

City of Lauderhill

Attend via Computer: <https://www.colvcm.com>

City Commission Chambers at City Hall
5581 W. Oakland Park Blvd.



Meeting Minutes - Final

Monday, March 8, 2021

7:00 PM

Attend via phone: Dial 1-312-626-6799 & Meeting ID: 924 4655
2167

City Commission Meeting

LAUDERHILL CITY COMMISSION

*Mayor Ken Thurston
Vice Mayor Denise D. Grant
Commissioner Melissa P. Dunn
Commissioner Lawrence Martin
Commissioner Sarai Martin*

*Desorae Giles-Smith, City Manager
Andrea M. Anderson, City Clerk
Earl Hall, City Attorney*

I CALL TO ORDER**II COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC (AND RESPONSES TO THE PUBLIC, IF THE TIME PERMITS DURING THIS PORTION OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COMMISSION)****III ADJOURNMENT (NO LATER THAN 7:30 PM)****I CALL TO ORDER OF REGULAR MEETING**

Mayor Thurston called to order the Regular City Commission Meeting at 7:00 PM.

Mayor Thurston explained the present meeting was being conducted in a new and challenging era, as the City of Lauderhill, Broward County, the State of Florida, the United States of America, and the world were experiencing new challenges due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the challenges of the virus, the City would continue to hold hybrid, virtual governmental meetings in accordance with the Center for Disease Control (CDC) COVID 19 guidelines, the State of Florida Governor Ron DeSantis Executive Order 20-52, City Code Chapter 8.5, and Florida statutes. The waiver of the physical presence requirement expired, and board members were required to be physically present at public meetings. As a result, all members of the City Commission were present in the Commission Chambers at City Hall assessing the virtual meeting from their laptops. Due to the nature of the meeting and the constraints of holding a virtual hybrid meeting, he asked for everyone's patience. Anyone wishing to speak should let him know by asking to do so. The microphones of all members of the Commission would be live during the entire meeting, while City staff and members of the public attending the meeting remotely would be muted. He said anyone having issues should text IT Director Doug Downs, thanking everyone for their patience and cooperation during such difficult and ever changing times.

II ROLL CALL

Present: 5 - Commissioner Melissa P. Dunn, Vice Mayor Denise D. Grant, Commissioner Lawrence Martin, Commissioner Sarai Martin, and Mayor Ken Thurston

ALSO PRESENT:

Desorae Giles-Smith, City Manager
Earl Hall, City Attorney
Constance Stanley, Police Chief
Andrea M. Anderson, City Clerk

III PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG FOLLOWED BY GOOD AND WELFARE**HOUSEKEEPING**

A motion was made by Vice Mayor D. Grant, seconded by Commissioner L. Martin, to **ACCEPT** the Revised Version of the City Commission Meeting Agenda for March 08, 2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Vice Mayor D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin, Commissioner S. Martin, and Mayor K. Thurston

Abstain: 0

IV CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Commissioner M. Dunn, seconded by Commissioner S. Martin, that this Consent Agenda was approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Vice Mayor D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin, Commissioner S. Martin, and Mayor K. Thurston

Abstain: 0

V APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes of the City Commission Meeting for February 22, 2021.

Attachments: [February 22, 2021 - City Commission Meeting Minutes](#)

These Minutes were approved on the Consent Agenda. (See Consideration of Consent Agenda for vote tally.)

VI PROCLAMATIONS / COMMENDATIONS

VII SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS

VIII GENERAL PRESENTATIONS (5 MINUTES MAXIMUM)

A. REMOVED

B. A PRESENTATION OF THE MPO BIKE CHALLENGE TO THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL RESIDENTS AND STAFF (REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER LAWRENCE MARTIN).

C. A PRESENTATION OF THE LAUDERHILL SHINES II PROGRAM (REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER MELISSA P. DUNN).

D. A PRESENTATION RECOGNIZING AYTIA TARPLEY FOR HER PERSEVERANCE AND HER ONGOING WORK AGAINST HUMAN TRAFFICKING WITH CHRISTIAN RESILIENCE (REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER SARAI MARTIN).

IX ORDINANCES & PUBLIC HEARINGS - FIRST READING (NOT ON CONSENT AGENDA) (AS ADVERTISED IN THE SUN-SENTINEL)

A. ORDINANCE NO. 210-03-104: AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE BUDGET REVIEW OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE AMENDMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021 IN THE TOTAL ADJUSTMENT AMOUNT OF \$3,173,444.00; APPROVING AN INTERDEPARTMENT BUDGET ADJUSTMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$96,077.00, A CAPITAL BUDGET ADJUSTMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$944,065.00 AND A

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,133,302.00; REFLECTING APPROPRIATE ADJUSTMENTS TO VARIOUS REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS; PROVIDING VARIOUS BUDGET CODE NUMBERS; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY CITY MANAGER, DESORAE GILES-SMITH).

Attachments: [ORD-210-03-104-Budget Adjustment & Appropriation FY 2021.pdf](#)

[AR 210-03-104](#)

[Supplemental 2021 q3.pdf](#)

Commissioner L. Martin remarked whenever he saw an amount of \$2.1 million in an agenda item, he felt staff should provide an explanation to the public for transparency sake. That is, where the money was coming from and where it was going, as it was important for taxpayers to know the City Commission and administration were being good stewards of their tax dollars.

Deputy City Manager/Finance Director Kennie Hobbs reviewed the subject item, as detailed in the backup, highlighting the following:

- The first item was a supplemental appropriation, meaning staff had to adjust the budget to account for unbudgeted or unexpected revenues and expenditures; the first totaling \$2.133 million was an increase to budgeted revenue, and an increase to budgeted expenditures; the amendment would show the budget reflecting revenues coming to the City by way of reimbursement from Broward County through the Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act dollars; this was roughly \$1.9 million, in addition to the appropriation of fund balance out of the Community Development projects that were about \$235,000.00; these monies were not part of the budget presented to the Commission in July and September 2020, and the proposed change was to include with the City's receipt of those funds and established a budget for their expenditure.

Commissioner L. Martin encouraged Lauderhill citizens to pull agenda items ahead of time; they should open and read the attachments shown in the backup for each item.

A motion was made by Commissioner L. Martin, seconded by Commissioner S. Martin, that this Ordinance be approved on first reading to the City Commission Meeting, due back on 3/29/2021. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Vice Mayor D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin, Commissioner S. Martin, and Mayor K. Thurston

Abstain: 0

X ORDINANCES & PUBLIC HEARINGS - SECOND READING (NOT ON CONSENT AGENDA) (AS ADVERTISED IN THE SUN-SENTINEL)

XI RESOLUTIONS (IF NOT ON CONSENT AGENDA)

1. RESOLUTION NO. 21R-02-31: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY

COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA, URGING THE BAHAMIAN GOVERNMENT TO STOP ANY OFFSHORE OIL DRILLING EXPLORATION THAT MAY ALREADY BE UNDER WAY AND PERMANENTLY BANNING OFFSHORE OIL DRILLING ACTIVITIES IN THE BAHAMAS; PROVIDING FOR TRANSMITTAL; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER SARAI "RAY" MARTIN).

Attachments: [RES-21R-02-31-Ban Oil Drilling.pdf](#)

[AR 21R-02-31](#)

[hastings fights to put a stop to imminent offshore drilling project.pdf](#)

This Resolution was approved on the Consent Agenda. (See Consideration of Consent Agenda for vote tally.)

2. RESOLUTION NO. 21R-03-50: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL APPOINTING PAUL SHELTON BY THE CITY COMMISSION AS A WHOLE TO SERVE AS A MEMBER OF THE GENERAL EMPLOYEE PENSION BOARD FOR A TWO (2) YEAR TERM EXPIRING FEBRUARY 2023; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attachments: [RES-21R-03-50-Brd-GE Pension appt Commission as a Whole 2021.pdf](#)

[AR 21R-03-50](#)

[General Employees Pension Board List](#)

[Shelton, Paul](#)

Mayor Thurston said one name was given to the Commission, Paul Shelton; he knew Mr. Shelton served the City for a long time.

A motion was made by Commissioner L. Martin, seconded by Mayor K. Thurston, that this Resolution be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Vice Mayor D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin, Commissioner S. Martin, and Mayor K. Thurston

Abstain: 0

3. RESOLUTION NO. 21R-03-51: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL APPROVING THE APPOINTMENTS OF APRYL FREEMAN AND FELICIA MCCRARY AS SELECTED BY THE LAUDERHILL EDUCATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD ITSELF TO SERVE AS FIRST AND SECOND ALTERNATE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD FOR THE REMAINDER OF A TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 2022; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attachments: [RES-21R-03-51-BRD-Educ-Advis Board appt 1st & 2nd Alt.pdf](#)
[AR 21R-03-51](#)
[Educational Advisory Board List](#)
[EAB Board Selection for Alternate Board Members](#)
[Freeman, Apryl](#)
[McCrary, Felicia](#)

This Resolution was approved on the Consent Agenda. (See Consideration of Consent Agenda for vote tally.)

4. RESOLUTION NO. 21R-03-52: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA, OPPOSING SENATE BILL 522 AND HOUSE BILL 219, PREEMPTING THE REGULATION OF VACATION RENTALS TO THE STATE; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER SARAI "RAY" MARTIN).

