

Progress Meeting #8 Minutes

Cypress Creek Mobility Hub Master Plan

Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization

Friday, July 10, 2015 @ 9:00 a.m.

Attendees: Lynda Westin (SFRTA), James Cromar (BMPO), Karen Reese (City of Fort Lauderdale), Craig Pinder (City of Fort Lauderdale), John Portera (FDOT), Rob Piatkowski (Renaissance Planning), Kevin Fischer (Broward County Planning), Rick Buckeye (City of Oakland Park), Cary Goldberg (Envision Uptown), Larry Merritt (FDOT), Nick Sofoul (BCT), Alfredo Sanchez (B&A), Odalys Delgado (HNTB), Matt Vinke (HNTB), Tom Lavash (WTL+a – via phone conference), Tom Moriarty (WTL+a – via phone conference)

Introductions were made:

- The June meeting minutes were updated to reflect Larry Merritt's attendance

Progress Update:

- Odalys briefly discussed the recent progress to date, as well as the outcomes of the streetscape meeting (July 1) with the City of Fort Lauderdale, City of Oakland Park, Broward County, and FDOT

Presentation:

- Alfredo discussed some of the goals and assumptions that formed the basis for the site plan concepts that were being presented.
 - John Portera asked whether the Noise Zone from FXE was considered during this process.
 - Yes, as long as the development is below the height restriction, then the FAA requirements are met.
- Scenario 1 was presented, which included residential and hotel components which take up the totality of the site. Final conclusion is that this scenario is not feasible from an affordability standpoint, among others (inadequate access, lack of recreation / open space, etc.)
- Scenario 2 was presented, which included hotel and office components.
 - Improved internal circulation and access to the site's proposed developments.
 - Modified transit drop-off location
 - Currently shows only two bus bays, and Nick mentioned that the three existing should be maintained. Additional bus bays may also be needed in the future.

- Site plan includes a pedestrian galleria between the two developments, offering a comfortable and enjoyable pedestrian experience.
- This site plan creates a sense of place and adds character to the site and adjacent areas.
- James questioned the design of the auto and pedestrian circulation, which Alfredo addressed by explaining that access has to be maintained throughout the site for a comfortable and convenient pedestrian walkway throughout the site.
- Scenario 3 was presented, which only included a residential component.
 - Maintains priorities for improved internal circulation
 - Would require a land use amendment
 - Development could possibly have a level of parking underneath to maximize development potential, but would significantly add to the overall cost of the project.
- Scenarios 4A and 4B were presented, which included two different phases of development. The first phase included a hotel on the western side of the site with no structured parking, while the second phase included an office development on the eastern side of the site with a parking structure on piles over the retention area.
 - Scenario 4A would have the least impact to the existing site and would be able to be implemented faster than all other scenarios.
 - The first phase (hotel development) may prefer to build its own parking structure, likely attached to the development, to support its use despite any shared parking arrangement – likely constructing a deck with 100 or so spots
 - The second phase (Scenario 4B) could be phased in later, perhaps with some form of shared parking structure arrangement with the University of Phoenix site owners to the north.
 - This will need to be further explored by coordinating/talking with this site's owners
- Scenario 5 was presented, which included a single use hotel with structured parking
- Scenario 6 was presented, which included a single use office with structured parking
 - In both of these scenarios, the placement of the structured parking is directly related to the site's visibility
- A table that summarized the cost estimates for all the scenarios was presented and discussed. This table will be used to determine what the gap financing and return on investment will be for these scenarios.
- Cary had a host of questions and comments related to the site concepts.
 - What use can be done now? Likely just hotel.
 - Hotel development with surface parking is the most feasible
 - Scenario 1 would never work – too expensive
 - A partnership with the Banyan Partners / owners of the University of Phoenix site should be explored regarding the possibility of shared parking and/or the placement of any future structured parking on their property.

