

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, April 28, 2025

6:00 PM

City Commission Chambers

City Commission Meeting

LAUDERHILL CITY COMMISSION

***Mayor Denise D. Grant
Vice Mayor Sarai "Ray" Martin
Commissioner Richard Campbell
Commissioner Melissa P. Dunn
Commissioner John T. Hodgson***

***Kennie Hobbs, Interim City Manager
Andrea M. Anderson, City Clerk
Hans Ottinot, Interim City Attorney***

I CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Grant called to order the Regular City Commission Meeting at 6:00 PM.

II ROLL CALL

Present: 5 - Commissioner Richard R. Campbell, Commissioner Melissa P. Dunn, Commissioner John T. Hodgson, Vice Mayor Sarai Martin, and Mayor Denise D. Grant

ALSO PRESENT:

Kennie Hobbs, Jr., Interim City Manager

Hans Ottinot, Interim City Attorney

Constance Stanley, Police Chief

Andrea M. Anderson, City Clerk

III COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC (AND CITY MANAGER RESPONSES TO THE PUBLIC, IF THE TIME PERMITS DURING THIS PORTION OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COMMISSION)**IV ADJOURNMENT (NO LATER THAN 6:30 PM)****I CALL TO ORDER OF REGULAR MEETING****II HOUSEKEEPING**

A motion was made by Vice Mayor S. Martin, seconded by Commissioner R. Campbell, to **ACCEPT** the Revised Version of the City Commission Meeting Agenda for April 28, 2025 and to move item 3 to be heard under Resolutions not on the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Commissioner R. Campbell, Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner J. Hodgson, Vice Mayor S. Martin, and Mayor D. Grant

Abstain: 0

III PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG FOLLOWED BY GOOD AND WELFARE**IV APPROVAL OF MINUTES****V PROCLAMATIONS / COMMENDATIONS (10 MINUTES MAXIMUM)**

A. A PROCLAMATION DECLARING APRIL 2025 AS AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH (REQUESTED BY VICE MAYOR SARAI "RAY" MARTIN).

VI PRESENTATIONS (15 MINUTES MAXIMUM)

- A. A PRESENTATION OF CITY'S CAPITAL PROJECTS (REQUESTED BY MAYOR DENISE D. GRANT).
- B. A PRESENTATION OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY FORUM (REQUESTED BY MAYOR DENISE D. GRANT).
- C. A PRESENTATION OF THE LAUDERHILL HEALTH AND PROSPERITY PARTNERSHIP (REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER MELISSA P. DUNN).

VII QUASI-JUDICIAL MATTERS

1. RESOLUTION NO. 25R-03-75: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF LAUDERHILL, FL GRANTING 441 CLINICAL TRIALS, LLC, A SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE DEVELOPMENT ORDER, WITH CONDITIONS, TO ALLOW AN OFFICE, MEDICAL, WITH CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE PROVIDER USE WITHIN THE GENERAL COMMERCIAL (CG) ZONING DISTRICT ON AN APPROXIMATELY 2.3± ACRE SITE LOCATED AT 2451 N. STATE ROAD 7, LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA, AS MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED HEREIN; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attachments: [25R-03-75 Resolution special exception 441 Clinical Trials LLC](#)

[AR 25R-03-75](#)

[25-SE-002 DRR 2451 N. State Road 7 - 441 Clinical Trials](#)

[Executed affidavit \(25-SE-002\) 441 Clinical Trials](#)

Mayor Grant mentioned the subject item was discussed previously before the Commission, including the applicants being present to address some of the concerns expressed by members of the Commission, resulting in the item being tabled for staff and the applicant to have further dialogue with individual members of the Commission.

City Planner Molly Howson presented the proposed resolution, as detailed in the backup, stating the subject resolution pertained to the applicant group, 441 Clinical Trials. She affirmed the Commission tabled the subject special use application two meetings ago to allow for the gathering of additional information, so the Commission had a firmer grasp of how the applicant's business operated before voting on the subject use.

Moody Dubreuze, partner, 441 Clinical Trials, stated his was a professional with a longstanding relationship with the City, and for many years he contributed to Lauderhill, not just as a healthcare provider, but as an educator, and advocate. In 1992 he worked at Lauderhill Paul Turner Elementary School as a music teacher, a position he held until 2004; during summer breaks, he worked as a site coordinator for Lauderhill's Parks & Recreation Department. He noted that in 2004, he embarked on a new journey as an entrepreneur with his first mobile medical diagnostic imaging service in partnership with Dr. Rodney as his medical director. In 2020, during the pandemic, he seized the opportunity have a fixed site diagnostic imaging center in Lauderhill, which was a win/win for him in light of his familiarity with working in Lauderhill. He worked closely with local clinics and diagnostic centers, providing X-rays, MRIs, and clinical insight to

countless patients in this area. Mr. Dubreuze stated the subject project was very personal to him, as he understood the needs of the Lauderhill community, so 441 Clinical Trials was not just a business, it was a mission to bring access to cutting edge research, dignity, care, and trustworthy medical guidance to the Lauderhill public.

Mr. Pestana, Business Developer Manager, 441 Clinical Trials, understood when the subject item was last discussed by the Commission at a previous meeting, at which he was not present, there were some doubts, numerous questions, along with issues with clarity with regard to what the applicant would bring to Lauderhill. He gave a PowerPoint presentation to address the various questions and concerns, as provided in the backup, highlighting the following:

- The goal was to carry out clinical studies in Lauderhill
- The site was where clinical trials would be conducted; this would take place under supervision; the process included a protocol for the clinical trial authorized by the Federal Drug Administration (FDA) through the sponsor, which, in this case, was the pharmaceutical company
- Pharmaceutical companies sought a variety of sites based on ethnicity and other demographics with regard to the focus on a particular health issue(s)
- Clinical research studied people to understand health and the disease, helping the way doctors treated people, subsequently improving patients' lives
- Clinical trials were a critical piece of any type of medication utilized in the world
- There were four phases in clinical trials, the first focused on animal and other testing; the applicant's business engaged in stages two to four; that is, working with various sample sizes of humans to determine how the medicine worked
- If a clinical study required 500 people, the applicant's site would not work with that number of persons, as pharmaceutical companies worked with numerous sites in a variety of locations based on demographics, etc.; the goal was to get a variety of sample sizes to learn how medications worked on patients
- The focus of clinical trials included Type 2 diabetes, hypertension, gout, rheumatoid arthritis, heart burn, obesity, psoriasis, cardiovascular, irritable bowel syndrome, and asthma
- Informed consent was a part of the clinical research process, during which persons considering participating in a clinical trial were provided with study information before making their decision to participate; the documentation provided important information about taking part in the study, describing what would happen in the study, who could join the study, how much of the participants time the study would take, any payments/costs, and known benefits and risks for participating
- Other ways for potential participants in clinical trials to get information included the website www.clinicaltrials.gov where all clinical trials were published, along with protocols, and types of participants they sought for each trial
- Prior to giving signed consent, an individual discussed the study with staff; anyone signing a consent could withdraw from a study at any point in time without liability
- What took place during each trial depended on the protocol for a study
- Participating in a clinical trial was seen as a way to get free treatment for persons without insurance, those wishing to improve their lives
- Data was collected based on the protocol; methods included via surveys, questionnaires, bloodwork, MRIs, samples from diaries, etc.; all the time spent

on methodologies was paid for by the pharmaceutical company

- Participants were identified by working with local physicians, as patients did not just arrive at the facility and voice their wish to volunteer for a clinical trial
- Depending on the clinical trial, participants had to meet different requirements or inclusions 100 percent; once it was established that the requirements were met for a participant, the information was submitted to the pharmaceutical entity, who then sent the information to the International Review Board (IRB) that was controlled by the FDA for approval
- Sponsors from the pharmaceutical companies did regular checks of clinical trial facilities to ensure protocol were in place and guidelines were adhered to
- Every time a participant came in, the information was entered into a portal; the information came from their doctor(s) even if they brought their medical records
- The facility worked with doctors when a trial required sub-investigators, and doctors were notified when a patient was taking part in a trial to get their approval prior them participating in the trial; upon getting the doctor's approval, the facility worked with the doctor to monitor whatever was going on to ensure the participant was well; the health of the patient was the most important priority
- Components of the site was comprised of: principal investigators, sub-investigators, clinical research coordinators, nurses, pharmacists, lab technicians, and administrative staff
- The reason for the space of 800 square feet was due to the fact that no more than five to six patients were seen a day to ensure the quality of the service.

Mayor Grant wished to know the specific location of 411 Clinical Trials.

Mr. Pestana replied 2451 N State Road 7, Lauderhill.

Ms. Howson added that the site was located on the west side of the street, immediately north of the Village Center in an L-shaped plaza that contained a number of restaurants, as well as an MRI business that the applicant's site sat next to.

Mayor Grant recalled one of the Commission's expressed concerns was the fact that Dr. Rodney lived in Orlando, hence his ability to be readily onsite. She sought an explanation as to what staffing at the facility would look like on a daily basis.

Dr. Rodney responded that the applicant was awaiting Commission approval; when this was secured, he would be present at the subject facility full time; he had to be onsite for the protocols to take place; thus, without his presence, no trials could take place. With regard to everyday staffing, there would likely be four to five persons present each day: a doctor, nurse, medical aide, and secretary.

Mayor Grant sought confirmation that if any participant had an adverse reaction to one of the clinical tests, there would be sufficient medical staff present daily, along with the appropriate equipment to address such instances.

Dr. Rodney stressed that the most important part of doing clinical trials was the protocols, and everything was included in the protocol, including what staff should do in the event any complications arose. Pharmaceutical companies,

with the FDA's approval, dictated the protocols that included any possible complications that could arise, and how to deal with such situations.

Mayor Grant mentioned medication advertisements frequently included a list of possible side effects, and oftentimes persons might not know if they were allergic to certain medication(s), so her concern was that there would be sufficient, and properly qualified staff present to deal with instances where someone had an adverse reaction.

Dr. Rodney remarked it was the lack of treatment that usually led to complications, not the actual treatment.

Mayor Grant felt perplexed at how the system worked with the number of patients present daily at the facility, and the fact that they were being paid by the applicant.