Attachments: [RES-21R-03-52-Oppose Bills-vacation rentals.pdf](#)
[AR 21R-03-52](#)
[SB 522-Vacation Rentals.pdf](#)
[HB 219.pdf](#)
[HB 1481-vacation rentals local exceptions.pdf](#)

This Resolution was approved on the Consent Agenda. (See Consideration of Consent Agenda for vote tally.)

5. RESOLUTION NO. 21R-03-53: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 20R-02-37 WHICH SUPPORTED THE BROWARD METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) AND THE CITY OF LAUDERDALE LAKES IN ITS EFFORT TO COORDINATE THE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FOR THE N.W. 31st AVENUE TRANSPORTATION/TRANSIT RELATED CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECT TO APPROVE THE SUBSEQUENTLY REVISED SCOPE OF WORK; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY CITY MANAGER, DESORAE GILES-SMITH).

Attachments: [RES-21R-03-53-Support -Revised Scope of Work NW 31st Transit Corridor.pdf](#)
[AR 21R-03-53](#)
[Appendix A-PTAP Broward County Lane Elimination Proposal Requirements.pdf](#)
[Lauderdale Lakes-REVISED-PTAP-Scope of Services_1.28.2021 \(1\).pdf](#)
[RES 20R-02-37 Support MPO and Lauderdale Lakes NW 31 Ave Transportationpdf](#)

Commissioner L. Martin wished to summarize the subject item for the residents affected by the item, stating the Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)

was tasked with finding ways to get people out of cars, encouraging pedestrian traffic, getting people to ride bicycles more, and improve roadways for safer travel by means of moving about on roadways other than in automobiles. He said the subject project affected West Ken Lark and, possibly, Broward Estates/St. George; the proposed improvements included: lighting, crosswalks, upgraded bus shelters, and better maintained medians along the subject corridor. This was an opportunity the community needed to be aware of, so when they saw work being done, they knew the City was working hard on their behalf in partnership with other agencies at no cost to the City.

Mayor Thurston opened the discussion to the public

Samuel Wilkerson, 610 NW 38th Avenue, Lauderhill, wondered if the subject area could get lines repainted on streets and at the crosswalks where children crossed the street.

Commissioner L. Lawrence remarked, in the proposed MPO project, the crosswalks and crossing areas where frequent accidents occurred would be upgraded; he was unsure if it included redrawing lines in the middle of the streets.

Commissioner Dunn added there would be opportunities for members of the community to give input via community meetings, so Mr. Wilkerson could make his request then.

A motion was made by Commissioner L. Martin, seconded by Commissioner S. Martin, that this Resolution be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Vice Mayor D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin, Commissioner S. Martin, and Mayor K. Thurston

Abstain: 0

- 6.** RESOLUTION NO. 21R-03-54: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL APPROVING THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) BETWEEN THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL AND CIUDAD DE NUESTROS ANGELES I, LLC STATING THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THAT MUST BE MET FOR THE CONVERSION AND OPERATION OF THE HOTEL USE TO A MULTI-FAMILY USE FOR THE HOTEL LOCATED AT 3501 INVERRARY BOULEVARD; PROVIDING FOR TERMS AND CONDITIONS; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY CITY MANAGER, DESORAE GILES-SMITH).

Attachments: [RES-21R-03-54-Agrmt-MOU-Inverrary Hotel Conversion.pdf](#)

[AR 21R-03-54](#)

[MOU-re hotel final 2.23.21.pdf](#)

[A1.00 Overall Site Plan.pdf](#)

[C1 PGD.pdf](#)

[C2 PMS.pdf](#)

[Consent - Ciudad de Nuestros Angeles \(1\).pdf](#)

Mayor Thurston commented the final memorandum of understanding (MOU) was a part of the item's backup, asking if there would be testimony from City staff or the applicant.

Hope Calhoun, the applicant's representative, noted, from their perspective, the task before the Commission was simple, to the applicant's team recollection and review of the record; in October 2020, the direction given to staff was to negotiate an MOU to allow the hotel conversion to take place for the Chateau Mar hotel in Inverrary. The applicant's team worked with the City Attorney and administration to develop the MOU in the backup that included points that were directed to be placed in the agreement, so the hotel conversion could proceed. The applicant's team believed the Commission should approve the MOU, as it reflected the understanding of the parties. She understood there were members of the public wishing to speak on the proposed conversion, so she wished to reserve time after the public spoke to rebut. Although she was able to obtain copies of some petitions submitted on the subject item, she was unsure if she had all of them, as they were never formally presented to the applicant; she pointed out a number of issues with the petitions. A large number of the comments she reviewed spoke to the future development of 500 plus rental units on the grounds of the Inverrary Tennis & Racquet Club, but the subject item was only for the hotel conversion, not any other development. Secondly, one petition she reviewed was unsigned, and she wondered others were unsigned and represented no one; some petitions were duplicates, as in the sample set she had, one person submitted a petition twice; that is, it was not a copy of a petition, rather, one person signed two separate petitions. Ms. Calhoun mentioned these occurrences, as she knew the City received stacks of petitions, but she was unsure if any were duplicated or unsigned or had other issues rendering them null and void. She did not believe any signatures on the petitions were verified, so there was no true proof the persons signing the petitions actually lived in Lauderhill, or if they owned or rented. Regarding other petitions presented, some were filled with misinformation, and the developer tried through the whole process to educate and provide accurate information to the community; the developer knew what they said previously, what they promised, and what they anticipated doing, but some petitions contained misstatements. For example, the title of one petition stated it was a petition to protect and preserve Inverrary, of which there were about eight in her sample set, and there was wording about the proposed 500 plus units that the applicant never submitted any plans for, and which was unrelated to the hotel conversion. Another set of petitions spoke about the developer wishing to develop 200 extended stay units, with mention made about traffic; it was difficult to determine if any information on the petition was factual, and appeared to be more speculation. She motioned there were two letters, one was signed by Tom Harney; his letter began with a list of

reasons why the hotel conversion was not a good use for the community, and his comments were provided in eight bullet points, three of which said the same thing using different words and pertained to traffic. There was no traffic study she was aware of being submitted, so Mr. Harney's comments were based on speculation and not evidence, as opposed to her client who prepared a traffic study; City staff's review of the study showed the hotel conversion generating less traffic than if it operated as a hotel. She noted bullet three spoke about the safety of parents and children waiting for school buses; the developer, Robert Suris, previously told the Commission he intended, at some point, to improve the school bus stops if the conversion was allowed to proceed. In bullet five there was a statement by Mr. Harney about the hotel's rooms being designed for a different resident; although the converted hotel units were intended to service some existing Lauderhill residents, it was being designed to attract new residents to Lauderhill; it seemed Mr. Harney was saying residents did not want different people coming into the Lauderhill community. Ms. Calhoun remarked, if Lauderhill was a community wishing to grow, shine and progress, then it should be opened up to outside persons wishing to reside in the City, and not have the hotel focus only on serving existing Lauderhill residents. She said bullet points seven and eight were similar to one and two, referring again to traffic, for which Mr. Harney again provided no evidence to his claims that traffic would worsen, and the applicant's traffic study showed evidence to the contrary.

Vice Mayor Grant disclosed she visited two of the developer's sites in Miami along with about 17 persons she brought with her over a two-day period; about nine individuals went on the first trip and consisted of residents and business owners; the second trip was comprised of homeowners' association (HOA) presidents; and she met with Mr. Suris on another occasion.

Commissioner Dunn disclosed she visited one of Mr. Suris's properties in west Miami, and she, too, brought a number of Lauderhill residents with her.

Commissioner L. Martin disclosed he visited the Inverrary property the past weekend with some ten individuals.

Commissioner S. Martin disclosed he, too, went to Miami to visit two of Mr. Suris's properties.

Mayor Thurston commented on being impressed with his fellow Commissioners doing their homework.

Robert Suris, the managing principal for The Estate Companies, commended the members of the City Commission for the work they did in visiting his hotel conversion properties in Miami, as he believed elected officials were charged with doing the homework. All members of the Commission took a significant amount of their personal time to get a firsthand look at what the applicant proposed. He said they tried to be very transparent throughout the entire process, meeting with City staff, and agreeing to all of their recommendations, and they tried to address the issues residents raised, and he thought they did a very good job doing so. They were making massive investments in Lauderhill between the old Target site and the Chateau Mar hotel site. He said they believed in Lauderhill, noting it was a silent city with tremendous opportunity to grow, and they wished to be a part of that growth;

they intended to remain in the City for years not months, and they expected to attract numerous jobs to Lauderhill. Mr. Suris noted they gave an entire presentation, and the Commission spent significant time reviewing the material and were well versed with what the applicant proposed. He thanked the City Commission for all the work they put into understanding all sides of the proposed conversion project, as he dealt with numerous city commissions, and the Lauderhill Commission particularly wanted to do the right thing, for which he thanked them, regardless of how they voted.

Vice Mayor Grant mentioned already seeing the applicant's presentation, so she was well versed in it, but as there were other members of the Commission and attendees who might not have seen the presentation, asking Mr. Suris to present it again.

