

City of Lauderhill

*City Commission Chambers at City Hall
5581 W. Oakland Park Blvd.
Lauderhill, FL, 33313
www.lauderhill-fl.gov*



Meeting Minutes - Draft

Monday, August 28, 2023

4:00 PM

City Commission Chambers

Community Redevelopment Agency Meeting (CRA)

CRA Executive Director Sean Henderson

LAUDERHILL CITY COMMISSION

Mayor Ken Thurston

Vice Mayor Sarai Martin

Commissioner Melissa P. Dunn

Commissioner Denise D. Grant

Commissioner Lawrence Martin

Desorae Giles-Smith, City Manager

Andrea M. Anderson, City Clerk

Angel Petti Rosenberg, City Attorney

I CALL TO ORDER

Vice Mayor S. Martin called to order the Regular Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) Meeting at 4:02 PM.

II ROLL CALL

- Present:** 4 - Commissioner Melissa P. Dunn, Commissioner Denise D. Grant, Commissioner Lawrence Martin, and Vice Mayor Sarai Martin
- Absent:** 1 - Mayor Ken Thurston

Vice Mayor S. Martin read into the record a letter from Mayor Thurston to the Commission and public regarding his absence from the present CRA meeting, stating he previously experienced some issues with his vision that led him to take a leave of absence. Unfortunately, he was experiencing the same issue, for which he recently had another procedure successfully performed to resolve the issue; he was now recovering well, as he was in great spirits and physically healthy otherwise. His vision for the City remained strong and clear, and he would return to the Commission on September 13, 2023, and until that time he was confident in his fellow Commissioners, and city staff to continue doing a great job for Lauderhill.

ALSO PRESENT:

Sean Henderson, Executive Director
Angel Petti Rosenberg, City Attorney
Constance Stanley, Police Chief
Andrea M. Anderson, City Clerk

HOUSEKEEPING

A motion was made by Commissioner M. Dunn, seconded by Commissioner L. Martin, to ACCEPT the Revised Version of the Community Redevelopment Agency Meeting Agenda for August 28, 2023. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin and Vice Mayor S. Martin

Abstain: 0

III CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA

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

Yes: 4 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin and Vice Mayor S. Martin

Abstain: 0

IV APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. MINUTES OF THE JUNE 26, 2023 COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) MEETING.

Attachments: [June 26, 2023 - CRA Meeting Minutes](#)

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

- B. MINUTES OF THE JULY 10, 2023 COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) MEETING.

Attachments: [July 10, 2023 - CRA Meeting Minutes](#)

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

V THIS WILL BE A LIMITED AGENDA MEETING. THE ONLY ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED WILL BE:

City Attorney Rosenberg stated items ten or 11 were taken off the agenda, but the agenda items were not renumbered after they were taken out.

ORDINANCES - FIRST READING

1. CRA ORDINANCE NO. CRA-230-08-100: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY APPROVING THE COMMERCIAL CONTRACT BETWEEN THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL AND S.E.F. HOLDINGS, INC. FOR THE PURCHASE OF COMMERCIAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1249-1281 N.W. 31st AVENUE AS LEGALLY DESCRIBED ON EXHIBIT "A" INCLUDING THE EQUIPMENT AND FIXTURES THEREON FOR THE PURCHASE PRICE OF \$3,700,000.00 PLUS CLOSING COSTS; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SEAN HENDERSON).

Attachments: [CRA-230-08-100-CRA Ord-Land Purchase-Wyngate Plaza.pdf](#)

[AR CRA ORD NO. 230-08-100](#)

[Wyngate Plaza-Commercial Contract \(V2\).pdf](#)

[Wyngate Plaza-EXHIBIT A \(4\).pdf](#)

Commissioner Dunn noticed the subject item was on the Commission agenda, asking this meant the item would be voted on twice.

City Attorney Rosenberg answered yes, as funding would come from both the CRA, and city funding.

Commissioner L. Martin asked for an explanation of the property the City sought

to purchase.