Mr. Pestana responded that with the need for them to collect extensive data from the participants, there was a significant amount of data entry, as well as the numerous protocols they had to comply with; thus, a lot was taking place behind the scene. The facility would receive kits containing all the necessary information for the particular clinical trial to ensure the facility had everything that was needed, that it was secure, and all the controls were in place. He said the pharmaceutical companies requested that all data be entered manually, printed out, and filed away securely in binders. With regard to possible adverse reactions to trial medication, part of the protocol required the facility to keep persons taking medication to remain onsite for the set period of time to ensure there were no adverse reactions. Much of the testing for adverse reactions was done during phase one, as mentioned earlier in the presentation.

Mayor Grant questioned if participants in clinical trials followed up with their doctor after the trial was over, and did the applicant's facility have a system in place that did patient follow up.

Mr. Pestana restated, depending upon the protocol for the particular trial, their follow up could be on a daily to weekly basis, and facility staff was in constant communication with participants' doctor.

Mayor Grant wondered how the protocols were affected if a participant had no medical insurance, and no primary care doctor.

Mr. Pestana responded the review for such participants would be more extensive, and their follow up would be daily, including giving them the 800 number they could call 24 hours a day, seven days a week to communicate with the facility's doctor. If a participant was experiencing issues after the fact, they were usually instructed to go to the emergency room (ER) or call 911, and a representative of their facility followed up to find out exactly what the situation was. This had not yet happened, as the protocols were very strict, controlled, and thorough.

Mayor Grant asked about measures put in place to ensure none of the participants abused the medications being administered in the trial.

Mr. Pestana explained in the trials, the medication schedule was explained specifically, so participants understood exactly how they were to take the medication. He, too, would be onsite at the proposed facility.

Mayor Grant wished to know if the subject medical trials model was a new concept.

Mr. Pestana answered no. He knew the doctor who would oversee the facility had previous experience conducting clinical trials at hospitals and universities, as they took place at hospitals, universities, and other areas of the private sector.

Dr. Rodney explained as part of one's residency program, doctors were required to gain experience conducting clinical trials. Since completing his residency, he had not continued with clinical trials, but he worked in a hospital and in a family practice environment; doctors were already licensed to conduct clinical trials.

Commissioner Campbell recalled that one of the issues with the previous presentation was the difficulty the Commission had in understanding how the facility would conduct business; he believed this was due to a problem in the communication of information to the Commission. However, Mr. Pestana's presentation made it very clear, asking if the applicant was aware of the fact that due to history, some members of the Commission were somewhat hesitant when it came to minorities and clinical work. He said this anxiety, and the complexity of the business made it difficult for the Commission to digest the information at the previous meeting.

Mr. Pestana understood.

Commissioner Campbell thought it necessary for the public to understand the applicant did not intend to only work with Lauderhill residents, rather they were open to anyone.

Mr. Pestana concurred.

Commissioner Campbell remarked he now felt much more comfortable, as the testing was not based on the applicant's program, rather in doing business, they would be following a strict protocol in which they executed the testing, but all aspects of the process would be overseen by an external entity. Clinical trials were not unique to the proposed business, rather there were thousands of such trials conducted on a regular basis. He said the public, in general, took a lot for granted, and were it not for clinical trials, many medications would not be available, some of which were very compatible with people of color, and conducting the trials among members of the surrounding population allowed the field of medicine to determine the impact on people of color versus other groups. The presentation articulated by the applicant at the present meeting clarified his understanding of the need for such work, and with the consent protocols in place, people entered into such trials voluntarily.

Vice Mayor Martin sought clarification on the process of recruiting test participants.

Mr. Pestana replied that one method was to conduct promotions to recruit test participants, and it was possible for a patient to come to the facility to find out more about a test trial they learned about, as every participant had to meet certain inclusions. One such inclusion was to allow blood work to be done to ensure participants met the requirements stipulated by the FDA and pharmaceutical companies.

Commissioner Hodgson asked about the daily hours of operation.

Mr. Pestana responded that it depended on the trial itself, the number of patients involved, and the complexity. Some trials required more legwork to be done, so it could be five to eight hours a day.

Mayor Grant understood with some trials, participants were paid, asking if the applicant would be doing this.

Mr. Pestana stated the pharmaceutical companies provided funds to participants for volunteering to participate; the funds could be in the form of a gift card, a check, through Zelle, etc.; it would be paid to the patient by the applicant.

Commissioner Dunn accepted that clinical trials were critical to having new medications on the market. Her challenge with the presentation at the previous meeting was that it did not appear to articulate a clear strategy, business plan, and how the applicant would ensure the work being done would be in the best interest of the community. She read the applicant's proposal prior to the present meeting, and Mr. Pestana's presentation answered her remaining questions.

Mayor Grant opened the discussion to the public.

Varion Harris, Lauderhill resident, observed that the applicant stated in their presentation that their protocols for clinical trials had yet to be approved for the subject site. He claimed for this to take place, the applicant had to go through a three-stage approval process by the FDA, the Institutional Review Board (IRB), and the Florida Department of Regulations; thus, the applicant had yet to come before the Commission with a clear protocol.

Ms. Howson stated the protocols for each clinical trial was provided by the pharmaceutical companies that dictated all aspects of how trials were conducted. The City had to rely on the doctors of the facility to enforce and execute those steps as required. Unless trials were FDA approved, they would not get to the applicant's facility.

Alan Brown, Lauderhill resident, said he did not understand why everything new came to town had to come to Lauderhill. With regard to satisfying demands, it seemed the applicant's daily staff of four was inadequate, considering the health challenges people faced. He did not like the City of Lauderhill being a playground for experimentation; what was needed was quality healthcare,

urging the Commission to do their due diligence about this.

An unidentified female speaker mentioned being involved in clinical trials, asking if the protocol was approved for Lauderhill in terms of looking at the medications being used, the recruitment process, particularly if payment was involved in an area with vulnerable people.

Mr. Pestana replied the protocol was different for each clinical trial, so the applicant had no protocol approvals, as the subject business had yet to be established. Once their facility became operational, they could conduct clinical trials; the clinicaltrials.gov website showed all the approved clinical trials being conducted, including the protocols for each trial. He said if the pharmaceutical company awarded their facility a clinical trial, they had to follow the protocols established via approval of the FDA, IRB, etc. for the particular clinical trial.

The speaker said regardless of the established protocols for each clinical trial, there still needed to be a review process to ensure vulnerable populations in the area in which the facility was situated were not at risk, particularly for trials that paid participants, even if they signed a consent form.

Mr. Pestana explained part of the informed consent process was explaining, for example, any possible side effects of the drug(s) the participant had to take. He clarified that their facility did not establish protocols; the clinical trials they would conduct had protocols that were already established through the approval process via the FDA and IRB. Their facility would only be bringing the approved trials to the community to offer the opportunity to participate to interested and qualified persons who met the established criteria for the specific trial. All the information for each trial was public, and could be found on clinicaltrials.gov.

The speaker said she was satisfied with the safeguard of the IRB being one of the bodies granting protocol approvals.

Mayor Grant received no further input from the public.

A motion was made by Vice Mayor S. Martin, seconded by Commissioner R. Campbell, that this Resolution be approved. The motion failed by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner R. Campbell, Commissioner J. Hodgson, and Vice Mayor S. Martin

No: 2 - Commissioner M. Dunn, and Mayor D. Grant

Abstain: 0

2. RESOLUTION NO. 25R-04-86: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA, GRANTING SALMOS 23 NO. 8, LLC, A SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE DEVELOPMENT ORDER, WITH CONDITIONS, TO ALLOW A SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL FACILITY (CATEGORY 3 WITH 128 BEDS) IN THE RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY (RM-18) ZONING DISTRICT ON AN APPROXIMATELY 4.09± NET ACRE SITE, LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS THE CALCUTTA FIRST ADDITION PLAT, A PORTION OF TRACT B AS RECORDED IN THE OFFICIAL

RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA IN PLAT BOOK 80 PAGE 17, MORE COMMONLY KNOWN AS 2801 NW 55 AVENUE, LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attachments: [25R-04-86 Resolution Special Exception ALF Salmos 23](#)

[AR 25R-04-86](#)

[Attachment A - SEU Application](#)

[Attachment B - Applicant Narrative](#)

[Attachment C - Floor Plan](#)

[Attachment D - Development Review Report \(DRR\) 25-SE-001 - Salmos](#)

[Attachment E - Public Notice Affidavit \(unsigned\)](#)

[Attachment F - SEU Conditions Affidavit \(unsigned\)](#)

[SIGNED Attachment F - SEU Conditions Affidavit \(SIGNED\)](#)

Ms. Howson reviewed the proposed resolution, as detailed in the backup, stating the assisted living facility (ALF) would remain under a new owner; per city code, this use could not change owners without the new owner applying for a special exception approval from the City Commission. She said the footprint of the facility would change; the current number of beds was 105, and the applicant wished to increase that number to 128; they previously had room choices, and the plan was to add beds to the larger rooms. The applicant would still meet the state requirement for the number of square feet needed per person; their total capacity would still need approval through their state licensure, as well as their fire capacity; city fire staff found the increase in beds appropriate to meet fire code requirements.

Interim City Attorney Ottinot swore in persons wishing to speak on the subject item.

Mayor Grant asked if there would be any other changes to the subject facility with regard to infrastructure, and programming.

Magda Robelo, the applicant's representative, stated the plan was only to increase to the number of beds without any other changes to the facility; though many improvements to the facility were already made, there was no plan to do any construction to enlarge the existing structure. She translated the owner's introduction commentary to the Commission, stating she purchased her first ALF in 2003, and to date they had seven ALFs with a total of 500 beds. Their ALF was named Psalms 23, and her hope was always to give those she served quality of life, and when she brought her business to a community, it was to help the residents, and give them the quality of life they deserved. She distributed photographs of the improvements they made to the subject ALF; she purchased the facility six months ago.

Mayor Grant restated her question as to other planned changes to programming/staff.

Ms. Robelo replied there would be education, replacement of furniture, and an

increase in cleaning staff.

Mayor Grant asked if all 105 beds were occupied.

Ms. Robelo responded 90 beds were filled, but she anticipated an increased need at the facility; she intended to have a section focused on memory care.

