supports religious activities.

Mr. Centamore commented that since he has been on the Board there has been a decrease in slum and blight and an increase in the tax base.

Mr. Lagi mentioned the four-month comment and took it that was a structured period of Advisory, Executive Board, or Legal.

Mr. Spence was talking about the City Commission sitting at the CRA Board. The legal process is a lot more than that.

Mr. Lagi believed the estimate of time savings would be a month or two months less if the project did not have to go before the Advisory Board.

Mr. Spence agreed that about three months would be eliminated.

Mr. Lagi commented that the same backup would probably have to be created for the final Board, as there would have to be documentation.

Mr. Spence indicated that Administrative approval would go to the Executive Director. The Board would have an opportunity to ask questions and voice concerns about projects that are \$50,000 on the general project sheet.

Mr. Lagi referenced Lago-Mar Holding LLC as an example. It was noted that the amount was \$50,000 and it did not come through based on current incentive guidelines. Certain applications could have an amount of \$100,000 and that would be the same kind of example.

Mr. Spence indicated the project would come to the Board in this fashion but not for final approval. The Board does not have an approval, only a recommendation.

Mr. Gabriel stated when the initiative review process first came before the Board it was a much higher number and the Board collectively objected to whatever the number was and Administrative approval was sought on three programs. A \$50,000 Administrative matter was already approved on a project but the information given was after the project was approved. Questions can be asked but without information regarding approval, there is no clue how the money would be used.

Mr. Spence advised that the City Commission asked Jonathan Brown to do \$50,000 and come back to revisit. It seemed that the Board has been fine with the \$50,000 as it applied to these programs.

Mr. Gabriel commented that from his perspective it has been under the table because how the money has been spent was not brought to the Board. Even though \$50,000 is shown, it did not identify any fashion what the money was being used for. There are concerns. The City Commission may have the same issue as the Board since they do not get the projects for final approval. Mr. Gabriel did not have an issue with Administrative review, the concern was that there was no way to object, stop, or question a project until it is way too late. It was noted there is no cap on the Administrative review.

Ms. Barber mentioned that whenever a limit is set a type of behavior is created to conform to that limit and questioned the real need for the project. Ms. Barber was concerned about setting the tone and direction.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if there was a way to be more formal in letting the Board know what is in the pipeline and give members the right to call something.

Mr. Spence advised that the City Commission call up procedure is a 30-day wait period.

Mr. Strawbridge indicated that was not what he was envisioning. Under New Business every month, staff says there are three or four new applicants receiving this much funding to do so much work and the Board should find out if they are paying taxes or if they are religious for the purpose of funding. Maybe by a majority vote someone could be brought back after Administrative approval because the Board had a chance to look it over.

Chair Centamore questioned if staff approval was done to that amount if it has to go to the attorney's office.

Mr. Spence stated that all projects go to the attorney's office. Staff has worked on getting a template that is supposed to expedite the process inhouse. Mr. Spence introduced a new staff member, Eleni Ward-Jankovic, Project Coordinator. Ms. Ward-Jankovic has specifically been hired to deal with that kind of backlog and to deal with contracts, coordination mapping and completion. Ms. Ward-Jankovic's background is as a paralegal. Mr. Spence noted that the backlog is being reviewed and is one of the strategies where the template will be used. All awards have agreements that accompany them.

Chair Centamore commented that if someone requests something that costs extra, up to \$100,000, that is something that could be placed on the agenda the day prior to the meeting.

Mr. Spence advised that for this Board it would be easier because they control the agenda but for the CRA Board it would not be that easy to alter their agenda. Mr. Spence would not be opposed at the recommendation of the Board being a part of the Administrative process in the call up capacity; that would be fine with him.

Chair Centamore stated that the Executive Director could get in on the regular Board's agenda.

Mr. Spence indicated that there are other entities involved in the internal process and it has been made clear that no late items would be received.

Mr. Centamore did not believe the \$100,000 was an issue.

Mr. Strawbridge stated if there were an Advisory Board review to help he believed the process could be done quickly and efficiently and that he could go for the \$100,000 at some point. This is about being user friendly.

Mr. Spence advised that the call up suggestion as part of the Administrative approval would be moved forward.

Mr. Lagi questioned how many are needed as the majority for a call up.

Mr. Gabriel commented that projects would be brought to the Board for preliminary review. A call up means the project has basically been approved subject to a complaint or something.