CRA Executive Director Sean Henderson explained the plaza on the subject property existed for a long time; it was located in the newly expanded Eastern CRA along NW 31st Avenue; the plaza had been a staple in the community for many years. The CRA felt the purchase was an opportunity to make a change along this corridor; there were some four or five different owners, so it was a complicated process, but the CRA was able to negotiate a deal with them that was very good from a value perspective. He said the property abutted the Swap Shop, and West Ken Lark community, and it was a great opportunity similar to when the City acquired the Mission Lake Plaza in the Central CRA. The CRA saw acquiring the property was a chance to help the businesses along the corridor, as well as to expand the CRA's scope, as this was on the boundary between Lauderhill and Fort Lauderdale, and there were many drives moving along that corridor. He said the acquisition would allow the City to address some of the nuisances along the corridor, including loitering, as well as do façade improvements.

Commissioner L. Martin questioned if the acquisition deal was highly likely to go through, as other similar deals failed in the past.

City Attorney Rosenberg indicated the due diligence and appraisal of the site was already done; in the past, the City sought to enter a contract before those were done. The subject property was being purchased for under the appraised value. The timeframe for completion of the deal was closing within 60 days after approval of the subject ordinance.

Commissioner Grant sought clarification on the benefits of the subject purchase for the surrounding community, and the achievement of the City's redevelopment goals.

Mr. Henderson replied, based on the communications with the businesses in the subject plaza, they wished to various issues addressed under the CRA's ownership, such as: loitering, drainage issues in the parking lot, the site abutting residential; the issues were similar to that seen at Mission Lakes Plaza.

Deputy City Manager/Finance Director Kennie Hobbs mentioned that the short term improvements to the building, (sod, driveway, etc.) after its purchase was not how staff intended for it to remain. The site would go through the planning process to determine what it would look like ultimately; as it was located along a commercial corridor, staff was exploring the commercial opportunities for the long term, such as providing a space to house the CRA, as well as offices to provide educational training by such entities as Broward College, along with other commercial uses such as restaurants. He said there was also the possibility of having mixed use of residential, a police substation, etc.

A motion was made by Commissioner M. Dunn, seconded by Commissioner L. Martin, that this Ordinance be approved on first reading to the Community Redevelopment Agency Meeting (CRA), due back on 9/14/2023. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin and Vice Mayor S. Martin

Abstain: 0

2. ORDINANCE NO. CRA-230-08-101: AN ORDINANCE OF THE LAUDERHILL COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) APPROVING THE "AS IS" RESIDENTIAL CONTRACT FOR SALE AND PURCHASE BETWEEN THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL AND SHANELL ROBERSON FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5731 N.W. 28TH STREET, LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA AS LEGALLY DESCRIBED IN THE CONTRACT FOR THE PURCHASE PRICE OF \$348,500.00; PROVIDING TERMS AND CONDITIONS; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE ANY DOCUMENTS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SEAN HENDERSON).

Attachments: [CRA-230-08-101-Ord-Purchase-Shanell Toberson.pdf](#)

[AR CRA ORD NO. 230-08-101](#)

[5731 NW 28 ST - Shanell Roberson](#)

[Shanell Roberson - Restrictive Covenant](#)

Commissioner Grant sought a brief presentation for the public's benefit, including the steps the CRA took to ensure the purchase price for the subject site was fair and reasonable.

Mr. Henderson reviewed the proposed item, as detailed in the backup, stating staff's practice was to appraise the homes every July to understand their value on the market; the prior set of homes sold were for \$310,000.00, so it was felt the proposed purchase price was a reasonable increase. The completion date was expected to be in 18 months, and staff received the keys the previous week when the house received its certificate of occupancy (CO). With the present first approval, staff expected the second approval on September 14 to allow the closing on September 15. The increase in property values was consider part of doing business.

Commissioner L. Martin wished it known to the public that over the course of the work, particularly as it took 18 months, there were cost increases for materials, etc. that led to cost increases. The homes were now worth more than they were originally estimated to be. His main concern was the profit the City and CRA anticipated making on these homes had been absorbed by the unexpected markups, etc. over the course of the last year.

Mr. Hobbs answered yes, but because of the increased value of the homes, the City anticipated receiving additional property tax revenues, as the adjustments would be made based on the true market value of the house.

Commissioner Dunn asked for the bottom line as to whether the CRA/City made or lost money.