Mr. Suris gave a PowerPoint presentation on the subject item, as detailed in the backup, highlighting the following:

- He thanked everyone who visited the subject site, most of whom were residents; most people were impressed, as they did not know what to expect with the conversions
- His firm did not just provide housing, and rental properties were not what they used to be, as they were now a lifestyle
- Once converted, the name of the property would be Altire Inverrary
- If the Target site was already built, it was unlikely the present conversation would be taking place, as people would have been able to see firsthand the type of product their company built; many residents who did visit their converted properties elsewhere were very happy with what they saw
- The Estate Companies were a multifamily, institutional-type, quality developers building in the Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, Collier and Lee Counties
- Their properties were highly amenitized, and it was all about lifestyle; from the moment residents rented their units, they wished them to have a sense of arrival, a feeling of living at a resort
- Soleste TWENTY2 was built a year ago; it was self-contained, eight-story product abutting residential, with about 800 to 900 residents; when visiting the site, it was hard to tell such a large number of residents lived there; their facilities were designed so there were spaces throughout the community, and people were spread out; amenities included a fully equipped gym, doggy parks, playgrounds, Wi-Fi lounges, etc., and this helped them to maintain their tenants within their property, and reduce traffic
- When the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) did their analysis on such residential products, it was determined one single-family home generated the same amount of traffic as two or three of their units
- They wished to attract residents wishing to live in Lauderhill but had no option but to rent a unit on a property similar to what the developer offered in other cities
- The City of West Miami had an average household income similar to that of Lauderhill, around \$43,000.00, and on the subject property, the average household income was \$90,000.00, so people would come if the facilities were available; there were thousands of jobs in Lauderhill held by people who wanted to live in the City, but they had no option, because the product they were offering was not yet available
- Their high-end finishes were the same; this was their brand and could be seen in all their residential products; units were well designed regardless of their size

- They proposed converting some hotel rooms to studio apartments, as in all of their residential products in Miami, Dania, Hollywood, etc., about 30 percent were studio units; in the example conversion provided, of the 338 units, 100 of them were studios, and that building was 95 percent occupancy
- There was a large shortage of studio apartments in Lauderhill, so they believed there was a demand and great absorption for what they offered, particularly with the amenities they proposed putting in
- The convention center would be demolished to add more parking; parking counts would be increased to 1.5 spaces per unit on average
- The center court areas would accommodate amenities areas, including: gym, cycling, meditation rooms, yoga, a Wi-Fi lounge, work stations throughout the property; they proposed live/work spaces for some units, something they did in all their buildings, as they helped incorporate the new demand for people working from home; providing such units allowed renters to get an occupational license from the City, so they could run their business from home; restrictions would be imposed on the type of businesses that could be housed in those units; for example, they could not generate significant traffic to the property; such units would be one-bedroom units with a den, with the den functioning as office space
- The existing model, which all members of the Commission already viewed, was a 360-square-foot space, with full kitchen and bathroom, a living/dining area that accommodated up to two people; a baby would be allowed as a third person
- The lobby would be a mixed use space with sitting areas and a lounge area where people could sit, meet and have coffee, and work on their computers
- A fully staffed leasing office would be available onsite, with housing provided for staff onsite; managers and assistant managers lived on the property, as well as some maintenance persons; they encouraged police officers to rent, offering them a 50 percent discount in rent to live on the property, as their presence acted as a great deterrent to criminal activities
- Staff monitored who entered and exited the property; air condition filters were changed monthly, so staff would enter units and see how tenants kept them
- Along with the gym, they had health programs running the entire week, such as a nutritionist coming in to do classes, trainers conducting training sessions, food courts with vendors offering food for purchase to tenants; there would be constant activities going on to keep residents comingling and engaged
- The pool area would have lounge chairs, cabanas, and dining and barbeque areas
- A traffic engineer from KBB, one well known to City staff, conducted a traffic study to compare existing hotel traffic to projected traffic from the proposed conversion; the analysis of the traffic engineer showed the existing hotel would generate 1,967 trips with 212 rooms; with the proposed multi-family units, the number of trips went down to 1,154; thus, the propose use would reduce traffic by 813 trips a day, a significant change in traffic pattern; this did not take into account when existing hotel used the convention center; the traffic analysis would be verified by City staff.

Janet Bravo, head of the property management for The Estate Companies, continued the presentation, highlighting the following:

- She reviewed some marketing initiatives and tenant screening to attract residents and fill the property's units
- All rental applications went through a screening process, including: credit scores, income verification, criminal background checks, occupancy guidelines; their system used an algorithm that looked at all aspects rather just one to decide

whether to accept or decline an application; along with verifying income, other income factors considered the amount of the income, the rent, the applicant's debt, and the chances they would be able to pay the rent in accordance with their guidelines; they determined whether to approve an applicant with a standard deposit, an additional deposit, or declined; any applicant with an outstanding debt to another rental community was an automatic decline

- The occupancy guideline of maximum two persons per unit could be adjusted if the occupants had a child via birth or adoption; tenants could remain until the child was a year old or until the annual lease was up for renewal, at which time they would have to move
- When the conversion was complete, they would begin hiring to fill positions within the management company; they would host a job fair, partnering with the City, to open the available jobs to Lauderhill residents first
- For the City of Lauderhill, the marketing strategy would be similar to that of West Miami, where they had longstanding residents and older homes; when they brought the new residential product into that city with its accompanying amenities, there was a wave of new people coming into the city, along with the children and grandchildren of existing residents coming back to the City where they could rent a unit to be closer to their older relatives; this need was included in their marketing strategy
- The vehicle they would use most in their marketing strategy was the internet, as it was the most powerful tool they had to work with; signage would be posted throughout the community, so drive-by traffic was alerted to availability of rental units; they would use outreach, collateral, and promotional items; they would work with all the internet listing services (ILS), such as Zillow, apartments.com, etc.; they would do search engine marketing, key words people used, placing specific funds to attract people to the community; anyone searching for luxury apartments, studios, rentals in nearby cities, their proposed units would come up in those searches; they would post to Google My Business where they could do target marketing, going to different hubs and placing ads for the community on Facebook and other social media; they could target demographics, age groups, people working in certain locations; their marketing strategy was to go out and bring people into the community
- They preferred employers in their community, and they would go to those businesses and target them, as well as partnerships with realtors; they cooperated with brokers in their community, so Lauderhill brokers were welcome, and the applicant would fully cooperate with them when they brought qualified renters; they had referral campaigns, so when they approved a resident, they offered them an incentive to bring another into the community and be a neighbor; another target tenant was professionals
- Lead nurturing referred to another marketing strategy, whereby, they followed up with residents, held email campaigns, sent out surveys for feedback from tenants on their application experience, and from visitors to the property as prospective tenants
- Regarding tenant retention, their work did not cease once a tenant took up occupancy; they maintained a relationship with tenants throughout their residency, as it was important for them to renew their lease each year; they held many events at their various developments on a monthly basis, along with surveys, so they did all they could to keep residents happy; they took care of many of tenant needs, from changing a light bulb to listening when tenants needed someone to listen
- The property would have a full management team and maintenance team, and the

property office would be opened seven days a week; part of the regular walk of the units included checking for unauthorized tenants or pets that were not properly registered.

Mr. Suris added they had DNA tests of all registered pets in their buildings, so if they found animal feces on their property, they sent it off to a service that they could identify the pet. For the first offence, owners were issued a warning, after which they were fined. This showed how intense they managed their properties.

- They sent four of their leasing agents the previous Thursday and Friday to speak with people around Lauderhill, going to shopping centers and other locations, about four or five hours in each day; they spoke to close to 200 people, explaining the conversion project to them, showing them brochures; there were a significant number of people in Lauderhill who sought a residential product the converted hotel rooms offered; they had the signatures and address of people they spoke with, so City staff could verify their residence in Lauderhill
- Many people he spoke with and took to see the model of the converted unit went in with an attitude of being against the project and came out with a more positive one after seeing the unit's layout, and how they ran their communities; the proposed development would be very positive Lauderhill; they sought to improve property values, and generate tax revenue for the City; some residents complained about the need for more police, and increasing the City's revenue enabled the City's affording more officers
- Lauderhill was centrally located, and the means of communication and access was very quick, so people working in nearby cities who could save \$500.00 or \$600.00 in rent would prefer to live in Lauderhill, as long as the type of residential product was available with the amenities and safety mentioned above.

Vice Mayor Grant spoke from a position of practical experience of seeing examples of the proposed conversion at other developments run by Mr. Suris's firm. The quality of the unit, the amenities, and the staffing was exceptionally high quality and up to standard, and no such housing product was available in Lauderhill at present. The staff was professional, knowledgeable, and the development offered numerous amenities, packaging and dry cleaning services for residents. She said the common areas were serene, convenient and welcoming for tenants. Her position on having the proposed conversion in Lauderhill, despite what she observed visiting the Miami development, had to be what the community wanted, hence her taking as many residents as she did when she visited the Miami property, and they included homeowners' association (HOA) presidents, longtime business owners and residents, people with vested interests in Lauderhill. About 95 percent were impressed with what they saw, but they still had concerns, the major one being the City's efforts to increase homeownership in Lauderhill. Vice Mayor Grant remarked, if the applicant was building condominiums or low-density housing, there would be little opposition to the development; facilitating the goal of increasing homeownership would not be facilitated by the proposed conversion. She said the hotel already existed, and the owner and developer sought to renovate the units to become efficiency rental apartments. The agreement before the Commission for consideration was related to the hotel only, and not the racquet club.