- This would help them finance additional development on their property that would ultimately help improve the community
 - This potential agreement may open up the possibility for SFRTA to lease spots and create a revenue stream from the parking structure
 - This potential partnering idea would also lend itself well to the phasing scenarios by giving SFRTA, et.al. more time to work out an agreement and better assess the market as more time goes by.
- Cary mentioned the quoted price for a parking structure of \$20,000/spot is too high.
 - He said \$8,000 is more reasonable based on recent projects, experience, etc.
- Tom Lavash considers this area as a “transit redevelopment district”
- Tom mentioned that the retention area, if not developed into a parking structure, would be a valuable asset to the site as an attractive amenity and feature to any future development and the larger area
- James added that it is good to expand the scope/scale beyond just the SFRTA site. Working with Banyan has many positive externalities.
- Odalys pointed out that the City of Fort Lauderdale still needs to take a stand on the reduced parking policies as it relates to this site.
- Cary asked about the water and sewer infrastructure needs and how that would be impacted with any potential deal with Banyan in the future. Would the extension of lines from Cypress Creek across their property be cheaper to connect with than along 59th court?
 - This could lower the overall costs of extending water and sewer services to the SFRTA
 - Alfredo was to follow up
- James briefly mentioned the “no parking required” overlay district in downtown Fort Lauderdale and how inferences could be drawn possibly to this area
 - John Portera mentioned that the downtown overlay zone was only possible because the city built numerous parking structures that allowed nearby developments not to include additional parking.
- Cary mentioned Envision Uptown’s effort to develop a regulating plan for the general study area, and that he anticipates the process to take around 12-14 months.
 - Others mentioned that this is very optimistic and may actually take upwards of 2-3 years.
- Tom then presented the joint development strategies
 - Tom highlighted the importance of taking a developer’s perspective when trying to create value
 - The ROI needs to be identified
 - For ‘emerging TODs’, parking usually follows standard parking requirements established at least in the beginning, until the site is more fully developed
 - Tom noted that if a residential development with 200 units is built, it would fall within the community center and regional center categories established by the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Councils’ density targets for TOD areas.

- Tom pointed out that TODs in the past relied on public infrastructure investments to improve the site and make it more marketable
- The impact of nearby industrially zoned land on the future value and development potential of the site must be considered.
- Tom showed examples of land value appreciation near various transit stations around the country, concluding the value added with nearby transit service
 - Nick pointed out that the examples selected did not include a commuter train service, making it difficult to draw conclusions
- Tom mentioned that some of these examples had TOD plans in place for nearly 20 years before the vision was realized, even in DC – which is uncharacteristically unique compared to the country in terms of its transit use and local land uses.
- Tom then presented some relevant case studies whose lessons learned can be applied and used for the Cypress Creek station. These studies were selected if they were adjacent to a major highway, had similar parking issues, were part of a larger TOD district, etc.
 - An example from the BART Pleasant Hill Station was used.
 - Had difficulty locating transit-supportive retail despite having more than 6,500 daily riders
 - Created a Pleasant Hill development agency
 - Built parking structure first
 - Parking requirements have been shrinking here due to increase in mode split
 - 1.23 spots required per residential unit
 - Lynda asked whether Florida has any statutes to allow for the creation of a development agency or leasing authority similar to what BART did.
 - Will look into this further
 - An example from the BART East Dublin Station was used.
 - Multi-phased project on a former surface parking lot
 - No retail was included in phase 2 – mostly because of the market; not needed
 - Market stipulated more residential units than what was once planned
 - Phase 2 required less parking per unit than phase 1 – again due to increase in mode split
 - An example of the Newton MBTA Station was used.
 - This is light rail service
 - MBTA owns the site and leases
 - Incorporates complete streets approach to roadway network
 - Phased development
 - Similar to concepts for Cypress Creek, there was an internal circulation to the site provided by roadway loop
 - An example of the Alewife MBTA Station in Cambridge was used.
 - Although not originally planned this way, this station became the terminus for the red line

- City upzoned the area adjacent to the station prior to major developments
- This site benefitted from a city-wide overflow of business and office development
- Under-supply of parking, which is still a major problem
- Local traffic congestion has helped to encourage more biking – which has resulted in a new bike parking facility
- Some takeaways and final thoughts/comments from these case studies include:
 - Low ridership (for the Cypress Creek Station) will play a major role for the development potential, but may hope for steady, incremental ridership growth in the future.
 - Significant rezoning and increased density needed within the study area
 - There are challenges for the timing of the RFP and when it is advertised.
 - May be best to have land “ready” first
 - Should seriously consider partnership with Banyan
 - Building the parking structure first may not be needed, especially if hotel is built. Then no structure would be needed at all.
- At the end of the meeting, John mentioned that the FDOT-owned site will be seeking its own land use plan amendment to allow residential use. A new site plan from new developer was being presented in September.

Next Meeting:

- Friday, August 14, 2015 @ 9:00am – Broward MPO Conference Room