Mr. Henderson thought moving fast, and getting houses sold was the nature of residential developments. In the subject case in this phase, the process moved slowly, partly due to going through the COVID-19 pandemic and the unavailability and/or escalated costs of materials. The existing homeowners were happy with the housing product the City built, and they felt like a community, and these were some of the intangible returns on the investment. He noted the final contract price of the home was \$348,500.00, and the original contract, plus the change orders totaled \$353,852.00, so just over a \$5,000.00 difference.

City Manager Giles-Smith remarked this was a neighborhood in which police and fire were called for service on a regular basis. The subject change to the community decreased the number of calls for service, and the quality of life for the residents improved significantly.

Commissioner Dunn pointed out that as the mission of the CRA was the ultimate redevelopment of the subject area, this was a growth and learning opportunity for the next phase.

A motion was made by Commissioner L. Martin, seconded by Commissioner M. Dunn, that this Ordinance be approved on first reading to the Community Redevelopment Agency Meeting (CRA), due back on 9/14/2023. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin and Vice Mayor S. Martin

Abstain: 0

- 3.** ORDINANCE NO. CRA-230-08-102: AN ORDINANCE OF THE LAUDERHILL COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) APPROVING THE "AS IS" RESIDENTIAL CONTRACT FOR SALE AND PURCHASE BETWEEN THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL AND ROAN DOWE AND BRIDGETTE GARWOOD FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5741 N.W. 28TH STREET, LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA AS LEGALLY DESCRIBED IN THE CONTRACT FOR THE PURCHASE PRICE OF \$348,500.00; PROVIDING TERMS AND CONDITIONS; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE ANY DOCUMENTS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SEAN HENDERSON).

Attachments: [CRA-230-08-102-Ord-Purchase-Dowe & Garwood.pdf](#)

[AR CRA ORD NO. 230-08-102](#)

[5741 NW 28 ST - Roan Dowe and Bridgette Garwood](#)

[Roan Dowe and Bridgette Garwood - Restrictive Covenant](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner L. Martin, seconded by Commissioner D. Grant, that this Ordinance be approved on first reading to the Community Redevelopment Agency Meeting (CRA), due back on 9/14/2023. The motion

carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin and Vice Mayor S. Martin

Abstain: 0

4. ORDINANCE NO. CRA-23O-08-103: AN ORDINANCE OF THE LAUDERHILL COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) APPROVING THE "AS IS" RESIDENTIAL CONTRACT FOR SALE AND PURCHASE BETWEEN THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL AND CASSANDRA BLACKMON FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5801 N.W. 28TH STREET, LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA AS LEGALLY DESCRIBED IN THE CONTRACT FOR THE PURCHASE PRICE OF \$348,000.00; PROVIDING TERMS AND CONDITIONS; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE ANY DOCUMENTS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SEAN HENDERSON).

Attachments: [CRA-23O-08-103-Ord-Purchase-Blackmon.pdf](#)

[AR CRA ORD NO. 23O-08-103](#)

[5801 NW 28 ST - Cassandra Blackmon](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner L. Martin, seconded by Commissioner D. Grant, that this Ordinance be approved on first reading to the Community Redevelopment Agency Meeting (CRA), due back on 9/14/2023. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin and Vice Mayor S. Martin

Abstain: 0

5. ITEM REMOVED

6. ORDINANCE NO. CRA-23O-08-105: AN ORDINANCE OF THE LAUDERHILL COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) APPROVING THE "AS IS" RESIDENTIAL CONTRACT FOR SALE AND PURCHASE BETWEEN THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL AND JALECIA K. MACK FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5821 N.W. 28TH STREET, LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA AS LEGALLY DESCRIBED IN THE CONTRACT FOR THE PURCHASE PRICE OF \$348,500.00; PROVIDING TERMS AND CONDITIONS; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE ANY DOCUMENTS NECESSARY; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SEAN HENDERSON).