Mayor Grant mentioned visiting the subject facility a number of times, and she spoke with residents on at least two occasions via one of the City's programs, Teatime with Seniors. She said the facility under the previous owner did fairly well, so she thought what the new owner planned to implement, with the services provided was an improvement

Ms. Robelo stated when the facility was opened, she would do an open house, and invite the members of the Commission to visit the site.

Mayor Grant wished to know more about the planned memory care programming.

Ms. Robelo said, physically, patients receiving this care would be in a closed section with specific access; the programming included: activities with music, yoga, etc. that would enhance patients' lives.

Ms. Howson noted staff recommended approval, as the previous operators ran the facility responsibly, and the new owner continued to communicate with city staff over the last few months, and the reports from fire staff were good; the facility complied with all the City's standards.

Vice Mayor Martin asked if ALFs were part of the City's code enforcement's minimum housing inspection.

Interim City Manager Hobbs replied they were not part of the City's minimum housing inspection, but they were subject to an annual fire inspection, and an annual business COU license inspection.

Commissioner Campbell asked if the memory care portion of the applicant's service included an independent living aspect.

Ms. Robelo answered no; they only provided ALF services.

Mayor Grant opened the discussion to the public; she received no input.

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

Yes: 5 - Commissioner R. Campbell, Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner J. Hodgson, Vice Mayor S. Martin, and Mayor D. Grant

Abstain: 0

VIII CONSENT AGENDA

IX RESOLUTIONS (IF NOT ON CONSENT AGENDA)

4. RESOLUTION NO. 25R-04-88: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO RETAIN A FINANCIAL EXPERT OR CONSULTANT TO CONDUCT A FORENSIC AUDIT OF GRANT FUNDS AWARDED TO THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL BY U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES ("HHS") BASED ON A REPORT ISSUED BY THE INTERIM CITY MANAGER TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE GRANTS, POLICIES AND THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL; PROVIDING THE INTERIM CITY MANAGER AND INTERIM CITY ATTORNEY WITH THE AUTHORITY TO DO ALL THINGS TO EFFECTUATE THIS RESOLUTION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER RICHARD CAMPBELL).

Attachments: [25R-04-88 Grant Audit Resolution-LHPP-4-29-25.revised](#)

[AR 25R-04-88](#)

[Exhibit A to Audit Resolution Re LHPP](#)

Commissioner Campbell mentioned on the past Monday, the Commission had the first opportunity to hold a public discussion on the issue of the remaining COVID funds that totaled \$3.8 million; he gave a brief historic recap of the COVID 19 pandemic, its effects on people's lives, and the government funding provided to help address the post-pandemic effects. Going through the Lauderhill community, of great importance was what government at all levels - city, county, state, and federal - could do to help them meet their daily and monthly expenses. He noted that since November 2024, he began tracking the Commission meetings with regard to the \$3.8 million, and what he found frightening was what he received when he requested information on those funds; that is, the extent to which no one knew. Since that time, he fought to get documents to give him a peak into the matter; it was like pulling teeth, and eventually he received a document that indicated what happened to almost \$4 million that no one was able to explain, and after receiving a printout, he was told by someone that it was a lie, which to him meant that the person was inferring the City provided a lie. He said salaries of over half a million dollars were paid, but it was unclear to whom the funds were paid; other amounts included a fringe benefit of \$275,000.00, and \$2 million for supplies. Commissioner Campbell stated that as the pandemic progressed, the federal government made most things free, so he was surprised to see \$2 million for supplies for a city with a population of less than 75,000 people. He said the worst part of the situation was that no one could say they ever saw the supplies, or their distribution; he was a Lauderhill resident, and he received no supplies, and he had yet to come across anyone who received any supplies from the City. These difficult questions continued to be asked, and in addition to the printout, he received a two-side list of city employees who should have received some of those funds; he would not reveal the names of the employees on the list, as it was unfair to them, particularly since they did not receive the funds.

He noted there were employees from various city departments who were paid up to \$200,000.00, based on the very extensive list he reviewed, and he recently learned some persons were paid a second time, which caused more confusion on the matter. Commissioner Campbell mentioned a discussion between Mr. Hobbs and him a few weeks prior, and he indicated that there was a problem, referring to the abovementioned list he received. There were those in the audience who asked him why he was keeping them in the dark, to which he said he, too, was in the dark, and two weeks after that the Commission was told that the grants were frozen, and a report would soon be issued, which they did receive. He said the contents of the report made the situation worse, as what was understood was that the Grants Division that was under the Finance Department was moved to administration, so no one knew how the subject funds the City received were collected and delivered. This was unacceptable for any city to be utilizing funds through that city with no oversight, or accountability; the Grants Division was now back under the Finance Department; he asked if there were now protocols in place within the Grants Division that determined how monies came in, and were disbursed.

Director Intergovernmental Affairs Zach Davis-Walker explained there were protocols that were specific to each grant, specifying the reporting requirements, and the City had procurement guidelines for the expenditure of all city funds, whether they were General Fund or grant dollars.

Commissioner Campbell questioned if these protocols were followed as they related to COVID dollars.

Mr. Davis-Walker was unable to speak to that, as in the capacity he worked with the City at that time, he was not privy to that information.

Commissioner Campbell asked if Mr. Davis-Walker knew of anyone in the City who knew the protocols that were followed.

Mr. Davis-Walker mentioned Operations Administrator Yolanda Todd could respond to the matter.

Mayor Grant commented, as the present conversation continued, she wished it to be clear that, as it related to positions, Mr. Davis-Walker was a city attorney with the City at the time in question.

Mr. Davis-Walker affirmed, stating at that time his main duties involved drafting resolutions, ordinances, grant agreements, etc.

Operations Administrator Yolanda Todd, Finance Department, stated she could speak to the procurement protocols; that is, how the vendors were procured, and how the dollars were spent. For the most part, with a few exceptions, the protocols for disbursement were adhered to.

Commissioner Campbell noted Nova Southeastern University (NSU) received \$632,000.00, asking what NSU did to receive those funds.

Ms. Todd clarified that they received \$662,491.91; the funds that were paid to

NSU were for a minority servicing institution for the scope of work sent out to them, which included doing some reporting for the grant.

Commissioner Campbell wished to know if the City received a report for the funds paid.

Ms. Todd explained she could not speak to that outcome, as it was no longer a procurement matter.

Interim Finance Director Sean Henderson stated that at the time the administration of that grant did not fall under the Finance Department, though in December the latter was involved in submitting for reimbursements.

Commissioner Campbell observed that since the subject inquiries began, no one from the City appeared to have contacted Nova to clarify how the funds were spent. He asked if the job was too big to handle by the City's Marketing Department; at the last Commission meeting he recalled the City handled millions of dollars to date.

Mr. Hobbs affirmed this to be the case.

Commissioner Campbell remarked that despite the City already paying competent staff, when the City received the subject grant, the decision was made that those staff were not capable of handling the grant, so a private organization was given the job, paying them almost a million dollars to administer the grant.

Mr. Henderson answered yes.

Commissioner Campbell asked if this had not bothered anyone at the City.

Mr. Hobbs commented it was important to note that the individuals handling the subject grant were no longer working with the City; thus, the questions being asked of current staff were matters that were neither decided nor discussed with them.

Commissioner Campbell stated, most recently, there was a disagreement that eventually allowed staff to research the matter that led to the discovery of some information, and at that time, the director of the department left. What was now left that bothered him was that there was an individual he knew personally who owned a mom and pop business received a total of \$73,794.84 for what he did not know. Some gift cards were purchased by a company worth \$256,245.75, yet it appeared no one received the gift cards. He said staff were unable to tell him when the gift cards came to the City, and how they were distributed; these were just some of the items before him; CompCare Medical Center received \$169,853.16 for COVID vaccine and testing, which he found amazing, as at that time, the federal government made free testing and vaccinations available to all persons in the U.S., and this took place post COVID. Additionally, there were schools, community centers, temples, synagogues, etc. where the City could have organized testing and vaccinations; and CompCare's work was done in Oakland Park, not Lauderhill. He noted \$57,000.00 was spent on printing and

mailing of a magazine; money went to experts at NSU hired to administer the grant; they received \$932,000.00, and salaries of \$358.00 paid to no identified person; the list went on and on. Commissioner Campbell noted that what the report revealed was that in addition to all the abovementioned information, the City now owed \$1.6 million, and the experts explained that when a grant was applied for, then awarded, the total funds were not disbursed at once, rather, it was given incrementally. After the first disbursement was given, before subsequent ones were made, there had to be an accounting of how the first disbursement was spent, and apparently this protocol was not followed, for which no explanation was given. He understood the grant dollars should have been fully awarded and utilized by 2023, but this was not done, which led to some funds being taken from the City; Lauderhill's taxpayers now had to pay back the \$1.6 million. Nothing in the report indicated any group of folks in Lauderhill benefited. Again, he was mystified as to how NSU, one of the richest institutions in South Florida, came to receive the City's grant dollars without providing the City any details as to how those funds were utilized. Some Lauderhill schools struggled to reopen after the pandemic, and some of the City's children went without food; despite explanations at the Commission workshop about restrictions on how the funds could be spent, etc., nothing indicated the funds were used in Lauderhill for any purpose for which it was intended. He commented that no creative ways were devised to get some of the grant funding to help Lauderhill's children in need; none of the City's schools, children, or nonprofit organizations serving Lauderhill residents received any of the grant dollars; it seemed only entities that were already rich received the funds. If this was not upsetting to anyone in Lauderhill, they should have their head examined, as this was unacceptable, and it should be said loudly to the persons who did this, "Shame, shame, shame on you." Commissioner Campbell stated the resolution before the Commission was to reset the clock, and ensure this never occurred again, and that all monies coming into the City should be dealt with appropriately; the resolution called for the hiring of a forensic auditor to determine what really happened. As the City did not have such experts on staff, it was recommended that an outside, independent audit be conducted to look into how the monies were spent. Despite what was being said on social media, the Commission was not going after any particular individuals, as the Commission did not know who was responsible; this was the purpose of the independent audit, and the findings would be provided to the public eventually. He noted the City needed to determine how to recoup the \$1.6 million Lauderhill's taxpayers were being asked to pay to bridge the gap. He understood the City was trying to contact the grantors, with the hope of getting back the \$1.6 million.