Mr. Strawbridge suggested taking the term call up out.

Mr. Spence clarified that the Board was looking for Administrative approval with final veto power.

Mr. Gabriel questioned if the Board could also comment on modifications.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham questioned if this item could be deferred to next month so there could be a full outline as to how the process would be done and more clarification on the vision for Focus Area 4.

Mr. Spence replied affirmatively.

Motion made by Ms. Glasco Foderingham seconded by Mr. Lue, to defer for one month. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

V. Dorsey Riverbend Monument

**Enrique Sanchez,
Parks and
Recreation**

Laronda Ware was present with Pamela Pittman, Dorsey Riverbend President, and their trustee and former CRA, Jesse Adderly.

Ms. Ware mentioned the history of Dorsey Riverbend and distributed a monument type to be considered. Dorsey Riverbend is a community of history/pioneers that paved the way for many in this community. Dorsey Park was named after Dana Dorsey, who was the first millionaire in Miami. Mr. Dorsey was a man of vision and moved to Dania, Fort Lauderdale, Pompano, and Fort Lauderdale. The vision then transferred to Marjorie Davis, the past President of the Homeowners' Association. Ms. Davis was an educator and made sure the community was enhanced and respected. The monument is something very simple and the reason for the monument came about 15 years ago because the Cherry Building, which was the first law office in the area, was lost because no one would put the building on a piece of property. After that Ms. Davis asked that a monument be placed somewhere within Dorsey Riverbend, which is now called the Historical Dorsey Riverbend, formerly known as Dorsey Riverbend Homeowners, which is incorporated. Ms. Ware mentioned a book, My Soul is a Witness, which has a lot of people who would be forgotten if the monument is not replaced. They would like to have the monument in the center and are aware that the YMCA is going to build in the future. The monument is something simple that could be moved around if needed.

Ms. Pittman advised that the monument would be a great way to preserve history that is being forgotten. Legacy is big in the community and is something to preserve.

Mr. Sanchez explained that dollars were already programmed for purchasing property to place the monument on and the request is that the dollars be reprogrammed to build and place the monument. The money was funded from the CRA Board and has already been allocated; the money is in the City's CIP Plan.

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Lue, to authorize reallocating \$50,000 to pay for constructing a monument at Provident Park. The **motion** passed on the following roll call vote:

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

Nays: None

Ms. Teague questioned why a project must come before the Board if the \$50,000 or \$100,000 is available.

Mr. Spence explained that the previous discussion was about the City's Incentive Programs, which are dollars in the operating budget that can be awarded to encourage people to do redevelopment projects in the area. This project is monies in the Capital Improvement Project, which are approved by the Commission. Churches and religious groups are part of clean up. When the item is brought back it should be clear.

VI. Presentation of Proposed Uses for CRA Property

a. Fuse Funding – Eyal Peretz

Mr. Peretz provided a brief Power Point presentation on the progress of the project as follows:

- Three buildings were purchased in December 2016.
- Two approved projects were shown as well as where the CRA building is located, the 900 building where they are in a temporary office, and across the street.
- An agreement was finalized with the City in December 2017.
- Additional properties have been acquired within the corridor and they may be in a position to activate about six City blocks of frontage along Sistrunk Boulevard, which would be called an island.
- An island is something that can sustain and carry itself from a business perspective no matter what anyone else does. The mixture of uses in mind are office and retail.

A two-minute video was shown from NE 7th Terrace to Powerline Road.

- They are currently under contract and working with a land use attorney to purchase a 30,000-square-foot building for office space approved.
- There is another property currently in permitting.
- A photo was shown of the CRA owned land they would like to purchase.
- There would be a mixture of retail, micro-retail, and office space, with food and beverage concepts.

Mr. Lagi mentioned parking going down Powerline Road.

Mr. Peretz stated there would be three parking facilities and some ground parking at the intersection. As far as parking, they are well covered.

Mr. Lagi questioned if the facilities are more garage multi-level parking.

Mr. Peretz indicated that there are three levels of a garage and levels of office. One garage is wrapped with offices. Attempts are being made so only retail or offices would be seen; not parking.

Nothing was done to on-ground parking. Mr. Peretz believed this could be phenomenal and would bring several businesses to the area.

Mr. Wilkes questioned when parking would be built.