Attachments: [CRA-23O-08-105-Ord-Purchase-Mack.pdf](#)

[AR ORD CRA NO. 23O-08-105](#)

[5821 NW 28 ST - Jalecia Mack](#)

[Restrictive Covenant - Jalecia Mack](#)

A motion was made by Commissioner L. Martin, seconded by Commissioner M. Dunn, that this Ordinance be approved on first reading to the Community Redevelopment Agency Meeting (CRA), due back on 9/14/2023. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin and Vice Mayor S. Martin

Abstain: 0

7. ITEM REMOVED

RESOLUTIONS

8. CRA RESOLUTION NO. 23R-08-11: A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE EMPLOYEE LEAVE BENEFIT POLICY FOR COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (CRA) EMPLOYEES; PROVIDING FOR PAID TIME OFF AND BEREAVEMENT BENEFITS; PROVIDING TERMS AND CONDITIONS; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SEAN HENDERSON).

Attachments: [CRA-23R-08-11- Employee Benefits.pdf](#)

[AR CRA RES. NO 23R-08-11](#)

[Item 1 - CRA EMPLOYEE LEAVE BENEFIT PROPOSAL](#)

Commissioner Grant understood that even though the CRA was part of the City, the agency was an entity in its own right. What the proposed resolution sought to accomplish was in line with industry standards, and best practices, so she thought having this in place would improve the CRA employees' work/life balance and their wellbeing.

Commissioner L. Martin asked that the Human Resources (HR) go back and look at the resolution's language to clarify to what "proof of" was referring to avoid any misinterpretations as to what was expected of them.

City Attorney Rosenberg explained the language was amended, as shown in the backup.

Mr. Henderson reviewed the proposed item, as detailed in the backup.

Vice Mayor S. Martin opened the discussion to the public; he received no input.

Mr. Henderson remarked the subject resolution was strongly needed, as two CRA employees experienced death in their family, but the existing rules had to be adhered to, and it was important to be able to give employees under such

circumstances the ability to take time off.

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

Yes: 4 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin and Vice Mayor S. Martin

Abstain: 0

9. CRA RESOLUTION NO. 23R-08-12: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF THE COMMERCIAL FAÇADE GRANT APPLICATION OF 38TH AVENUE WAREHOUSES, LLC REGARDING 1801-1821 N.W. 38TH AVENUE AND OF M&M COMMERCIAL REALTY, INC. REGARDING 1763-1799 N.W. 38TH AVENUE; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SEAN HENDERSON).

Attachments: [CRA-23R-08-12- Facade Grant Applications.pdf](#)

[AR CRA RES NO. 23R-08-12](#)

[CFG Lastrada 1801-1821](#)

[CFG Lastrada 1763-1799](#)

Commissioner Grant questioned the projected budget allocation for the CFG, and how would it be funded without compromising other essential projects and initiatives.

Mr. Henderson stated in prior approvals, there were CFG projects approved, and of that only one moved forward with their project. Of the remaining two candidates, one tried to use the funds just to replace windows to lower their insurance, which was not the objective of the program; with the other candidate, one of the stipulations of the grant was that the property could not be for sale, and the candidate tried selling the property to Mr. Henderson not knowing who he was. The CRA drafted letters, cancelling their grant funding.

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

Yes: 4 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin and Vice Mayor S. Martin

Abstain: 0

12. RESOLUTION NO. CRA-23R-08-10: A RESOLUTION AMENDING CRA-RESOLUTION NUMBER 23R-01-01 TO UPDATE THE PROPERTY TAX REIMBURSEMENT (PTR) PROGRAM TO AMEND THE GUIDELINES FOR DIRECT FINANCIAL INCENTIVES AS REFERENCED IN THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL STATE ROAD 7 COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT PLAN; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SEAN HENDERSON).

Attachments: [CRA-23R-08-10-Tax Incentive Program Amendment.pdf](#)
[AR CRA RES. NO 23R-08-10](#)
[RES CRA-23R-01-01 Property Tax Reimbursement \(PTR\) Program.pdf](#)
[Property Tax Reimbursement \(PTR\) Program REV 8-29-23](#)

Commissioner L. Martin asked for a brief summary of the proposed resolution, including if there was a dollar amount the applicants requested versus what the new chart numbers reflected, so there could be a point of reference.

Mr. Henderson noted at the last CRA meeting, there were two developments giving presentations on development along the corridor in the State Road 7 CRA. The CRA created a tax reimbursement that mimicked what other CRAs did to meet the developer in the middle. Staff was tasked by Commissioner Dunn to massage the numbers, so the CRA was not giving the house away, while incentivizing development of what the City desired. He said the first thing staff did was extend the term from seven to eight years, which was a compromise, as the request was for nine years; then staff frontloaded the reimbursement in the beginning to try to appease the developer on a cashflow basis to build what the City wished to see, while helping the developer on a financing and cashflow basis, and having that decrease over a period of time on the backend. It still remained at 75 percent, so the value was 75 percent of the taxes over that period of time.