City Attorney Hall affirmed this was correct, they were two separate items. The racquet club development would be a quasi-judicial item, where witnesses would

be sworn in. The subject matter was a vote by the Commission on an MOU for the conversion of the Chateau Mar hotel into a rental residential use.

Vice Mayor Grant indicated one of the major concerns of area residents was the hotel use and the rental use was being coupled together.

Mr. Suris said they were not, they were two separate properties.

Vice Mayor Grant noted another concern expressed by residents was Mr. Suris's company would manage the property for a period of time and then sell it; she asked what was The Estates Companies' track record as to average time they managed a rental development before selling it.

Mr. Suris replied it depended on the market, but they did not sell a property before they stabilized, which usually took about two years. When the conversion was completed, this did not mean the property would be sold in two years, and the Chateau Mar hotel was a unique product, as it was an existing older hotel, so it was likely they would hold it for a longer period of time, but at some time in the future it would be sold. He said the buyers to which they sold the property would run the property in the same manner as they did.

Vice Mayor Grant wondered how they could make sure the new owners managed the property in the same manner, asking how buyers were selected.

Mr. Suris responded it was a market process, whereby, people bid on the property, and the highest bidder with the better terms won; usually such buyers made a large investment, so they did what they had to protect their investment. Many of the properties that were not managed were owned by individuals, and it was one person making a decision on how to manage their property, but in such instances the rental property was usually smaller, having about 20 to 50 units. Once the number went above 100 units, the purchase price was much higher, and buyers tended to be a more professional, structured organization, and a set management process.

Vice Mayor Grant questioned how subleasing would be handled.

Mr. Suris said there would be no subleasing, and anyone who did this would be considered as breaking their contract, and the property management would have the right to evict. Preventing subleasing began with developing a relationship with the tenants, and with the management and other staff living on the property, they would know who the occupants were. He noted strangers on the property had to check in, as all access on the property was electronically controlled, so nonresidents had no access to the unit or amenities unless the staff or a resident gave it to them; staff could shut down access at any time.

Vice Mayor Grant stated one of the issues voiced was the adverse effect on surrounding property values having rental apartments in such close proximity. She knew when she spoke earlier with Mr. Suris, he gave her a scenario.

Mr. Suris used the example of the successful West Miami conversion, stating it was a very old city, with many dated homes that had not gone through any

remodeling. As their West Miami project developed and attracted higher income persons, and many people who rented usually moved on to buy a house, many of their tenants eventually purchased a home in West Miami. He remarked residents observing the high quality property were motivated to clean up their yards and renovate their homes, and with new residents moving into buildings, they became customers at area businesses, and more businesses came to the area, filling empty retail spaces.

Vice Mayor Grant said residents questioned the average square footage of the units.

Mr. Suris replied the units began at 360 square feet for studios; there would be ten one-bedroom apartment of about 700 square feet.

Vice Mayor Grant wished to know if there was an alternative to the conversion.

Mr. Suris said if they were not approved to move forward with the proposed conversion, they no longer had an interest in running the hotel at the subject site, as the property was no longer suited for that use since it was no longer the destination it once was with the golf courses closing. Golfing was not popular with the younger generation anymore; golf centers that were successful were very isolated and in specific locations. He noted they built 850 homes at the Tamarac golf course site; many golf courses were disappearing all over the country; the hotel industry did not see Chateau Mar as a good hotel prospect; when the property went on sale, there were no hotel bidders. Thus, if they were unable to move forward with the hotel conversion into a multifamily environment, they would have to walk away from the property, with the likely result that the current owner would have to rent the units to the first ones that came. Under a hotel license, there was no monitoring of tenants, background checks, etc.; anyone presenting a valid credit card or cash had to be allowed to rent a room; thus, what the City and residents were trying to avoid so desperately was exactly what was likely to happen. There were no other options, and the subject discussions had been going on for eight months with no one coming up with an option that made any economic sense or was sustainable. Mr. Suris said no one was ready to write a check to keep the property as a hotel, and they were ready to invest, because of their positive experience in other cities; they knew the conversion would work and be a positive thing for the City.

Vice Mayor Grant asked staff what was their recommendation to the Commission.

Commissioner L. Martin asked about the size of the smallest unit at the Miami property.

Mr. Suris believed it was between 360 to 400 square feet.

Commissioner S. Martin echoed how well run he thought the two Miami properties were, stating he wished more people could see them; he hoped to delay the decision on the subject application to allow more time for residents to visit those properties. He asked Vice Mayor Grant about the feedback she received from residents and business owners who went with her to visit the Miami properties.

Vice Mayor Grant responded she reached out to the community to see who was

interested in visiting the Miami sites; going by herself would not facilitate community engagement. The feedback from those who visited the sites with her was exceptional, with about 95 percent of them loving the converted units; they were taken aback at the quality and standard of the units, and how the overall property was run.

Commissioner S. Martin wondered if they were initially opposed to the conversion project, and did the visit change their minds.

Vice Mayor Grant affirmed there were a number of them opposed to the conversion, and she focused on inviting them to visit the Miami properties with her, reiterating once they saw the quality of the units and amenities, and how the property management ran the site, they thought such a use would be great for Lauderhill, as there was nothing like it in the City. She noted there was a caveat, which had to do with wrestling with the desire to increase homeownership in the City. She heard numbers of 65 to 70 percent renters versus homeowners in Lauderhill, and the goal was to flip those numbers, as she understood the passion and the zeal for the City to have more home ownership. However, she could not deny the product Mr. Suris's firm offered was a great one.

Mr. Suris commented the actual number, based on the U.S. Census, was around 45 to 50 percent of Lauderhill residents were renters, noting he had an app that allowed you to stand in any neighborhood, and it gave you the demographics of how many homes were rented and leased based on U.S. Census information. Many people chose to rent, as not everyone wanted to own, and many people in the younger generation were turned off of homeownership, having witnessed people losing millions in the homes they owned in the last economic downturn, so owning a home was not as glorified as older generations thought. Many younger people did not see owning a home as such a wise investment, particularly in light of how expensive residential property was at present, so trying to get everyone into the same box might not be the right way for the City to move forward, and it was important for the City to have a variety housing of products on offer. He noted every city had a variety of housing, as no one type appealed to everyone.

Vice Mayor Grant mentioned Mr. Harney visited the Miami properties on the second tour, along with Eula Murray-Hylton; they were still opposed to the conversion project being in Lauderhill, despite both thinking the Miami properties were great.

Commissioner Dunn sought clarity on specific language in the MOU; regarding the traffic study, it stated the owner should provide the City with a traffic study; she asked what would be the outcome if the traffic study came back saying traffic was an issue.

City Attorney Hall replied, normally, the traffic engineer suggested solutions to any issues found; the developer agreed to address the problems as a condition of approval.

Mr. Suris interjected, stating they were currently licensed as a hotel, so their present use generated a certain number of cars; he believed it was 1,985 trips; the proposed conversion would reduce that count by 800 trips a day, so the change would positively impact traffic.

City Attorney Hall understood the numbers, but the City still wished to have the results of the study.

Commissioner Dunn questioned the criminal background check language; she saw the procedure was to make sure no prospective tenant was convicted of a felony, such as sexual battery or predator, drug-related, or any other violent crimes in the last ten years.

City Attorney Hall indicated the language would be added to the MOU.

Mr. Suris said that was fine.

Commissioner Dunn mentioned one of the concerns she received from residents was the possibility of the property catering to a more transient population, and she saw in the MOU's language that 90 percent of the units would be required to have a lease of one year or more, about 191 units, while 21 units could do a six-month rental.

Mr. Suris explained the reason for the 21 units rented on a shorter lease was sometimes executives came down for training, etc., and they would only be in the area for six or eight months, so they preferred not to do a year's lease; they wanted the ability to capture that tenant.

Commissioner Dunn found another part of the language a challenge, about which she had several conversations with residents; specifically, the maximum number of persons per unit being limited to three, consisting of two adults and one child under the age of seven.

Mr. Suris clarified, after they did the research, they discovered they could not discriminate on the age of the children allowed to live on the property. To address the matter, they would put it in the lease language that a couple renting a unit who had a child, whether via adoption or natural birth, had the right to stay on the property for an additional year, after which they had to move. The dynamics could be a mother and a child, and a third person, but the third person would be allowed for the first year of life, as the law stated if you rented a unit and had a baby, you were allowed to stay and renew your lease for an additional year.

City Attorney Hall said staff would modify the language in the MOU to state two adults and a child for no more than one year, then they had to move.

Commissioner Dunn asked if the child could be any age.

City Attorney Hall answered no; Mr. Suris said from birth.

Mr. Suris added the same rule applied to a child by adoption; the tenant could rent the unit for one more year, after which they had to move. Adoption was allowed by law, so they could not force the tenants to leave before that time.

Commissioner Dunn wished to know more about the demographics of the residents who resided in the efficiencies at the Miami property she visited; that is,

how many units were occupied by one person, or by two persons, or people with children.

Ms. Bravo replied, for all their studios, they were occupied by one tenant or young couples. There were no children residing in their studios, and it was by choice, as a mother and a child would be allowed, but this did not appear feasible for the space, which prospective tenants could see.