Mr. Peretz stated that parking depends on the CRA process and they need to go through a level to approval. They are fully funded and all equity. Their offices have been moved and are currently in a construction site.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if the Bass property has been acquired.

Mr. Peretz advised that they are currently under contract with the Bass property and in the process with the City for approval of the project.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if there is anything in the master plan for this type of development to be mixed use with housing incorporated.

Mr. Peretz stated there is no residential component. Currently the residential market has a lot of players and they are not specializing in residential development. They can accommodate a minor residential component as far as expertise but there are more experienced layers in the market that are involved in this area looking solely at residential projects. It was felt that not everything needs to have residential. Further east of their location, the commercial aspect was somewhat neglected and it is believed that people living in a certain area because of jobs is equally or sometimes more important.

Ms. Ware questioned the impact on the residential area.

Mr. Peretz stated that traffic would be on Sistrunk Boulevard. They are not looking to change any zoning or proposed uses and no negative impact on the community was seen.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham commented that sometimes a separating wall is required between commercial and residential properties.

Mr. Peretz advised that they could not go into commercial development towards the residential; there is a border with a very clear outline of what the commercial properties are.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham questioned how cut-thru traffic would be controlled.

Mr. Peretz indicated that he could not control cut-thru traffic; however, it was believed that would not be a problem because of sufficient infrastructure on Sistrunk Boulevard to accommodate the traffic.

Ms. Barber commented that any time there is a commercial structure development next to residential there must be some type of border wall or something that separates the two. Ms. Barber would like to see the impacts this business would have on existing businesses.

Mr. Peretz stated that they are in the preliminary phases and some of the properties are not owned yet.

Ms. Barber would like to see an impact on development for the existing businesses. It was noted that while in the process of bringing in new businesses some existing businesses would be taken out. Ms. Barber questioned if evaluations of projects could be seen. A few businesses would be closing and those are businesses that employ local people and have local ownership.

Mr. Spence stated it would be a comparison of existing businesses versus what is going to replace them.

Mr. Peretz indicated that many of the areas being discussed have no businesses. They took buildings that had more than 50% vacancy. Only one business moved out of the area and not too many were misplaced.

Ms. Barber does a lot of work with youth and her interest is in family businesses because there is a lack of youth employment. Ms. Barber mentioned that different types of businesses have different impacts on people and she believes that should be included in the evaluation. The Board should look at whether this will have a positive impact on family businesses that lead to more youth employment. It would be excellent if developers could do things to increase a family business type of component.

Mr. Peretz agreed and noted that goes a long way with their internal philosophy of where commercial real estate is going. A major shift has been seen, as what used to work has been tremendously jeopardized in the past five to seven years. Currently, most of the spaces are very small and are geared toward small businesses. The future of commercial real estate goes toward the smaller spaces, which bring in more room for growth with small operations price wise and because the consumers are looking for more of a personal interaction.

b. Fraternal Order of Police Project – Greg Brewton

Mr. Brewton was present along with Mike Tucker, President of the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), Joe Margovero, Benefits Manager, Jamison Jones, and Shanarra Anderson with Combine & Concepts.

Mr. Brewton provided a brief overview of the site plan and elevation renderings. The property borders Sistrunk Boulevard on the south between NE 7th Terrace and NE 8th Avenue. It is believed this project would be co-existent with the projected activity going on within the corridor. When the rezoning of the corridor was done one of the things anticipated was a mixture of many different types of uses. The FOP is not a non-profit organization, they pay taxes, and along with this component is an attached retail component. The FOP would have Administrative offices and associated with that would be a retail component to the east as well as professional office and a community facility possibility to allow meetings for the community on the third floor. The building is 45 feet in height and the interaction of the Police community would be a significant addition to help bring in new and other uses to the corridor.

Ms. Anderson explained that the proposal is for a 5,400-square-foot footprint and about a 1,600-square-foot retail space. They have tried to be sensitive with the design so it is contemporary but not necessarily commercial by adding different materials to break up the façade by using glass, glazing, metal, and stone. The ground floor of the Administrative building would have a large lobby, about 1,500 square feet, with an entry from the Sistrunk Boulevard corridor and from the parking lot. A reading area would be offered as well as a Police lounge, gym, and locker areas. The second floor would house the FOP offices. There would be a large entrance facing Sistrunk Boulevard, which the Benefits Manager, President, and Executive Assistant would always be able to see. There would also be additional offices and conference areas. The third floor would have an open tenant space available for build-out and future use. With regards to the elevation on NE 7th Terrace, the rear elevation would be towards the parking lot and towards residential that has balconies and planters on NE 8th Avenue.