Commissioner Dunn sought to clarify some points for the record, which she already clarified during the recent Commission workshop. First, the \$3.8 million awarded to Lauderhill was intended to do a very specific thing; it was the Advancing Health Literacy Grant, funded through the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (HHS), and it was to develop, and disseminate health information around the COVID vaccine. She stated that at the time in 2021, there was a lot of medical distrust around the pandemic, and the federal administration at the time issued the grant to a number of cities around the nation, of which Lauderhill was one. In order for a city to apply, they had to have certain things in place: work with a minority-serving educational institution

capable of doing research, of which NSU and Broward College (BC) filled that criterion; as NSU was one of the founding cochairs of the Lauderhill Health & Prosperity Partnership (LHPP), they were already at the table. Thus, including them in the grant application made sense. Commissioner Dunn said there was a procurement process that included NSU coming before the Commission to be awarded the contract, during which she recused herself from the vote, as she had a prior relationship from NSU; the matter passed 4-0, and two members of the current Commission, Mayor Grant and Vice Mayor Martin, voted to approve NSU. Additionally, as this was a health communication contract/grant, at the time the City lacked the capacity, and Lauderhill, like several cities in a similar situation, went through a competitive bidding process, from which S. Nelson & Associates was accepted. As she knew, and previously worked with S. Nelson & Associates, out of an abundance of caution again, she abstained from the vote. Commissioner Dunn agreed the report did reveal some challenges, and she had questions for Mr. Hobbs, asking who administered the subject grant funding.

Mr. Hobbs replied the grant was administered by then Grants Division staff.

Commissioner Dunn wished to know who was responsible for every check that was cut for payment from the subject grant.

Mr. Hobbs explained the department administering the grant was responsible for ensuring that the information received was signed off on; Finance cut checks based on the documentation received from the grant administrator.

Commissioner Dunn noted the third paragraph of the same page where it said grants administered by LHPP should be audited, she wished LHPP to be removed, and the language should say that all grants received by the City from 2020 to 2025 should be subject to an independent audit. The current language read as though only grants involving the LHPP should be audited. She recommended specific language as follows: Objectives: 1) the audit should assess adherence to grant agreements, and guidelines; 2) evaluate the accuracy of financial reporting and document; 3) analyze fund utilization in relation to program outcome and objectives; 4) evaluate the effectiveness of fund utilization in achieving specific program outcomes, as outlined in the grant agreement, including assessment and performance metrics; 5) identify areas of improvement for best practices. In terms of deliverables: 1) a detailed audit report summarizing findings, compliance issues, and best practices; 2) recommendations for improving fund management, and program effectiveness; 3) a follow-up action plan. Commissioner Dunn said she agreed with Commissioner Campbell that there were clearly some failures, and that there should be a forensic audit; the audit should be done, not as a punitive measure, but from a place of discovering to where \$1.6 million disappeared. She suggested that not only should whoever the City hired be a forensic auditor, they should be an expert in grant management with expertise in managing state, federal, local, and private foundational dollars. She believed that if this person had some process improvement background, whether they came from Kaiser, etc., they could give the City a detailed report of where the breakdown in the process took place, looking at best practices of other cities around the nation to see where opportunities for improvement were for Lauderhill. Commissioner Dunn

recommended an amendment to the subject resolution, specifically page one of two of the resolution, the language in the second paragraph was inaccurate, as the grant was managed by the City's Grants Division, so she wished the inaccurate language struck out.

Mayor Grant concurred with her colleagues, stating \$1.6 million was a significant amount of dollars, and she found the subject situation disheartening, as she was very connected with the City's seniors, religious leaders, etc., and she was well aware of Lauderhill residents struggling to make ends meet, paying their monthly bills, etc. Sometimes elected officials felt powerless to help, as there were no programs through which to help them, and now she learned that \$1.6 million was missing. As the City's Mayor, it was difficult to be before the Lauderhill public and not have answers; no member of the dais was represented in a positive light in the subject situation. Another matter that came to her attention was that Lauderhill received a letter from the Governor's Office, as did many other Florida cities, inquiring about funds were being spent; the City was again notified of the Governor sending another letter of inquiry in relation to how grant dollars were spent. She believed the subject resolution and matter of discussion arose due to the need to find out what the exact situation was, so she supported the need to have an independent audit. Mayor Grant noted she did vote on the funding for NSU, and she had many questions at the time the matter came before the Commission for consideration; she voted on the matter because of the City's procurement process, which usually took 15 to 30 days, and NSU had only five days. NSU was being hired to do research, for which she was agreeable, as it was not possible to get statistics without research and gather data. She saw nothing about the other bidders, etc., so she would not comment on such matters, but if the company hired did the right thing, then they did the right thing. She concurred with the request to conduct an independent, forensic audit, adding that it was very important to understand the organizational chart at the time when such decisions were made, and the current city management staff were in the Finance Department, not the Grants Division where such decisions were made.

Commissioner Dunn asked if when a vendor received payment for services, was Finance staff required to submit a report as to the outcome of those services.

Mr. Hobbs explained it depended on the funder; most of the City's federal grants did not require the local government to provide details of how those dollars were spent, rather it was about the total dollars spent in accordance with the proposed budget.

Commissioner Dunn understood, but she knew goals were set as to the number of people reached; she found it hard to believe that city staff could find no outcome report, which she and other commissioners were asking for as to the results of the use of the funds.

Mr. Hobbs indicated he had city staff review the existing files, and current grants staff were asked to review the files to determine what transpired. With regard to the government reimbursement grant, on December 9 staff filed the required financial report for the \$1.69 million to be reimbursed; there was no outcome as

yet, but receipt of the report was confirmed at the federal government level, so city staff would continue to work with them for the City to get reimbursement. The reporting time ended the last quarter of fiscal year 2023. He noted, specifically related to S. Nelson, current city staff reviewed the existing files, and they were not able to identify any reporting that was submitted, though S. Nelson did send city staff an email following the last Commission meeting, providing the reports that they said they previously submitted. S. Nelson subsequently requested a meeting with his staff and he, so they would meet with them in the coming weeks.

Commissioner Campbell felt the work done with the \$1.6 million was extensive enough for the City Commission and Finance to receive an extensive report on the use of those funds. He could not vote on anything without a comprehensive report being produced first on the subject issue; any concerns about what transpired ten years prior, that was a separate issue. The Commission needed to have a specific understanding as to what happened to \$3.8 million, and the impact that had on the \$1.6 million; this would likely require a sizeable investigation; if this led to reasons to look into other areas, that was acceptable.

Mayor Grant acknowledged Commissioner Dunn's motion to amend, and what that entailed, and that Commissioner Campbell preferred the resolution to remain as is.

Commissioner Dunn restated her motion to amend as she stated earlier.

Mayor Grant noted the motion died due to the lack of a second. She opened the discussion to the public.

Lawrence Martin, Lauderhill resident, expressed disappointment in the Commission in general, and particularly in the comments made by Commissioner Campbell, which he felt were disingenuous in the way they were framed. He supported getting the City's books right, but he disdained efforts to try to divide the community by highlighting that the funds were not used to purchase food, clothes, or given to the City's schools, despite it being placed on the record more than once that the subject grant could not be used for such spending. He urged Commissioner Campbell to stop trying to divide the community, adding that Vice Mayor Martin sat on the City Commission for the past five years, attending and participating in meetings, as did Mayor Grant. Mayor Grant and he spoke recently, and this was a time when the Mayor should stay firm, and the Commission should stop this foolishness. He urged Commissioner Dunn to stand strong. Mr. Martin felt that Mr. Hobbs had the opportunity set the Commission on the right track; he should have meetings with the Commission individually to acknowledge the simple facts of the subject situation. The present City Commission kept having conversations that alluded to the activities of the previous commission, and city manager, and grants division staff; the subject grant started with Jane Sullivan, who clearly demonstrated to the satisfaction of previous city commissions she served under, that her work for the City was above board, working hard for the City to bring millions of grant dollars that benefited all city departments and the community. The current conversation now appeared to call her character into

question, as did other staff who worked tirelessly for Lauderhill's benefit. With regard to Commissioner Campbell's question on why the City had to seek outside help to administer the federal dollars, the answer was that between former Mayor Thurston, Commissioner Dunn, and he, they brought in more grant dollars for Lauderhill than had ever been seen in the City for those three and a half years. Outside help was needed to help manage the significant amount of grant funds that were not taxpayers' dollars.

Karen Grey, Lauderhill resident, recalled that the previous week Mayor Grant referred to words having power and consequences, and it seemed that at the meeting last week, and at the present meeting, there was a buffoonery of word salad with words that insinuated lack of character, misconduct with the use of such words as trickery and plots to rev up the emotions of Lauderhill's residents. She claimed that at last week's meeting the Commission knew nothing, and at the present meeting they appeared to be doing the same thing. She stated Commissioner Campbell should be ashamed of himself, sitting on the dais with his smug, righteous indignation attitude; he should not think that the Lauderhill public did not see this, as he did this more than once in everything he did. It was not about him; it was about the City, the residents, and the betterment of Lauderhill. She asked Commissioner Campbell not to think that Lauderhill residents were stupid, and unaware, and uninformed as he was; they were very much aware of what was happening in the City; the citizenry was sick and tired of such displays. Whether Mayor Grant wished to admit it or not, Commissioner Campbell made her look bad; the City could not afford four more years of such dialog.

Mayor Grant remarked that members of the public should show respect and decency when coming to speak before the Commission; she understood speakers had their emotions and passion, but comments that took jabs at members of the Commission were unacceptable. It did not work in 2024 and it would not work in 2026.

Alan Brown, Lauderhill resident, echoed disappointment in the City Commission in addressing the subject matter, acknowledging there were some serious money concerns; this was not about behind the scenes politics, and the members of the Commission should know better. Everyone had challenges, and some members of the Commission had theirs too, and they could resurface, so the political tactics should stop, as all members of the Commission represented all Lauderhill, and the City and its residents were better than this; the Commission was making Lauderhill look terrible. The Lauderhill residents and taxpayers were the boss and the Commission worked for them. He urged Commissioner Campbell to do his due diligence, as Commissioner Dunn's amendment was very comprehensive, and he felt sure Mr. Hobbs and his staff were up to the task the amendment would set; he would find the money the Commissioner was asking about, and report his findings accordingly. Mr. Brown said the Commission needed to respect the Lauderhill community, as anyone could be investigated at any time. He urged Mayor Grant and the Commission to work together as a team, and if the behavior continued, every resolution put forth by Commissioner Campbell would be thoroughly investigated, as he was not listening to the Lauderhill public, and it appeared that he was not doing his due diligence as to the specifics.