Mr. Suris noted they had a very low number of children among the tenants on their properties.

Commissioner Dunn noticed in the applicant's presentation, mention was made of a job fair to hire local people.

Mr. Suris affirmed they ran a job fair before construction through a third party that monitored and could report to the City as to who attended, who applied, the skill levels, etc.; they required multiple levels of skills depending on the development. They held another job fair for the staff who would be working full time on the site once the conversion was completed; the jobs included leasing, manager, assistant manager, etc.

Commissioner Dunn wished to know more about the demographics of the residents who resided in the efficiencies at the Miami property she visited; that is, how many units were occupied by one or two persons, or an adult with one child.

Mayor Thurston observed 9:00 p.m. was approaching, so a vote was needed to move agenda item Comments From Public Officials to the end of the meeting.

Commissioner L. Martin made a motion to Move Comments From Public Officials to the end of the agenda, seconded by Commissioner Dunn. The vote was as follows:

Commissioner Dunn	Yes
Vice Mayor Grant	Yes
Commissioner L. Martin	Yes
Commissioner S. Martin	Yes
Mayor Thurston	Yes

Commissioner Dunn sought confirmation the point where the applicant would begin construction, they were open to announcing this to find local businesses that were, potentially, a good fit for goods and services for the project. Then at time of staffing the property, they would open staffing opportunities to residents.

Mr. Suris affirmed they would open their staffing efforts to any Lauderhill resident wishing to apply.

Mayor Thurston expressed a security concern, as the concept looked good, and he visited the model at the Chateau Mar hotel; based upon the applicant's management plan, it seemed the proposed conversion could work. However, a fair amount of security would be needed to ensure it would work.

Mr. Suris commented they would keep security on the property when their staff was not there, reiterating their desire to offer a 50 percent discount on rent for one or two units to police officers, as their presence on the property created a police presence, which was a positive thing. It helped when a patrol car was present on the property constantly; this was something they did for all their other properties. He said they would have security in the evening, if necessary, as all of their properties were access controlled, and some properties had security coming from 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.; security was one of their most significant amenities, and the goal was to only attract tenants who were professional in nature and wished to feel secure, so security was a major component in their buildings.

Mayor Thurston observed Mr. Suris was making that commitment, and it was a part of their management plan, but what happened if, in two years, he decided to sell the property.

Mr. Suris asked that the same rules of expectation be applied to him as would any property owner who sold their property to another with the expectation that the new owner would continue to maintain the property as well or better than the prior owner. Whoever came in after him would be investing a very significant amount of money, and they were unlikely to let security be an issue.

City Manager Giles-Smith questioned what would happen if a single woman and a child were the tenants, and the woman later got married, would her spouse be allowed to move into the property.

Mr. Suris answered not really.

Ms. Bravo replied if a single mother got married in the middle of her annual lease, her spouse would need to apply to become an authorized occupant; however, at that time, it was likely they would be asked to vacate the property and do an early termination of their lease.

City Manager Giles-Smith asked if age discrimination issues might arise.

Ms. Bravo answered no, as the two-person rule would have been met previously, so an extra adult would put the original tenant over the occupancy guidelines.

City Manager Giles-Smith wished language to be added to this effect.

Mr. Suris remarked they did not have the authority to evict a tenant, that was something decided by the courts, so if a tenant broke their lease, they would give them notice of the violation and ask them to vacate the unit. If they refused to move, then eviction was the next step, which required noticing the tenant, and going to court to make it effective.

City Manager Giles-Smith understood, stating the language should clearly state if a tenant refused to move, the building's management would move to evict them. She asked for clarification as to who was the current owner the Chateau Mar hotel property, asking if Luis Navas maintained a majority share in the hotel.

Mr. Suris replied he was an owner of the property, but it was an investment entity,

so there were numerous investors in the property; he was the manager of the property, the one responsible for everybody else; the rest were all silent partners, including Mr. Navas, who no longer held a majority share in the hotel. Their group owned close to 75 percent of the property.

Commissioner L. Martin asked if the Commission was to approve the subject application, and there was still another part of the process, the MOU only gave the property owner(s) authorization to begin the conversion while continuing to work with the City on the long-term conversion.

City Attorney Hall answered yes.

Commissioner L. Martin observed there would have to be specific amendments to the City's code to allow the applicant to operate the conversion units in the long term.

City Attorney Hall replied, in addition, the City would have to amend its Land Development Regulation (LDR) to change the use to allow for multifamily, and the applicant had to request a special exception. In the discussion as to what would happen to the property if it were sold, the Commission could, if that day should come, include terms in the special exception application that any future hotel owners had to come to apply for their own, separate special exception from the Commission. This would give the City another opportunity to discuss the security of the property, if desired. He explained if the City approved the MOU, it required that the actual use was approved via a special exception granted by the Commission; at that time, the City could include additional required conditions. One of the conditions the City included in its special exception uses was before a property could be transferred, the new owner had to be approved by the Commission.

Mr. Suris remarked they intended spending millions of dollars bringing the subject property up to par with what they believed it needed to be for their product type, so once the MOU was approved, they would take all the necessary steps to get the zoning aligned with the proposed use, after which they could not go back and remove the changes to the hotel.

City Attorney Hall restated the Commission and staff wished the language in the MOU to state if or when the present owners sold the property to another organization, the latter had to apply for a special exception in which they had to agree to abide by the same conditions.

Ms. Calhoun sought confirmation that if the MOU was approved at the present meeting, Mr. Suris and his team could proceed with the next steps to bringing about the conversion of the subject hotel units; that is, submitting permit applications and getting the kitchens installed.

City Attorney Hall answered yes.

Operations Administrator Zachery Davis-Walker pointed out, with the applicant's reference to live/work units, the MOU's language needed to be modified and detail which entity would initiate; currently, the City initiated the text amendments for

Schedule "B" and Schedule "C" on unit size. Thus, the MOU had to include the course of action for making the live/work units allowable within the district.

Commissioner L. Martin questioned if a text amendment would be added to include the residential guidelines regarding children.

Mr. Davis-Walker affirmed the language would be added, and the same rules would apply to occupancy of the live/work units.

Mr. Suris commented as to the live/work units, stating they had the same occupancy rules as other units; the only reason they mentioned them at present, so it was not a matter of bringing up additional factors at the last minute, was due to Commissioner Dunn's mentioning the live/work units, and the applicant agreed to allow the outer liner units for live/work; the modifications would be made to the MOU's language.

Commissioner S. Martin noted about a month ago he opined the Commission should wait before deciding on the proposed hotel conversion to allow the Urban Land Institute (ULI) study of the golf courses to find out the highest and best uses with the presence of an existing hotel. He inquired as to the status of the ULI study.

Mr. Hobbs affirmed City staff spoke with ULI about incorporating the study of the hotel into their scope, and to review it in conjunction with the golf courses; the hotel was reviewed before on its own.

Mr. Davis-Walker said this would be the City's second Technical Advisory Panel (TAP), as the first was on Broward Boulevard and NW 31st Avenue for which the final report should be in April 2021; it took about 45 days after the final presentation. According to Julie Medley, the ULI representative, the kickoff meeting for the golf courses would resume in mid to end of April, after which it was usually a three-week process for their analysis. He hoped for late May, but he did not wish to under deliver, so June might be a safer estimate.

Mr. Hobbs commented, in relation to City staff's recommendation to the Commission, as the item before the Commission was only the approval of the MOU, and the use had to come back to the Commission for a special exception, staff had no recommendation as to the ultimate use of the subject property. However, as it related to the proposed MOU, the City Attorney, City Manager and their staff reviewed its terms, and based on the direction of the Commission and the City's Comprehensive Plan, the proposed, short-term conversion was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. City staff saw the subject discussion as an opportunity for members of the Commission to include in the MOU addressing any issues they might have prior to the conversion moving to the special exception process, as it was at the latter point staff would do the whole analysis and return to the Commission with a recommendation for the actual use of the hotel. Commission approval of the MOU would allow the applicant to proceed at their own risk to permitting, etc. to allow them to install kitchens in existing hotel units.

Mr. Suris requested clarification.

Mr. Hobbs explained staff understood there were text amendments requiring

approval, as the final version of the use was not allowed under City code.

Mr. Suris thought the MOU would allow the applicant to operate while they went through the various processes needed to get the long-term multifamily use approved.

City Attorney Hall stated the language in the MOU read as follows: The City will consider the adoption of the appropriate amendments no later than 12 months after execution. He said it went on to state: The owner shall have the right to rent out the units on the property with 12-month leases, in accordance with the requirements of section four below prior to final adoption of the amendments to the Land Development Regulations (LDR). Additionally: The City shall not revoke or modify the owner's right to operate the project, except as expressly provided in this agreement. He noted, by approving the MOU, the City would be allowing the applicant to begin operating the hotel within one year; if the City did not complete the process of reviewing the LDR and making amendments, the applicant could begin operating the building.

City Manager Giles-Smith asked what would happen if, in the next three months, the Commission did not approve the amendments to the LDR, and the developer already began installing the kitchens.

City Attorney Hall stressed the developer would be proceeding at their own risk, and it could be stated clearly in the MOU the City could send the developer a notice to stop the use within a set timeframe.