Mr. Hobbs added that the original incentives included the impact fees and permit fees would be reimbursed at 50 percent; the subject resolution proposed changing the reimbursement for permit fees from 50 percent to 90 percent, with the understanding that in the agreement, the developers had to hire their own reviewers and inspectors, removing those costs from the City. The second change would be increasing the reimbursement for the impact fee from 50 to 75 percent, but the developer was still required to build whatever infrastructure improvements they needed in order to service their community. The goal was to establish something that was sustainable across the board for present and future redevelopments; before the plan was created, staff spoke about the requested and anticipated reimbursement numbers with the developers with projects in the subject area. He said it was up to the Commission to decide if any waivers would be allowed if requested by a developer. As his staff and he worked out the reimbursement numbers, and their impacts on the City's revenues, they would return before the CRA Board with more exact numbers.

Commissioner L. Martin asked about the timeframes.

Mr. Hobbs responded that in staff's discussions with some of the developers, the understanding was that the previous agreement had a date certain, realizing that each developer/development was different, such as developing a vacant lot versus redevelopment of a lot with an existing structure. In discussions with the City's legal staff, it was recommended that the additional language contained in the proposed resolution should be included.

Assistant City Attorney Davis-Walker explained it was based on the approval of

the second reading of the development agreement, which was six months in that timeframe, during which the developer should pull their permits and begin construction. This was not uncommon for larger multi-family developments that had mostly institutional investors/developers, as they had the financial backing purchase a five-acre lot, and time was money, so they were unlikely to intentionally delay their projects. He said there were annual callbacks of the developers of the large projects, and this was stated in the development agreement, which contained tiers for failing to start as promised. These were: going from 90 percent to 95 percent in year one; 85 percent to 95 percent in year two; 80 percent to 90 percent in year three; 75 percent to 90 percent in year four; 70 percent to 85 percent in year five; going to and staying at 65 percent in year six; year seven went from 60 percent to 50 percent; and year eight went from 25 percent to 40 percent.

Mr. Hobbs added that the impact fees went from 50 percent to 90 percent; the impact fees relating to the utility impact went from 50 percent to 75 percent.

City Attorney Rosenberg asked that when the resolution was passed, it should be as amended with the new percentage changes, as discussed.

Commissioner Dunn wished to make sure the CRA had something in writing requiring the developers hire local, or contract local; it was important for this to be some part of the agreement in which the developer was getting some form of tax break. They should make some type of commitment to the development of the City's economy and workforce.

City Attorney Rosenberg believed that in the special exception agreement there was currently some language on that point, but in each agreement there would be more detailed specifics in this regard.

Mr. Hobbs noted in recent conversations with the developers, a businessowner asked that the City identify certain types of work that it was possible for local vendors to undertake, as when large developers hired locally, they tended to focus on hiring them for maintenance staff. The skilled professionals, such as plumbers, electricians, etc. received no work. He asked Ms. Rosenberg to help his staff and he develop further language for inclusion in the development agreements; the latter was approved by the Commission in two readings.

Vice Mayor S. Martin opened the discussion to the public.

Jeremy Shir, land use attorney of record for the Arthouse project and Newrock, owner of the 1883 site, stated the applicant appreciated the efforts of staff meeting them halfway, as it was not just a matter of desire to develop, it was also whether the project could be financed. Even with the revised changes, the applicant's team had not had much time to review and analyze the project to determine if it would work. He said what the developers of both projects sought to make their projects financeable was something along the lines of a 20-year, close to 100 percent of the tax abatement, and the full reimbursement of permit and impact fees. They were very willing to include as a condition of approval in the development agreements that they would hire local vendors in a variety of