Mr. Brewton added that when the plan was developed sensitivity as to how it would mix in with the community was taken into consideration. They met with Planning staff prior to coming to this Board because they wanted feedback on the design and whether they were accomplishing the role of making sure they would become a part of the community and that it did not stand out. The futures shown were fully supported by Planning staff. As one enters from the parking lot in the rear, there would be a courtyard with tables, to provide some type of on-street open area activity to combine the retail component with the office uses being proposed to the west. The FOP is a fully funded operation and they are ready to move forward with the process in accomplishing the acquisition of the property.

Ms. Glasco Foderingham questioned where the FOP office is currently located.

Mr. Brewton replied that the FOP office is currently located on NE 3rd Avenue just north of the Credit Union.

Mr. Strawbridge questioned if the FOP and Mr. Peretz were in cahoots.

Mr. Brewton explained that he heard Mr. Peretz was having a problem permitting his existing building so without any conversation of what he would be doing in the future, the goal was to help him get off the ground with what he was proposing to do at the current CRA site. It had nothing to do with this project. The FOP is not buying the property from Mr. Peretz; it is CRA property.

Mr. Wilkes noted there would be two buildings; one two-story and one three-story, with a 5,400-square-foot footprint. Mr. Wilkes questioned if the 1,600-square-foot footprint would be clarified for retail.

Ms. Anderson stated that the smaller building is 1,600 square feet and the large building is 5,400 square feet. The total square footage is close to about 18,000 square feet.

Mr. Brewton advised there would be retail in the smaller building as well as a commercial office on the third floor and FOP Administrative offices throughout the entire building.

Ms. Barber questioned the nature of the offices.

Mr. Brewton stated that there would be Administrative offices for FOP with a mixture of professional office. They want to offer a piece to the community to hold meetings, etc., which would be made available upon request. There would be retail to the east in the smaller building.

Mr. Strawbridge mentioned that their business is a for-profit business.

Mr. Brewton advised that they are a 501c8 and they also have a for-profit corporation, which they are expanding to this site. There will be about 6,000 square feet of leasable tenant space and the for-profit would be next door. The FOP office would be the 501c8 and they pay property taxes.

Chair Centamore questioned what kind of retail is anticipated.

Mr. Brewton indicated that retail has been discussed and there was a suggestion of a doughnut shop. They want to offer retail activity that would be compatible with what is going on along the corridor. They will be very aggressive in trying to make this happen and they do not want a year and a half long process. The FOP would be going out to the community because they want to have the Neighborhood Associations involved. Construction drawings would be developed and there has already been a meeting with Planning staff.

Ms. Barber questioned how many parking spaces there would be.

Mr. Brewton stated there would be 58 parking spaces, which is more than enough.

Mr. Spence advised that the next step is for an RFP to go out on the properties so the competitive process can move forward.

Ms. Barber indicated that she would like an analysis of the existing land and zoning uses to understand what percentage is zoned residential and commercial, as well as to understand what is utilized in the categories.

Mr. Spence noted that the underlying future land use is Regional Activity Center (RAC). Usually a land use plan would show commercial, industrial, residential, and this would show a large lot that has this area within an RAC. There is a breakdown table; however, it does not tell what tables, but will tell how much commercial, residential, etc. is allowed within that RAC. The zoning map is more focused and would provide information as to what parcels are zoned for business uses and residential uses.

Ms. Barber questioned the utilization rate of the residential.

Mr. Spence stated that Planning staff should have that information.

VII. Old/New Business

Investor's Forum – 2/21/18

NPF CRA Staff

Mr. Spence announced that the forum will be held on February 21, 2018. This is the first of two forums; a second forum will be held in March. This forum is directly geared for the community, local potential investors and property owners. There is a lot of activity and interest in the CRA, particularly coming to NE 9th Avenue from the east. They want to make sure that the people in the community are ready and invested and that they recognize what is occurring. The forum in March will follow up with a broader "Come one come all" investor's forum and Collier's Realty is being used to reach out to their nationwide client base to look at properties.

VIII. Communication to CRA Board – None.

IX. Public Comment – None.

X. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

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