An unidentified female speaker expressed concern about Mr. Hobbs, who was the finance director at the time that he stated the grant dollars in question were managed by the Grants Division, not LHPP. After four years, she was puzzled that he stated he did not know what happen to those grant funds, and the fact that there were no reports with regard to the spending of the \$1.6 million. When she went to lauderhillah.com, she found four reports, some of which showed exactly how much money S. Nelson was paying out, so it was puzzling that the City had no reporting to show for those funds. The checks were being written by Finance staff, so how was it possible that there was no record of how the funds were spent. Commissioner Campbell kept mentioning items for which the funds could not be expended, yet at the last Commission meeting, he took time to mention his extensive experience in nonprofits; if this was true, he should understand that grant applications were written for certain types of spending, and when awarded, the funds had to be used for those specific items, and using them otherwise would place the City in jeopardy. She said if Commissioner Campbell was so concerned about children dying in the City of Lauderhill due to a lack food, etc., it puzzled her that he seemed so against LHPP that worked to end violence in Lauderhill. Again, she urged members of the Commission to educate themselves, as she did; she preferred that Commissioner Campbell ramble on less, and do more research to get the facts, and make statements based on those facts.

Madeline Noel, Lauderhill resident, said various comments spoke of honesty, yet incorrect language confirmed by Mr. Hobbs was displayed in the resolution that the Commission refused to correct; she had asked a number of questions, for which she desired answers other than, "I don't know". She hoped where answers were unknown, staff would do the research, and come back with answers: Did the City have ongoing audits on how all grants were managed and distributed, and the programs that were supported by the grants? Could the City make such results available to the public? Were programs randomly selected for audit? Were there other audits that were needed? There was concern about whether LHPP funds could be used for residents facing challenges during COVID, during which Commissioner Campbell went on to remind the public of what the pandemic was. She stated she had a clear memory of what the COVID 19 pandemic was, and what it felt like, as her father passed away due to COVID, so no one needed a reminder at to what the pandemic was. American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds were designated to help residents; she asked if there was any accountability for these funds, as she recalled in the last fiscal year, taxes could not be lowered because the City utilized the rest of its ARPA funds in that fiscal year's budget. She wished to know if the ARPA funds were now fully expended, and were they used as they should have been; she desired a reply to this inquiry. Ms. Noel found Mr. Hobbs' and his staff's response as to how funds were used for LHPP at the last meeting a complete disaster. Responses of "I don't know" made it seem that the people responsible for managing the expenditure of the funds were incapable of doing so, as the LHPP program existed over three years; it was a shame that members of the Commission claimed they did not know how the program was run. She urged the Commission to direct staff to audit and manage all grants as Commissioner Dunn requested.

Mae Smith, Lauderhill resident, expressed feelings of embarrassment, stating it was a shame to hear what was being said; she was embarrassed for Mr. Hobbs and Mr. Henderson to have to sit and take what was being said, and in looking at them, she knew there were things they could not say; they were caught. With regard to the \$1.6 million missing, just as she fought with the Broward County School Board about the missing \$7 million that should have gone to Lauderhill's schools, she was not friends with any member of the Commission to the extent that she would not charge them to find those funds; they were gone, and something had to be done to find out what happened. She said during such times when programs and funding were being cut everywhere, and the possibility of raising taxes leading to voters not wanting to put current commissioner back in office, some seemed okay with not finding what happened to the \$1.6 million. If the money was missing, Finance staff had to find it; they handled the City's sizeable budget of over \$200 million, so it was puzzling that they could not handle \$4 million, leading to it being sent to city administration, only to have the latter hire an outside entity to manage it. She said the money paid to the outside entity to manage the grant funds could have been better used to the community's benefit.

Mayor Grant received no further input from the public.

Vice Mayor Martin said, in response to members of the public who mentioned his name, he spoke when he felt it was necessary. In relation to the subject matter, he felt Ms. Smith summed the matter up clearly, and he supported what she said, and that was to not get lost in the noise. There were multiple topics discussed by the Commission at last week's meeting, and at the present meeting with regard to the processes, and now the subject funding was spent to the point where neither Finance staff nor the Commission knew where those dollars went. He was embarrassed to air the City's dirty laundry, but he did not think the subject discussion was an attack on LHPP, but all members of the Commission agreed there were some processes that needed to be checked. He, like his fellow Commissioners, agreed there was a problem, and they all supported having a forensic audit; as to his position on LHPP, he supported and voted for LHPP in the past.

Mayor Grant sought clarification that the \$3.8 million was an HHS grant that was not managed by LHPP.

Mr. Hobbs answered correct; the grant was managed by the City's Grants Division.

Mayor Grant wished to modify the language in the resolution, as with it being an HHS grant, the resolution's language should reflect this, as well as changing the language stating that the grant was managed by LHPP to it being managed by the City's Grants Division. Staff should make this modification accordingly.

Commissioner Campbell commented that the reason LHPP was placed in the resolution was due to all the documents provided to the Commission in the backup indicating LHPP was part of the distribution of the funds. The amending of the language did not matter to him, as the important focus should be an audit of the grant itself.

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

Yes: 5 - Commissioner R. Campbell, Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner J. Hodgson, Vice Mayor S. Martin, and Mayor D. Grant

Abstain: 0

5. RESOLUTION NO. 25R-04-89: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL CONFIRMING THAT THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT OF CITY OF LAUDERHILL IS SOLELY RESPONSIBLE FOR MANAGING ALL OF GRANT FUNDS RECEIVED BY THE CITY; DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER OR DESIGNEE TO ESTABLISH POLICIES FOR THE APPLICATION AND MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH GRANT REQUIREMENTS, POLICIES OF THE CITY, AND CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL; PROHIBITING THE MANAGEMENT OF GRANT FUNDS BY OTHER DEPARTMENTS OR INDIVIDUALS OUTSIDE THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT; PROVIDING THE INTERIM CITY MANAGER AND INTERIM CITY ATTORNEY WITH THE AUTHORITY TO DO ALL THINGS NECESSARY TO EFFECTUATE THIS RESOLUTION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY VICE MAYOR SARAI "RAY" MARTIN).

Attachments: [25R-04-89 Finance Department Management of Grant Funds](#)
[Resolution-4-28-25](#)
[AR 25R-04-89](#)
[Exhibit A to Audit Resolution Re LHPP](#)

Commissioner Dunn believed the subject resolution was premature; she wished to see what came out of the audit first, as it would be a challenge to write policies before knowing what the system failures were. She made a motion to table the item until after the reports from the forensic audit came back to see if it identified areas of weakness, and opportunities to improve.

Mayor Grant indicated the motion died due to a lack of a second.

Vice Mayor Martin explained that he sponsored the subject resolution due to things being done differently by the present administration as compared to the previous one. The Grants Division was currently under the Finance Department, and the subject resolution sought to ensure this remained as such to prevent a repeat of Finance staff having no answers in response to Commission questions on grant fund expenditures. He expected, as he was sure all members of the Lauderhill public did, that the finance director of the City would know what was going on with all the funds in the City; if there was any move to change this, he wished to ensure the Commission, and the Lauderhill public knew it before it happened.

Commissioner Dunn believed the City needed great policies, echoing her position on the resolution being premature; she asked if any policies created would come before the Commission for approval prior to their implementation.

Mr. Hobbs replied, traditionally, policies created at the administrative level were not brought before the Commission for approval prior to implementation.

Commissioner Dunn approved of the City's current checks and balances for expenditures; as Mr. Hobbs and his staff knew, she was very particular in ensuring all spending paperwork was complete and accurate. She was leery that policies would be put in place that would do what the memo did, which was to try to freeze/stop LHPP. It was clear to her that even though her colleagues verbally supported LHPP, it felt as though there was a movement to stop the program. She suggested that before expenditure policies were approved for implementation that they be presented to the Commission to facilitate dialog; this would ensure policies that were developed were clear and fair to prevent what the original resolution under item five might have accomplished; that is, to permanently pause LHPP. Commissioner Dunn restated her concern that policies might be implemented in the dark to accomplish what the community did not want to happen.

Mayor Grant asked Mr. Hobbs to bring the final draft of any proposed policies Finance wished to implement back to the Commission for review.

Commissioner Campbell felt the prior item showed that it was a best practice to leave all financial matters under the Finance Department, so the Commission and the public knew exactly which department dealt with grants, etc. This would eliminate misunderstandings.

Mayor Grant concurred, stating she supported LHPP and all the work they did in the Lauderhill community; she supported any initiative in the City that did great work to benefit Lauderhill and its residents.

Mayor Grant opened the discussion to the public.

Tarik Mohammad, Lauderhill resident, claimed his 33311 zip code was the most impoverished in Lauderhill, asking where was the money, a question being asked by other residents. He was a graduate of Lauderhill Shines cohort nine; this was a very important program initiated by Commissioner Dunn. The City faced the challenges of high poverty rates and unemployment; there was a correlation between high poverty and crime, hence the importance of the LHPP program to help create entrepreneurship, programs for youth, and allocate funds where they were well needed in the community. He questioned why the Commission would not choose to audit all its grant programs, so the Commission and residents really knew what was going on, and the City could be as transparent as possible. Mr. Mohammad remarked that LHPP was a wonderful program, as the program's agenda came from the actual Lauderhill community, based on the results of surveys conducted in all Lauderhill communities, so why put such a program on pause if it sought to satisfy what the community needed.

Mayor Grant agreed that, at some point, the City needed to do an audit of all its grants, and that it was very important for the Commission to hear from the community so the elected officials could be better leaders and ensure all city

programs were geared to satisfy the needs of the Lauderhill community.