Mr. Suris found this a foolish arrangement, as no one would spend such a large amount of money without any guarantees the use would be approved. They understood it took time to do text amendments, etc., but the Commission was voting on allowing them to come in and make improvements, start operations by granting them a certificate of occupancy (CO); thus, the MOU was to allow for a transition period while the developer got the legality of the entitlement taken care of. He believed the subject MOU the Commission was being asked to approve was to allow the applicant to move forward with the proposed conversion without some certainty, installing the kitchens, only to be told in six months to remove them.

Vice Mayor Grant thought the MOU's language needed to be modified for clarification for both parties' understanding; it was interesting that there were so many differing opinions, despite the matter being discussed for some time. She asked Mr. Hall what he suggested with regard to the present MOU and discussions.

Mr. Suris believed there was hesitancy in making the decision, but it was one that needed to be made, as the matter had been tossed back and forth for the past eight months.

Mayor Thurston concurred, stating he was very uncomfortable, so he was not able to vote to proceed.

Commissioner L. Martin opined the subject situation sounded like a cart before the horse scenario, asking if the usual procedure was to make amendments to the LDR before, or during with an MOU, while being unsure if the City would eventually

approve the amended use. He heard Mr. Suris and his team wished to spend millions to convert the subject property, but it appeared staff was saying in six months the City could stop the conversion if the Commission did not approve the changes to the LDR, and the use remained unpermitted.

Mr. Suris reiterated the subject conversion had been discussed for over eight months, and they continued to pay the cost of the utilities, security, property taxes, etc.

City Attorney Hall responded, in the State of Florida, there was a process called the Florida Local Government Redevelopment Act that allowed a city commission and developer to agree to certain terms in advance of a project going forward, from which he read portions of the statute, specifically Chapter 163, section 3220. The section said a local government was allowed to work with developers, as they would make a major investment, and speak about what the government would do to its land development codes in the future to enable the project to happen. He said this was, in essence, what Mr. Suris and his team was asking of the City Commission, and it was a decision that had to be made, and it did involve some risk.

Mr. Suris remarked they already submitted plans that specifically showed all the changes they proposed, and he understood, over time, they were going to be allowed to proceed, as it took time to get all the entitlements in place, while the property sat dormant. The plans were with City staff, who began reviewing them, then stopped, then started again, but their team was always transparent about their plans for the hotel property. It was clear that once they were approved, they could begin making the changes noted in their plans and start leasing; the City then had the obligation to approve the entitlements required to operate legally.

Commissioner L. Martin stated, with the understanding communicated by Mr. Hall and Mr. Suris, he wished to go back to staff for a recommendation to the Commission, as it sounded as though if the Commission approved the MOU, the City was buying into whatever the developer did to the property, and staff's possibly later recommendation not to allow the use months down the road would be moot. If City staff needed more time to make a recommendation on the approval of the MOU, that should be articulated.

City Manager Giles-Smith noted the City Commission was the body that made the final decision on whether to amend the language in the LDR, and staff took whatever direction the Commission gave.

Ms. Calhoun said the applicant had no objection to adding more specific language to the MOU. However, her recollection from the October 2020 meeting was for staff, working with the developer, to prepare an MOU that included all the items necessary to allow the hotel conversion. She indicated if there were details missing that made either side uncomfortable with what the approval of the MOU meant, those modifications could be made, and the agreement finalized subject to those conditions of approval.

Mr. Suris asked the Commission to give clear and concise instructions to the City Manager on how to proceed, so there were no further delays, as they were

repeatedly delayed for months. Numerous people had the chance to see the finished product, ask questions, with considerable interface with the community, so a decision was needed.

Commissioner S. Martin mentioned a community that requested an entrance road to their complex; this was a part of the first MOU, and that community later rescinded that request. If the Commission approved the MOU, he questioned if that community could, again, request the developer install a separate entrance to their community.

Mr. Suris remarked they had been in negotiations with that community's attorney for months, as they desperately wanted a road to the entrance of their community. The developer later received a letter rescinding what the developer believed was an agreement; they no longer wanted the street and intended to leave it to the Commission to decide what to do. He said they were still open to doing the street for the community, and it was the City that requested the street installation be removed from the MOU; they were still willing to pay for the street; if they had a clear indication the City would allow them to move forward with the conversion, the community would come back to the table.

Mayor Thurston opened the discussion to the public.

Elaine Gatsos, attorney for the Inverrary Association and the Courts of Inverrary, wished to rebut previous comments; the subject property was not owned by Mr. Suris or a company of his, or a management company of his, it was owned by the company created by Mr. and Mrs. Navas, and the title had not changed, unless something took place very recently. She asked where Mr. Navas was, as Mr. Suris stated what would happen to the hotel building if the City Commission did not approve the proposed conversion, but it was really up to Mr. Navas, as it was his property. She noted, attached to the agenda, was an authority or consent that was unsigned, and an unsigned document was stated as a concern of Ms. Calhoun's earlier, but she wished to know where was the signed consent from Mr. Navas allowing Mr. Suris to represent the hotel property. What was previously discussed in October 2020 was not what was currently before the Commission, reminding Mr. Hall of a prior discussion between them where the existing hotel use was to be converted into an extended stay hotel use. She said, however, the present discussion appeared to be about a hotel use being converted to include ten one-bedroom apartments, questioning how the discussion in October moved to the present discussion, as the latter was a discussion on finding a way to use the hotel. This was a case of the cart before the horse, as the MOU would allow Mr. Suris's company to invest millions in making changes before the City allowed the processes necessary for that use to be allowed in the City, including the adoption of the actual documents necessary to make the proposed use permitted. Ms. Gatsos reminded the Commission the country was in the middle of a pandemic, and many hotels were closed at present, but this did not mean they would never reopen down the road as the situation improved and more money was spent in Lauderhill. She pointed out some members of the Commission were not on the Commission at the time of the October 2020 discussions, so they might not be aware that what was now being proposed was different from prior discussions. In the letters and emails to the City Commission and staff, the proposed conversion was about the future development of 530 apartments, it was not about the hotel, and they were all under

one ownership, and the threats about if the conversion was not allowed, the hotel would revert to what it was under the prior owner's regime, and that golf would never happen again was wrong. She reiterated this was not what the community wanted, as evidenced by the residents attending the meeting; she asked them to stand. The subject agenda item should be tabled, so somebody could explain to the community the process of giving a developer authority to spend millions on changes the City might veto at a later date.

Tom Harney, president of the Inverrary Association, believed the Commission was fully aware of how the majority of the community in the surrounding area felt about the proposed conversion, and though the applicant's attorney wished to make them a disregarded entity, the residents were not, as it was their community. Not only did residents pay their taxes, they spent over half a million dollars a year additionally maintaining the waterfalls, swales, and property the City did not own, such as medians, etc. They were well invested in the Inverrary community and cared about it, and the proposed development was not a good fit, as existing residents wanted people who were as invested in Inverrary as they were, and to increase homeownership. He said Mr. Suris and his team did not want to work with the City through homeownership, because residents were expected to make up for a bad business decision when Mr. Navas paid \$12 million for the hotel, and that decision was based on their desire to build multiple towers of apartment rentals by the tennis courts. This was not what the community wanted. Mr. Harney commented Inverrary had a very unique community that had a unique lifestyle, and they wished that respected, so they urged the Commission to deny the subject application immediately. They were not saying nothing should be developed on the hotel and associated properties, but they wanted a product that was a community-based solution, and for the developer to work with residents as a community, many of whom were residents for up to 50 years, spending millions of dollars on maintaining and improving the community. He stated Mr. Suris and his team were just showing up and requesting all the concessions they requested be approved by the Commission, but the Inverrary HOA and others represented residents in their community invested in the community. The City should not allow the subject conversion to move forward. He submitted documents to be entered into the record. He remarked the FDOT information stated W. Oakland Park Boulevard by the waterfalls on Inverrary Boulevard down to 441 had an F rating, and from Rock Island Road to Commercial Boulevard, and where NW 44th Street T'd with Rock Island Road had an F rating.

William Donnelly, resident of the Hills of Inverrary, commented on the concern as to what would happen to the hotel if the proposed conversion was not allowed to proceed, noting some of the most successful businesses in Lauderhill were for senior living. All but the senior living on NW 55th Avenue just south of Oakland Park Boulevard had waiting lists, so there was a possibility for the subject property to be used in other ways, profitably, without impinging on the lifestyle of existing Inverrary residents. He recalled one of the developer's comments was the proposed use would generate less traffic than a hotel use, but they needed more parking spaces; he was puzzled as to how the two statements correlated. Another idea was residents would remain on the property, because of such amenities as dry cleaning, etc., yet one of the supposed selling points was the residents they attracted would patronize Lauderhill businesses. He said, regarding the live/work space, there was a commercial park across the road from the hotel that suffered

from unrented executive office and work spaces, so they would have to compete with an entity across the road offering the rental of office spaces. Mr. Donnelly remarked some of the difficulties that occurred in Lauderhill over the years did so in large parking lots, and the question was asked about security for the large parking lots, which was not addressed. He hoped a larger traffic study was presented to the Commission, not just a slide, as he was unsure as to the hotels used as the average trip per day example when comparing traffic generated by long term rentals to that of a regular hotel use.