trained professionals to work on their projects. For the Arthouse project they were anticipating an additional \$3 million in consumer spending, half of which would take place within Lauderhill; this was based on an analysis by Gowman York. Mr. Shir mentioned that if the developers were going under the ten year, 100 percent tax abatement using the market rate, not affordable housing, they would be looking at an estimated taxable value after year 11 of \$2.1 million; after year 21, it was an estimated value of \$19 million, and after year 31, it was an estimated value of \$42 million. He said even though the City was giving up a higher percentage of tax revenue at the beginning to make the projects financeable, so they could be built, after 31 years, the City would have a site that was valued at \$42 million. They had to option to go the route of the Live Local Act (LLA) that allowed developers to circumvent many local government's requirements coming into their boundaries, this was not an option the subject developers wished to use. For example, for the Arthouse project, if the developer went the LLA route, it would reduce their total cost by \$26 million, and the retail could be reduced from 7,000 square feet to 1,500 square feet. He said if they went with the LLA, the taxable value after year 11 was \$4.3 million, but in year 21, that only went up to \$7 million, and after year 31, the taxable value was \$12 million. Mr. Shir said this was a fully affordable project, very few amenities, no art maker spaces, and his clients were very eager to build these projects, and both property owners were local, with Newrock located in Oakland Park, and the other developer was located in Hollywood.

City Attorney Rosenberg asked Mr. Shir to state the dollar value in tax abatements and fee waivers they sought from the City for each project.

Mr. Shir replied that he did not have those figures to hand with regard to the Tax Increment Financing (TIF).

Commissioner Grant sought more information on Mr. Shir mentioning the developer would improve the City's economy by \$3 million.

Mr. Shir replied this was the estimate of revenue the City would earn by attracting new residents at their income levels; the estimate was based on standards and consumer spending within the City, such as in restaurants, etc. The \$3 million was per year, half of which was estimated to be spent in Lauderhill.

Commissioner Grant remarked capital was very important, knowing that they had the money to continue the project. Once Mr. Shir provided the TIF numbers, the City would determine if this was workable, but the City sought to work wise and smart in creating agreements that worked best for the City, and for the developer.

Commissioner Dunn understood the developers' perspectives, which was the impetus for the Commission to direct staff to continue working to find a way for the developers and the City to meet in the middle. However, the applicant should understand that the elected officials, as legislators, would not have resident support for the City's granting 100 percent tax abatement, and in year one, the City going from 90 to 95 percent was the City meeting in the middle.

She questioned if there was an opportunity for the developer(s) and the City to meet in the middle, as it sounded as though the City was budging, but the developers were not. She could not support a 100-percent tax abatement request from the developers, and this was not something she believed the residents would support.

Mr. Shir understood, suggesting that maybe longer terms might offset that, but the developers' teams would need to analyze the project numbers some more.

Commissioner L. Martin said the proposed item being discussed did not include Mr. Shir's clients; it had nothing to do with what the two developers were asking for and he believed Mr. Hobbs stated there would be further discussions between staff and the developers. The Commission was considering passing a resolution that would affect post Arthouse, post Le Parc, etc.; these developments were already in a special category that the City was willing to work with the developers based on the special circumstances when their projects came onboard.

Hope Calhoun, land use attorney of record for the Arthouse, stated the developer's team recognized that the subject resolution before the Commission for consideration did not pertain to their project. However, they asked that some mention be made, either in the motion or somewhere else, so there was a record that her client's project was excluded, and treated differently. Additionally, she suggested the developers' teams and staff review the numbers to facilitate a better understanding of why they were making the ask they were making.

City Attorney Giles-Smith thought it very important that the Commission consider passing the subject resolution, as the development(s) was something that would affect the City for years once it was built. It was critical that the development projects attracted the right residents for Lauderhill and it was good to say a number of years, but she thought an amount should be tied to this, so if the developer reached the amount before the 20 years, then that was the amount they needed, and the City should consider the debt paid in full. This would act as a cap, as she did not think it should be open ended.

Commissioner Dunn concurred, stating 20 years was too long, and 100 percent tax abatement was not acceptable.

City Attorney Rosenberg reminded the Commission the cap was included in the details of the development agreement. When the development agreement was drafted, there was a dollar amount and language to the effect that once the dollar amount was met, it was either the term or when the amount was met.

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

Yes: 4 - Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner D. Grant, Commissioner L. Martin and Vice Mayor S. Martin

Abstain: 0

VI ADJOURNMENT - 5:24 PM