Brent Lewis, Lauderhill resident, commended the Commission for amending the language of the resolution under item five. With regard to item six, he felt there was a breakdown in policy, as internal controls were not tight enough. He agreed with Commissioner Dunn that the results of the forensic audit would yield more information as to where the breakdown(s) in the system was, so adjustments could be made. Mr. Hobbs should be commended for the positive change of moving the Grants Division from administration back to Finance; as a member of the public, he, too, wished to see the proposed policies brought before the Commission prior to their implementation, so the Commission and the public could give input.

Pastor Kyle Henry, City of Grace Florida, Lauderhill, supported the audit, but he was confused, as it appeared some members of the Commission supported the audit, while others seemed they did not.

Mayor Grant replied that item five was already approved.

Lawrence Martin, Lauderhill resident, remarked if a grant's guidelines permitted the hiring of an outside entity to administer the grant, that cost was covered in the grant; this meant the City received funding to cover the cost of hiring the two persons that appear to be the cause of this whole commotion, including being tagged with the LHPP. This should be taken into consideration when the subject audit was conducted; that is, whatever the grant called for should be a part of what was expected. He noted the City received grants to aid in the costs for such city departments as fire, police, water and sewer, etc., and all the dollars went to Finance, but the persons working on acquiring and receiving the grants were not under Finance. In the subject scenario, HHS identified two entities to administer the subject grant, and they did the work and submitted the required reporting, and they were paid accordingly from the grant dollars. He urged complete transparency in the existing information and whatever else was found from the audit; the language of the subject resolution was acceptable, as it required the audit to follow whatever the writing of the grant stated.

Mayor Grant received no further input from the public.

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

Yes: 4 - Commissioner R. Campbell, Commissioner J. Hodgson, Vice Mayor S. Martin, and Mayor D. Grant

Abstain: 0

No Vote: 1 - Commissioner M. Dunn

Commissioner Dunn objected to not being allowed to comment prior to the vote, after public comments were closed.

Mayor Grant urged Commissioner Dunn to adhere to the City's policies and procedures for conducting Commission meetings, as she had when former

Mayor Ken Thurston chaired commission meetings.

Interim City Attorney Ottinot affirmed Mayor Grant was correct that proper meeting protocol was followed.

3. RESOLUTION NO. 25R-04-87: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL AMENDING RESOLUTION NOS. 16R-03-54 AND 13R-09-214 TO CONSENT TO THE TRANSFER OF SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE DEVELOPMENT ORDER FROM GREEN LIGHT CAR WASH, INC. TO NATIONAL EXPRESS CAR WASH D/B/A EL CAR WASH OR ASSIGNEE; PROVIDING THE CITY MANAGER OR DESIGNEE WITH THE AUTHORITY TO DO ALL THINGS TO EFFECTUATE THIS RESOLUTION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER SARAI "RAY" MARTIN).

Attachments: [25R-04-87 Green Light Transfer Resolution](#)

[AR 25R-04-87](#)

[RES.16R-03-54 Special Exception Green Light Car Wash Expand
Add Vacuum Area](#)

[RES.13R-09-214 Grant Green Light Car Wash Special Exception
Use](#)

A presentation was given on the subject resolution, as detailed in the backup, noting the present owner of GreenLight Car Wash planned to sell the business, and they hoped the City would approve of the new ownership. The parties would do their due diligence to ensure the special exception use could be transferred. He stated one of the things the new owners would be looking for was the closing out of existing city permits, which the parties anticipated taking one to two months, and the actual closing, going through the usual process, would be anywhere from a two to four-month period. The present owner's request was for this to remain open until the end of the year, after which it could expire.

Interim City Attorney Ottinot indicated the language of the subject resolution was fine as drafted, granting the requested extended time period.

Mayor Grant opened the discussion to the public; she received no input.

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

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

Abstain: 0

Off Dais: 1 - Commissioner R. Campbell

X ORDINANCES & PUBLIC HEARINGS - FIRST READING (AS ADVERTISED IN THE SUN-SENTINEL)

6. ORDINANCE NO. 250-02-107: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE CITY'S LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS BY AMENDING ARTICLE III, ENTITLED "ZONING DISTRICTS," SECTION 5.30A ENTITLED "PHARMACY" BY MODIFYING STANDARDS; AMENDING SECTION 5.50, ENTITLED "MEDICAL MARIJUANA HEALTH CARE ESTABLISHMENT" AND RENAMING IT "MEDICAL MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS" AND ESTABLISHING STANDARDS FOR MEDICAL MARIJUANA DISPENSING CENTERS; AMENDING SCHEDULE A, ENTITLED "LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS" BY CLARIFYING DEFINITIONS FOR MEDICAL MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS AND DISPENSING CENTERS; AMENDING SCHEDULE B, ENTITLED "ALLOWABLE USES," SCHEDULE B-2, ENTITLED "USES IN NON-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS" TO PROVIDE ZONING DISTRICT REGULATIONS FOR MEDICAL MARIJUANA DISPENSING CENTERS; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY, AND CODIFICATION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attachments: [250-02-107 - Amendment to LDR Medical Marijuana Dispensary](#)

[AR 250-02-107](#)

[Attachment A - Application](#)

[Attachment B - Development Review Report \(24-TA-005\)](#)

[Attachment C - Narrative](#)

Development Services Director Daniel Keester-O'Mills stated this was the second time the Commission was being presented the proposed ordinance for consideration, as it was tabled when it was first presented. Since that time, the ordinance was amended to add additional separation requirements between medical marijuana dispensaries, and from any schools.

Hope Calhoun, the applicant's representative, said the applicant's team reviewed the language revision proposed by city staff and they had no objections. Despite concerns expressed by municipalities about a proliferation of such facilities if one was allowed, her experience representing other entities throughout the State showed no evidence of that. She noted the language in the proposed ordinance was similar to that seen in other cities.

Commissioner Dunn restated the concerns she mentioned at the previous presentation of the proposed ordinance; specifically, the distance separation and access by young persons.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills said staff looked at other surrounding cities and the proposed ordinance was consistent with what other cities implemented; in the previous meeting's dialog with the Commission, it was stated that other cities had additional restrictions that did not apply to pharmacies, but state statute required pharmacies and the subject use be treated equally. He indicated that in cities with unique rules applying to the subject use, those rules were put into

effect prior to the State passing the law that pharmacies and the subject use should be treated the same. Fort Lauderdale was one such city, restricting the number of such uses that would be allowed in each county commissioner's district. He spoke with a representative in the Fort Lauderdale Planning & Zoning Department, and they informed him that their rule was adopted prior to the State statute, so they were not changing their practice; their position was that they were grandfathered in prior to that state statute. Mr. Keester-O'Mills recommended that the City not adopt any rules that went against the recommendations of the State statute, knowing that they would be adopted subsequently.

Commissioner Dunn questioned if the distance separation staff proposed in the amended language opened Lauderhill to having several of such facilities in the City.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills replied there were numerous factors that went into whether or not a business would be allowed into the City, and staff would evaluate each one on their own merit, particularly with regard to satisfying the distance separation from schools and other facilities. Once such a facility was permitted in the City, staff would evaluate where another could be located. He remarked, with regard to the concern about a proliferation of such uses in the City, as the Land Development Regulation (LDR) was a living document, the City had numerous tools by which to make changes if it was found that there was an increased number of applications for a particular use the City did not wish to see more of in Lauderhill. City staff would keep the Commission updated if there appeared to be an increased interest in opening such facilities in Lauderhill.

Commissioner Dunn asked if the language staff proposed meant that any new requests for the subject use would come before the Commission for review.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills explained the way the proposed ordinance was now written, there were some uses that would be permitted by right, while others required a special exception, which he said mirrored the pharmacy regulations. A medical marijuana dispensary was a "permitted by right" use in some of the City's zoning districts; if the businessowner planned to have a drive-thru component, this would require a special exception. Thus, if no drive-thru was planned, the business owner just had to go through the City's regular permit application process in order to be issued a COU if they met all conditions and criteria, as laid out in the ordinance. His staff and he would report to the City Manager and Commission when such requests were made.

Commissioner Dunn questioned if the applicant's team met with the surrounding community.

Ms. Calhoun affirmed the applicant held a public meeting before the Commission was first presented with the subject ordinance, and no member of the public attended; the applicant held no further public meetings since that time. She asked that the same information the applicant gave at the previous meeting be placed into the record of the present meeting.

Mayor Grant mentioned doing her due diligence regarding the myriad of uses for medical marijuana, and she learned there were a host of ailments for which it appeared people used medical marijuana; essentially, it served as medicine for them. The ailments included: arthritis, muscular dystrophy, Parkinson's disease, traumatic stress disorders, anxiety disorders, depression, nausea, etc. She had no wish to deny any type of medical services to anyone in Lauderhill, but for her there needed to be measures put in place with regard to proper management by such facilities. The Commission and residents had concerns, and they went back and had those discussions with the applicant's team; she believed the proposed amendments to the subject ordinance sought to address those concerns. She did not like the fact that after the discussions at the previous meeting no member of the applicant's team reached out to the residents to try to get input from them; it was imperative for the Commission to make such decisions based on the community's needs, how they felt about such uses, and their desire to see them in Lauderhill. She hoped that in the future, applicants, city staff, and/or whoever was responsible for outreach, made serious efforts to engage the community for their input prior to any presentation to the City Commission, and not to just wait for the residents to come to them. In the future, applicants of applications that sought approval with no evidence of reaching out to the surrounding community prior to coming before the Commission would be voted down.

Commissioner Campbell wondered if a pharmacy request were to come to the City for a location in the area of 441 and Sunrise Boulevard it meant that applicant had to come before the Commission for approval.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills replied if the requested was to locate in a new building, the applicant had to go through the usual site plan process; if the proposed location was in an existing building with no drive-thru component, they would be permitted by right. In that area, he was not aware of any schools that would be a part of the consideration for the separation requirement.

Commissioner Campbell wondered about the old K-Mart site located next to the Lauderhill Performing Arts Center (LPAC).

Mr. Keester-O'Mills said that site was not a CG zoning district, so a pharmacy use would not be permitted there.

Commissioner Campbell sought confirmation that any business wishing to locate in Lauderhill had to apply to the City's Planning Department, at which time the relevant staff would review the possibility of such a business locating in Lauderhill at the location chosen to determine whether or not it was possible.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills answered yes.