A member of the public stated she was a proud resident of Inverrary, and the residents were present to ask the Commission, as its body of elected officials, to preserve the Inverrary community. Historically, the community was established as a haven to combat the exclusion of peoples of a certain ethnicity, and Lauderhill progressed to a community of inclusion. She said Inverrary was already an established community fighting every day to preserve the qualities of a thriving neighborhood, and it was not the objective of residents to reject growth. However, Inverrary residents questioned what growth meant, asking if it meant overcrowding 200 to 400 persons in tiny living units to satisfy a developer; did it mean following antiquated guides of big city housing projects that placed 150 or more persons in one cramped building space. She questioned if the proposed conversion should be permitted to proceed, because there was no alternative use for the property, subjecting residents to daily, added traffic patterns, inevitably leading to an increase in accidents. It could mean the overcrowding of already strained healthcare, education, and emergency services, increased need for early childcare, and a depleted supply chain. She wondered if it meant growing business at the expense of the public's wellbeing. Inverrary residents believed growth should contain and continue to establish more health services, a strong educational system, access to green space, and healthy community development, as these undertakings enticed local, active business participation, establishing pride and community growth, and a community sense of wellbeing and accomplishment. She stated the residents of Inverrary asked the Commission to reject the proposed conversion by the developer, and embrace the development of Inverrary with an alternative, positive, productive, and inclusive community direction, and the residents stood ready to continue to improve their quality of life with the City's ongoing support.

A resident questioned how many products the subject developer developed in South Florida; she knew some members of the Commission and residents visited two of their properties in Miami, but she wondered who selected the properties they visited. It seemed there was a disconnect, as it appeared the Commission did not understand what they were being asked to vote on, and it seemed the Commission was relying on the developer to provide the information they sought to make a decision. She felt the Commission needed to have their own experts to answer their questions, as the developer would present themselves in the best light to gain approval. As a resident of Inverrary, there was no need to review the results of a traffic study, as anyone who had to drive in the daily rush hour traffic already knew the traffic situation, even when the hotel was vacant. She mentioned bus stops and the need to protect the City's children, so adding more traffic would create more problems. To the developer's comments about the hotel falling into disrepair if the City did not approve the proposed conversion, that was up to the City, as if the owners failed to properly maintain the hotel property, the City should issue code violations accordingly, and foreclose on the owners if they failed to do what was

required.

Allen Dorfman said, as a resident of the Hills of Inverrary for 48 years, he saw a lot of changes over the years, and Lauderhill was the residents' city, of which Inverrary was a part, and when one owned property in the City, everything was in play. There were new developments, old ones that disappeared, and the community looked better today than it did 30 years ago. He stated Mr. Suris made a beautiful presentation, claiming rents starting at \$500.00 or \$600.00, asking the Commission to look at what rental rates were in Inverrary at present; the proposed conversion was a perfect setup to fill the building, and then turn it over to another owner fully occupied. It would serve as a stepping stone to the rental apartment units they wished to build in the future, so Inverrary had to protect itself, as it was all the residents had.

Vice Mayor Grant stated she did not recall the developer saying rents would start at \$500.00 to \$600.00.

Mr. Dorfman clarified when Mr. Suris spoke of the renters coming in, he mentioned \$500.00, \$600.00 or \$700.00.

Denise Rogers, Inverrary resident, commented some of her concerns were mentioned earlier, noting everyone realized there was a need for development in Lauderhill, as the City was not viewed as one of the more desirable cities for a number of reasons, but most residents were interested in growth. This did not mean the City should mindlessly develop and attract the wrong residents into the community, as the City had enough bills already. Homeownership was nearing its ten-year high, and homeowners outnumbered renters two to one, with over 85 million owner-occupied homes nationwide, with the number of owner-occupied housing units in South Florida increasing seven percent year over year in 2020's third financial quarter. She was encouraged to see a decrease in property taxes in Lauderhill as a homeowner, and she hoped for more permanency in residency, rather than an increase in transient residents for even greater decreases in property taxes; statistically speaking, there was more serious crime reported in rental neighborhoods. Regarding the proposed conversion project, the infrastructure in the subject area of Lauderhill was not designed to accommodate the extra cars and traffic the development would bring. She noted, prior to the pandemic and shelter in place order, she traveled the Inverrary roads daily to and from work, and had to add 20 more minutes in her commute just to get out of the Inverrary community. While she pled ignorance in civil engineering, she failed to see very many viable ways to expand roads to accommodate more traffic, particularly when one considered the subject site was not the only one currently requesting some form of development approval. To build without considering downstream ramifications in a more holistic manner would result in a win/lose proposition; the developers would win, the City's residents would lose. Ms. Rogers said, pre-pandemic, she was also a road warrior for her job, finding herself becoming familiar with hotel rooms, and she could not conceive of a family of up to three people, one being a child up to age seven living in a small room of less than 400 square feet for a minimum for a year, recognizing some of the comments made about the modification of the MOU to accommodate for children; it was ludicrous. There were times when she became claustrophobic in a hotel room if she had to be stay for an extended period of time, so it would be worse for a family, even if it was two adults and an infant choosing to live in such a

small space, as they lacked the funds to afford a larger living space. She questioned who would be responsible for telling a family, because they had a child, they had to move. She would not belabor the points that came to mind as possible reasons for the City Commission to reevaluate the proposed conversion project, noting she attended the October 2020 meeting and echoed Ms. Gatsos's sentiments, in that she asked at that time about the City allowing the developer to install kitchenettes. Though some residents and she speculated at that meeting that the ask would grow over time, it was a surprise to her to see the MOU presented to the Commission include an ask that had yet to be discussed in public. To that end, her fellow residents and she beseeched the Commission to deny the subject resolution as presented.

Robert Crum, 3601 NW 7th Place, Lauderhill, stated he lived in the St. George/Broward Estates community, and he was recently elected as the vice president of their HOA. HOA president Sam Wilkerson and he came up with the idea of creating the Lauderhill Community Coalition, where all HOAs came together as one voice and spoke on issues of concern. Their coalition recently had a call on the subject of discussion, and they were here to support their fellow HOAs and residents to make sure their voices were heard, and as a realtor with offices in Lauderhill Mall, he was very familiar with the marketing conditions in the City. He noted, in reference to the residents' petitions, he was pleased to see petitions being used to communicate residents' positions, and he encouraged more use of that avenue of communication. The task before the Commission was how to make the subject situation a win/win for all parties concerned; the residential communities' position was one opposing the proposed conversion, and if the City Commission voted to approve the MOU, the criteria for screening prospective tenants would be difficult, and eliminate many in Lauderhill's residential communities when requiring a 650 credit score and other criteria required to rent a unit at the subject building. He believed persons wishing to become homeowners at a later time would be unable to rent a unit and build their credit toward homeownership, so lowering that requirement to, perhaps, a 600 credit score might be necessary. Regarding residents working as staff in the building, he wondered if it was possible to insert language requiring a set percentage of staff be residents of Lauderhill, so residents would derive a direct benefit from the proposed development, rather than it benefiting people outside Lauderhill. Mr. Crum questioned if the developer was willing to work with a homebuyers program to help transition its tenants from renters to homeowners, such as doing a monthly homebuyer workshop to educate tenants on homeownership. He knew the Lauderhill Affordable Housing board was working heavily to getting more people become homeowners.

Hayward Benson, resident of the Estates of Inverrary, said the Commission was always at its zenith when it responded to its constituents, acting in kind to their request; tonight was an opportunity for the Commission to do this. Residents were present to address the subject MOU that had a flawed protocol order to the extent that it should be denied, as the City should not give the applicant the thought that if the Commission were to approve the MOU, the applicant had the right to begin spending significant sums to convert the existing hotel to an rental apartment complex with lowering the City's existing standards for the required minimum size of a one-bedroom apartment. He believed many people would not choose to live in such a space, irrespective of models and units at other locations in Miami recently viewed by members of the Commission with the thought of them being replicated at

the subject hotel site. They should not be replicated in Lauderhill, simply because the area residents did not want it. Mr. Benson pointed out the MOU addressed the size of the family that could occupy a unit, but everyone knew families did what they wanted, and this was not an environment to raise a family; it was unfair, it was wrong, and the Commission knew better.

Kay Collette said she purchased a condominium in Environ, and in March 2020 she moved to Inverrary, and she came to the present meeting to gather information about what was going on in her neighborhood. She still had numerous questions, and if the Commission voted to approve the MOU at the present meeting, she wondered what would happen to the golf courses her apartment faced, as well as the increase in traffic. When she went out at 5:00 p.m. to go to Publix, it took her a long time to get there because of the traffic, never mind the incidents of speeding the City was already trying to address. She felt the Commission, too, should have a lot more questions before considering approval.