Commissioner Campbell heard at the previous meeting, and the present meeting's discussion, the effect such uses might have on the City's youth, but he understood that medical marijuana was dispensed to individuals with chronic conditions, for which they received a prescription from their doctor. Thus, most young people would not suffer from chronic conditions that warranted them using medical marijuana; the latter had nothing to do with youths, or smoking

marijuana, rather it was for persons with specific, chronic conditions whose use was determined by their treating physician. He commented that such a use was similar to that found at pain management clinics that existed in society for decades; while he might not support much of what they did, access to such medications allowed people in chronic pain to get some relief. Medical marijuana was legal, and the dispensaries were not places people went to smoke marijuana, rather, people had to have a prescription in order to gain access. Commissioner Campbell observed it seemed expensive, so it was not something people would likely go with cash in hand to such a facility to make a purchase; it was prescribed, and its dispensing was regulated by the State. While it was new to Lauderhill, it was not new to the United States, and it was not an illegal practice.

Commissioner Dunn mentioned doing a Google search to find out where other medical marijuana dispensaries were located, and she found Miracle Leaf at 4942 N University Drive, another was located 4.7 miles away from the City in Fort Lauderdale, and Certified Marijuana Doctors was 2.2 miles away from Lauderhill. In an earlier meeting with Mr. Ottinot prior to the present meeting he notified her there were some medical marijuana dispensaries in Coral Springs; thus, it was a short drive for anyone wishing to fill their medical marijuana prescription.

Ms. Howson stated Miracle Leaf in Lauderhill was a doctor with the ability to prescribe medical marijuana; the location was not a medical marijuana dispensary, as he was not allowed to distribute medical marijuana from his site.

Mayor Grant opened the discussion to the public.

Mr. Harris, Lauderhill resident, asked Mr. Ottinot if the applicant was vetted.

Interim City Attorney Ottinot explained that the City's code allowed any property owner to apply for a text amendment to a city ordinance.

Mr. Keester-O'Mills added that a public-initiated text amendment to a city ordinance applied citywide, thus it would not apply to one specific property only. Applicants were not vetted for any future use, as the matter before the Commission for consideration was an amendment to the LDR.

Interim City Attorney Ottinot indicated that if the proposed ordinance were adopted, and later an application was submitted, a different process would go into effect by which city staff would assess an applicant's ability to satisfy the LDR requirements. For example, staff would verify that the applicant was licensed to operate in the State of Florida, and that the corporation was authorized to do business in Florida. He said there was a more detailed vetting process for actual applications if the proposed ordinance took effect.

Mr. Harris questioned if a convicted felon could be a manager or have oversight of such a facility.

Ms. Calhoun restated the proposed application was only for a text amendment to an existing city ordinance to permit medical marijuana facilities by right in

Lauderhill. If adopted at second reading, and an application was submitted to operate in Lauderhill, those questions could be answered. She was more than willing to discuss outside the meeting who her client was.

Ms. Noel indicated she was the secretary for the United Lauderhill Community Association, and she spoke on the association's behalf, as she presented the subject matter to them and they voiced strong disapproval. Some of their concerns they wished addressed included: why medical marijuana dispensaries were not being allowed by surrounding cities; the presence of such facilities could increase crime rates, traffic congestion, and a decline in property values; long-term social and economic impacts of such establishments on the community remained uncertain; there were existing, alternate locations outside of Lauderhill where individuals could fill their prescriptions for medical marijuana; the potential misuse and diversion of medical marijuana raised concerns for public safety, and youth exposure. Ms. Noel stated many residents, including her, and their community association expressed strong opposition to the establishment of such dispensaries in Lauderhill. It appeared to them that the 441 corridor was turning into a free for all, and they looked to Vice Mayor Martin to speak up for them, but it seemed to them he had gone silent. She said he held various events in their community to bring them together, so he was versed in the challenges they faced. The Commission needed to think more about the activities along the 441 corridor, including loitering, crime, etc. She wondered if any member of the Commission lived in that area, so they could observe such activities. The residents of their community were unaware of any public meeting where the applicant tried to communicate with area residents.

Willie Mae Cooper stated she represented the West Ken Lark Homeowners' Association, expressing concern about the LHPP, as well as the City's approval of the medical marijuana dispensaries in Lauderhill. Even if there were those who desired such facilities in the City; she knew there were restrictions on youths purchasing alcohol and cigarettes, yet there were adults willing to go into stores to buy alcohol and cigarettes for youths. This was something the Commission needed to consider; children would find a way to get access. She pointed out the same entity requesting the text amendment was the same entity that received approval to build a residential development; she urged the Commission to think about the residents.

Mayor Grant reiterated doing due diligence, in the subject instance, researching medical marijuana to find out more about its purpose, along with polling the residents she represented. There were many residents in Lauderhill who depended on medical marijuana to treat their illnesses, including Mr. Ottinot's daughter who suffers from sickle cell anemia; this was the reason she was comfortable with her decision to support the subject amendment. Members of the Commission met with staff to ensure various safeguards were put in place, including amendments to existing language to make the use more palatable to the community. She would not approve anything she knew would cause harm to the community, as she too was a resident with a 17-year-old son. She received no further input from the public.

Commissioner Hodgson echoed disappointment at the applicant's not making

additional efforts to engage with the public after the item was tabled at an earlier meeting; they should have had dialog with the surrounding homeowners' associations (HOAs) to see where they stood on the matter. Initially, he was not against the amendment, as he supported medicine that helped people, but he was concerned the constituents had no dialog with the applicant's team.

Ms. Calhoun restated the subject amendment was a language change citywide, and not for a specific use application. Notwithstanding, the applicant did host a public meeting, for which notice was published, and posted. Before the site plan for the specific dispensary was submitted to the City, she would communicate to her client, who was not the property owner, on the need to meet with the surrounding areas' HOAs; the proposed text amendment was being forward by the property owner.

Vice Mayor Martin stressed that he did his due diligence on the subject facilities, visiting one to see how they operated; immediately, upon visiting, he noticed that it was very clean, and they would not let him in. He eventually convinced them to let him take a quick look, as no one was allowed to enter without a medical marijuana card; these facilities could be found in affluent neighborhoods; of the eight or ten in Broward County, some were in Fort Lauderdale. After speaking with Mr. Ottinot, he felt confident the City had tools at its disposal to prevent bad actors in the City.

A motion was made by Vice Mayor S. Martin, seconded by Commissioner R. Campbell, that this Ordinance be approved on first reading to the City Commission Meeting, due back on 5/12/2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 - Commissioner R. Campbell, Commissioner J. Hodgson, Vice Mayor S. Martin, and Mayor D. Grant

No: 1 - Commissioner M. Dunn

Abstain: 0

7. ORDINANCE NO. 25O-04-113: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE CITY'S LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS BY AMENDING ARTICLE IV, ENTITLED "DEVELOPMENT REVIEW REQUIREMENTS", SECTION 1.9 ENTITLED "PUBLIC NOTICE REQUIREMENTS", SUBSECTION 1.9.6 ENTITLED "NEIGHBORHOOD MEETINGS" BY MODIFYING APPLICABILITY REQUIREMENTS; AMENDING SCHEDULE B - ALLOWABLE USES TABLE B-1 "USES ALLOWED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS", BY MODIFYING THE ZONING DISTRICTS "PRIMARY AND SECONDARY, CHARTER AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS" AS PERMITTED USES TO BE CONSISTENT WITH "PRIMARY AND SECONDARY, PUBLIC SCHOOLS", AND B-2 "USES ALLOWED IN NONRESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS" BY MODIFYING THE ZONING DISTRICTS "PRIMARY AND SECONDARY, CHARTER AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS" AS PERMITTED USES TO BE CONSISTENT WITH "PRIMARY AND SECONDARY, PUBLIC SCHOOLS"; AMENDING SCHEDULE I, ENTITLED "SIGN

REQUIREMENTS" BY MODIFYING THE DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS OF ADDRESS SIGNS AND REQUIRING ADDITIONAL STANDARDS FOR COMMUNITY BUILDINGS AND COMMERCIAL SWIMMING POOLS; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY, AND CODIFICATION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attachments: [25O-04-113 text amendments for 4.28.25 meeting](#)

[AR 25O-04-113](#)

[Attachment A - 25-TA-SwimmingPool-Charter-NeighborhoodMtg - February 2025](#)

[Attachment B - Excerpt of P&Z Meeting Minutes - 2-25-2025](#)

Mr. Keester-O'Mills presented the proposed ordinance, as detailed in the legislation.

Mayor Grant opened the discussion to the public; she received no input.

A motion was made by Vice Mayor S. Martin, seconded by Commissioner R. Campbell, that this Ordinance be approved on first reading to the City Commission Meeting, due back on 5/12/2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Commissioner R. Campbell, Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner J. Hodgson, Vice Mayor S. Martin, and Mayor D. Grant

Abstain: 0

8. ORDINANCE NO. 25O-04-114: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE CITY'S LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS BY AMENDING ARTICLE III, ENTITLED "ZONING DISTRICTS," BY CREATING SECTION 5.58 ENTITLED "EVENT VENUE"; BY ESTABLISHING USE MINIMUM STANDARDS INCLUDING HOURS OF OPERATION, SITE ACCESSIBILITY, MINIMUM BUILDING SIZE, MINIMUM PARCEL SIZE, AND PARKING REQUIREMENTS; AMENDING SCHEDULE A - LAND USE CLASSIFICATIONS BY MODIFYING THE DEFINITION OF "BANQUET HALL" AND CREATING "EVENT VENUE"; AMENDING SCHEDULE B - ALLOWABLE USES TABLE B-2 "USES ALLOWED IN NON-RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS" BY INCLUDING "EVENT VENUE"; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY, AND CODIFICATION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attachments: [25O-04-114 event venue text amendment for 4.28.25 meeting](#)

[AR 25O-04-114](#)

[Attachment A - Development Review Report \(DRR\)](#)

[Attachment B - Application](#)

[Attachment C - Narrative](#)

Ms. Howson gave a summary of the proposed ordinance, as detailed in the backup, stating the location of the proposed wedding venue was 6650 W

Commercial Blvd., the five wooded vacant lots sitting immediately next to the Children Services building on Commercial Blvd. The applicant showed her the beautiful, successfully run venue in Arizona, and when she told him that it was not an allowed use by right in Lauderhill, and that he had to apply for a special exception, he quickly showed a willingness to do so, giving staff suggestions on how to have the use reinstated. Planning staff and the applicant work together, and they concluded a new category would be appropriate, specifically, a wedding event venue; it would be for more formal events on a larger scale than those held at a typical banquet hall in a plaza. The proposed ordinance was the result of their working together; it included supplemental regulations the applicant and staff believed would address negative impacts such a use could have on a surrounding neighborhood based on previous negative impacts witnessed. She said the subject amendment proposed language for the use citywide as one that was permitted by right in all general commercial zoning districts providing that applicants met all criteria shown on the list in the backup.