Alfred Sasladek stated his wife and he lived in the Hills of Inverrary for two years; he agreed it appeared the cart was being put before the horse, with the cart missing some wheels, and the MOU changing as the meeting progressed. It was plain to him, as it should be to everyone attending the meeting, the subject situation was the beginning of a piecemeal approach to getting approval for not just a hotel conversion, but the eventual approval of a larger project proposed by The Estate Companies, for which he already submitted a written objection in January. He said, with regard to the hotel conversion, as described in the MOU before the Commission, the development was being referred to as a multifamily residential project, but it was not for families, it was studio apartments for single individuals. It appeared the developer intended to install a kitchen in a hotel room and expect tenants to live there comfortably for long term, and the presentation was very heavy on amenities, likely more than would be needed by residents. He noticed very little time was given to discussing the comfort of the living units themselves; if they proposed to combine four hotel rooms into a reasonable living space for a two-bedroom apartment, turning them into 53 apartments to sell as condominiums, it made more business sense for Inverrary. The City should insist on conducting an independent traffic study to determine the effect of the hotel conversion and the larger development The Estate Companies proposed for later construction, as they would exacerbate the traffic situation along Inverrary Boulevard during peak hours.

Vice Mayor Grant questioned if staff had any thoughts as to the highest and best use for the subject property.

Mr. Hobbs replied, based on the site's current zoning, a hotel was the most suitable.

Mayor Thurston received no further input from the public.

Mr. Suris understood the community's position on the proposed conversion, and many of the comments made by the Commissioners and others who visited their Miami properties; many comments from the public said at the present meeting were erroneous. When he mentioned the \$500.00 to \$700.00 savings, he was referring to the difference between renting a studio on Lauderhill versus renting one in Fort Lauderdale, where to rent a studio cost \$2,000.00 a month, while it would be

about \$1,200.00 for a studio in Lauderhill; they could never rent the subject units for \$500.00 to \$700.00. There was a lot of misinformation going around, and he urged the Commission to go by what they saw, and the fact that the applicant was always very transparent; he did not know what else to do to be more transparent. He stressed there were only two options available: the building stayed as a hotel or it converted to a multifamily rental property; but regardless of the use, the traffic would continue to be bad as it was at present. Traffic studies by Broward County showed that because of improvements to other road arteries, traffic in Inverrary was scheduled to improve in 20 years from today. He recognized the subject decision was a very emotional one, and the residents present who spoke were a small group, and one that was not completely informed, while members of the Commission had done their job in getting informed, and their decision should be based on what they learned via their research, which he believed should support the proposed conversion project. The applicant preferred not to have any more delays, and for the Commission to make a decision for them to move forward or not.

Vice Mayor Grant commented the MOU needed to be modified in order for her to vote to approve it; as it stood currently, the community was against it, and though she personally loved the product she saw at the Miami property, and thought it would be a good addition and add value to the City's housing stock, she spoke on behalf of the residents she represented, from whom she received numerous letters opposing the proposed conversion.

Commissioner L. Martin stated he too was very impressed with the property he visited, though he had one reservation as to the closet space; the residents he went with to visit the Miami property were very impressed, particularly with the amenities. Lauderhill, at some point, had to move forward, and no one knew where the City would be in five or ten years from now. He said this was one of the hardest decisions he was faced with as an elected official, but his position was one of thinking long term for the betterment of the City, and the fact that the hotel had been dormant for a very long time, and it had gone through a number of owners, with nothing positive resulting from the changes. He saw the proposed conversion as an opportunity for the City to move forward, recognizing his vote of approval was not a popular one.

Commissioner S. Martin understood the conversion project, and agreed there was misinformation going around based on some residents' comments; it appeared they did not completely understand the project. If an elected official believed in a project, to bring it back to the community and sell them on it if their trust could be earned, and he believed the Commission needed more time to earn the community's trust. He understood Mr. Suris's position as a business person, and the effects of further delays to the project, but he had to vote in favor of what the residents desired.

Mayor Thurston said his decision was based on 360 square feet; he thought it was the wrong kind of development for Inverrary.

A motion was made by Commissioner L. Martin, seconded by Mayor K. Thurston, that this Resolution be approved. The motion failed by the following vote:

Yes: 2 - Commissioner M. Dunn, and Commissioner L. Martin

No: 3 - Vice Mayor D. Grant, Commissioner S. Martin, and Mayor K. Thurston

Abstain: 0

7. REMOVED

8. REMOVED

- 8A.** RESOLUTION NO. 21R-03-58: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL APPROVING THE EMERGENCY EXPENDITURE OF FEDERAL FORFEITURE FUNDS IN THE TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$51,000.00; APPROVING THE PIGGYBACK OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA CONTRACT WITH INSIGHT PUBLIC SECTOR SLED FOR THE PURCHASE OF 40 LAPTOPS FOR USE BY THE POLICE DEPARTMENT; WAIVING COMPETITIVE BIDDING REQUIREMENTS; PROVIDING FOR PAYMENT FROM BUDGET CODE NUMBER 110-683-09936; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY CITY MANAGER, DESORAE GILES-SMITH).

Attachments: [RES-21R-03-58-FFF-piggy purchase laptops.pdf](#)

[AR 21R-03-58](#)

[Memo & Proposal Insight-Laptops.pdf](#)

This Resolution was approved on the Consent Agenda. (See Consideration of Consent Agenda for vote tally.)

- 8B.** RESOLUTION NO. 21R-03-59: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL ESTABLISHING THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL HEALTH AND PROSPERITY PARTNERSHIP (“LHPP”); PROVIDING THAT THE LHPP WILL ENDEAVOR TO IMPROVE THE HEALTH, WELLNESS AND ECONOMIC PROSPERITY OF ALL RESIDENTS OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL; PROVIDING THAT THE LHPP WILL INCLUDE THE PARTICIPATION OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS, RESIDENTS, STAKEHOLDERS AND EXPERTS TO HELP DEFINE AND REFINE THE FUTURE HEALTH AND PROSPERITY OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER MELISSA P. DUNN).

Attachments: [RES-21R-03-59-Lauderhill Health and Prosperity draft resolution.pdf](#)

[AR 21R-03-59](#)

This Resolution was approved on the Consent Agenda. (See Consideration of Consent Agenda for vote tally.)

XII QUASI-JUDICIAL MATTERS (IF NOT ON CONSENT AGENDA)

9. RESOLUTION NO. 21R-03-56: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA GRANTING THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE DEVELOPMENT ORDER TO OSCAR MENDEZ, M.D., P.A., SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS, TO ALLOW IN THE GENERAL COMMERCIAL (CG) ZONING DISTRICT AN OFFICE, MEDICAL WITH CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE PROVIDER ON 1.43± ACRE SITE AS LEGALLY DESCRIBED HEREIN AND MORE COMMONLY KNOWN AS 5950 WEST OAKLAND PARK BOULEVARD, LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attachments: [RES-21R-03-56-Special X - Oscar Mendez, MD.pdf](#)

[AR 21R-03-56](#)

[DRR \(21-SE-002\) OSCAR MENDEZ MD](#)

[\(21-SE-002\) SEU Conditions Affidavit, Oscar Mendez MD](#)

[Attachment A](#)

[Attachment B](#)

[Attachment C](#)

[Attachment D](#)

[Attachment E](#)

Mayor Thurston swore in all members of the public wishing to speak on the following quasi-judicial item.

Commissioner L. Martin wished the community to be informed as to what the subject resolution was about. This was a part of the City taking a strong stance on making sure properties providing medical services coming to Lauderhill were vetted well to ensure they were not functioning as pill mills, and this was something Lauderhill did, that many other cities did not; that is, go an extra step to verify they would not be operating anything sketchy in the City.

A motion was made by Vice Mayor D. Grant, seconded by Commissioner L. Martin, that this Resolution be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Vice Mayor D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin, Commissioner S. Martin, and Mayor K. Thurston

Abstain: 0

XIII QUASI-JUDICIAL MATTERS, FIRST READING

XIV QUASI-JUDICIAL MATTERS, SECOND READING

XV UNFINISHED BUSINESS

XVI OLD BUSINESS

XVII NEW BUSINESS

XVIII COMMUNICATIONS FROM PUBLIC OFFICIALS AT 9:00 PM, OR IMMEDIATELY BEFORE ADJOURNMENT, WHICHEVER SHALL FIRST OCCUR. IF AN ITEM OF LEGISLATION IS BEING DISCUSSED AT 9:00 PM, THE CHAIR MAY DELAY THESE COMMUNICATIONS UNTIL AFTER THE ITEM OF LEGISLATION HAS BEEN RESOLVED.

Commissioner L. Martin announced in the present week, the National League of Cities would hold their virtual conference that was usually hosted in Washington, D.C., and some of his fellow Commissioners and he were tuned in to the virtual conference. The American Rescue Plan passed in the Senate a few days ago that was currently before the House for a revote appeared to be a very well put together plan to address the needs of local municipalities. He passed the information on to staff, and the City was looking at possibly getting a share of \$65 billion going directly to local municipalities to replace much of the revenue lost over the past year as a result of the pandemic, and the funds would open some opportunities for residents and businesses, helping them to get back on their feet with the direct funding the City could provide.

Vice Mayor Grant mentioned being on the Broward County Water Advisory Board, and she was reminded of their rebate program, where one could purchase a toilet, have it installed, then go on the website conservationpays.com to get \$100.00 rebate; the program was for residents, businesses, and nonprofit organizations.

City Manager Giles-Smith affirmed the City participated in the program previously.

Vice Mayor Grant said they were working on another program that would replace the one mentioned above in about six months, whereby, cities would be identified, and then they could identify, in certain neighbors, certain neighborhood within their boundaries they felt would benefit from such a program.

XIX ADJOURNMENT - 10:21 PM