Commissioner Dunn remarked on speaking with the president of the Cypress Hollow HOA who expressed concerns he heard from residents, asking what the responses were to those concerns, specifically noise after hours, and the measures to be put in place to mitigate them; this would likely be a citywide concern.

Ms. Howson responded that one of the key factors to mitigating a noise nuisance concern was restricting hours of operation; the applicant proposed hours of operation similar to those practiced at his other wedding venues, which was to operate until 11:00 p.m. Though city staff thought this was a little early, this was evidence that this would distinguish the proposed use from the typical restaurant bar, adding that at the location the applicant was considering, a restaurant use could be located there by right. If a developer chose to purchase the site to build a restaurant bar, they could do so by right, and the establishment could remain open until 2:00 a.m. Ms. Howson added that enhanced buffer wall requirements, along with the text amendment prohibiting outdoor music past 8:00 p.m. helped negate noise nuisances. Additionally, a site plan required for a new building allowed city staff the opportunity to influence where outdoor music was setup in relation to surrounding residential properties, and to encourage buffering. The applicant's proposed design for the venue showed a building wrapping around the area designated for an outdoor wedding, placing the building between the outdoor portion and the buffering to the rear of the site between residential and commercial.

Commissioner Dunn wished to know if the proposed use was consistent with the City's recommended uses from the Urban Land Institute (ULI).

Mr. Keester-O'Mills answered yes; he looked up the portion of the ULI study for Commercial Blvd., and he believed the proposed use was consistent with their recommendations for uses in that area.

Ms. Howson mentioned there was discussion with the applicant and staff about 11:00 p.m. being too early, and the fact that the applicant could have a client wishing to host an event until midnight.

Mayor Grant opened the discussion to the public.

Harjun Williams, Lauderhill resident, stated he resided next to the subject property. He was concerned with the fact that residents within a certain radius of the site were to be notified, which he was not.

Ms. Howson explained the proposed ordinance was a text amendment to the City's LDR, so the effect of the approval would be citywide. When an applicant proposed a text amendment to the LDR with a specific site in mind, it was staff's job to determine how that change affected every other potential site in Lauderhill if the code was amended to allow a particular use. For a text amendment, there was no specific 500-foot radius in which letters could be sent. If this was a special exception use, then residents within the 500-foot radius of the applicant's site would be notified. She noted that if the subject text amendment were approved, allowing the proposed use by right, and an applicant came in to initiate an event venue use, and they met all criteria, the use would be allowed by right. In the subject instance, the Commission would see another application from the applicant, as he was starting with a new building, so he had to develop a site plan, and the Commission required that staff bring all site plans for new development to the Commission for review before a developer went to building permit, so the community would see the proposed development again. It was possible for a businessowner to move into an existing building where the desired use was permitted by right, in which case it would not go before the Commission.

Mr. Hobbs stated he knew the area Mr. Williams was speaking about, and in the past there were noise complaints from residents coming from businesses abutting residential uses to the rear of the commercial property all along Commercial Boulevard.

Commissioner Campbell made a motion to Approve extending the meeting beyond 11:00 p.m., seconded by Vice Mayor Martin. The vote was as follows:

Commissioner Campbell	Yes
Commissioner Dunn	Yes
Commissioner Hodgson	Yes
Vice Mayor Martin	Yes
Mayor Grant	Yes

Mr. Hobbs asked if planning staff could add language that required a higher buffer wall, or other treatments to mitigated noise. Many of the uses were automotive in nature, so some of the complaints were related to the noise caused by bay doors opening and closing; he was unsure what the City could do to address those concerns.

Ms. Howson showed a mapped illustration of the site provided in the backup, adding that there were a variety of uses that were permitted by right on the subject site that could have negative impacts, including noise. Staff would remain mindful of whatever businesses sought to locate along Commercial Boulevard, requiring them to have adequate buffering between abutting residential uses. She showed the applicant's proposed layout of the site,

adding that a code change was required to change the buffer wall from eight to ten feet; staff could request that the applicant provide enhanced landscaped buffering. That site plan would be completely open to the public, so residents were encouraged to attend to learn how staff and the applicant went back and forth on such site plans in order to protect residential neighborhoods. Per the applicant's design shown, staff would ensure there was no outdoor music after 8:00 p.m., and outdoor activities would take place within the confines of the buffering.

Mr. Hobbs urged Planning staff to ensure adequate buffering was put in place, as along Commercial Boulevard was one of the communities that abutted commercial uses without any buffer, canal, or much distance between the actual commercial properties and the residential community.

Ms. Howson understood, adding that the applicant was very eager to keep as many of the existing trees as possible, as he wanted the brides not to be aware of Commercial Boulevard.

Mr. Hobbs asked that the HOA president of the community be kept apprised ahead of time of the progress of the proposed development, as he expressed his community's concerns regarding adequate buffering.

Ms. Howson affirmed she would.

Commissioner Campbell recalled in 2018 a school was proposed for the same site, and noise was a major concern of the abutting residents; those concerns resulted in a denial of the application. While he understood residents' concerns with regard to noise, there was now so much technology that allowed the City to prevent, and address many of the residents' concerns, including basic steps of retaining, and maintaining existing trees, and having a buffer wall above the required eight feet. He noted that in constructing a new building, there were design elements that could be incorporated to prevent some of the issues being discussed, and there were steps the City could take, such as limiting hours of operation, etc. Commissioner Campbell said he was not comfortable with situations where someone owned a property and they were prevented from doing anything with it, as opposed to looking at how some uses were possible, while addressing concerns voiced by residents. When there was a proposal to locate a specific use at a site, it was reasonable for the City to look at the proposal, possibly recommending a shift of the location of a building, or intended uses in a particular area of the site to help mitigate noise nuisances, or any other anticipated negative impacts, including construction that kept noise internal rather than external to the building. There were many ways to make both the residents, and the developer happy.

Commissioner Grant received no further input from the public.

A motion was made by Vice Mayor S. Martin, seconded by Commissioner R. Campbell, that this Ordinance be approved on first reading to the City Commission Meeting, due back on 5/12/2025. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Commissioner R. Campbell, Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner J. Hodgson, Vice Mayor S. Martin, and Mayor D. Grant

Abstain: 0

XI ORDINANCES & PUBLIC HEARINGS - SECOND READING (AS ADVERTISED IN THE SUN-SENTINEL)

9. ORDINANCE NO. 25O-04-111: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, CHAPTER 6, "BUILDINGS AND BUILDING REGULATIONS", BY CREATING A NEW ARTICLE V, "NEW DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES" BY ADOPTING AND IMPOSING IMPACT FEES FOR FIRE RESCUE, LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND PARKS AND RECREATION SERVICES FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT; BY ADOPTING AN IMPACT FEE SCHEDULE FOR FIRE RESCUE, LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND PARKS AND RECREATION INFRASTRUCTURE; BY ADOPTING A TECHNICAL STUDY OF SAID IMPACT FEES PURSUANT TO FLORIDA STATE STATUTE SECTION 163.31801; BY ESTABLISHING CRITERIA AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES FOR THE ASSESSMENT, ACCOUNTING, CREDITS AND COLLECTION OF IMPACT FEES TO INCLUDE REVIEW HEARINGS; PROVIDING FOR SAVINGS, CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY, AND CODIFICATION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE (REQUESTED BY INTERIM CITY MANAGER KENNIE HOBBS, JR.).

Attachments: [ORD 25O-04-111 impact fee fire police parks](#)

[AR 25O-04-111](#)

[Final Impact Fee Study Lauderhill BusinessFlare March2025](#)

A motion was made by Vice Mayor S. Martin, seconded by Commissioner R. Campbell, that this Ordinance be approved on second reading. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Commissioner R. Campbell, Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner J. Hodgson, Vice Mayor S. Martin, and Mayor D. Grant

Abstain: 0

10. ORDINANCE NO. 25O-04-112: AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAUDERHILL, FLORIDA, APPROVING THE SIX MONTH BUDGET REVIEW OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE AMENDMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025 IN THE TOTAL ADJUSTMENT AMOUNT OF \$14,197,292; APPROVING A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$3,934,292, AN INTERDEPARTMENTAL BUDGET ADJUSTMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$9,919,700, AND A CAPITAL ADJUSTMENT OF \$343,000; REFLECTING APPROPRIATE ADJUSTMENT TO VARIOUS REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS AS SPECIALLY INDICATED IN THE BREAKDOWN; PROVIDING FOR VARIOUS BUDGET CODES; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. (REQUESTED BY INTERIM

CITY MANAGER, KENNIE HOBBS, JR.).

Attachments: [ORD 25O-04-112 approving 6 Month Budget 4.14.25](#)

[AR 25O-04-112](#)

[BA Supplemental Sean](#)

A motion was made by Vice Mayor S. Martin, seconded by Commissioner R. Campbell, that this Ordinance be approved on second reading. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 5 - Commissioner R. Campbell, Commissioner M. Dunn, Commissioner J. Hodgson, Vice Mayor S. Martin, and Mayor D. Grant

Abstain: 0

XII UNFINISHED BUSINESS

XIII OLD BUSINESS

XIV NEW BUSINESS

XV COMMUNICATIONS FROM PUBLIC OFFICIALS SHALL BEGIN IMMEDIATELY BEFORE ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Campbell stated that, from time to time, residents approached him with genuine concern about people coming after him; his position was when one ran for public office, one should expect there would be those who agreed with you and those who did not. He advised those who supported his position but preferred that he hide behind them that he would not; he planned to speak his mind on any issues without fear. He felt comfortable to push initiatives he believed in, and in a very principled way, regardless of those who preferred that he did not.

XV ADJOURNMENT - 11:16 PM