



**City of Coconut Creek
Planning and Zoning Board Meeting
March 11, 2026
Minutes – Excerpt**

AGENDA ITEMS

1. **LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT:** AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CITY'S CODE OF ORDINANCES, BY AMENDING CHAPTER 13, "LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE," ARTICLE I, "ADMINISTRATION, REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES," DIVISION 3, "IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES," BY CREATING SECTION 13-43, "WORKFORCE HOMEBUYER PURCHASE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM," PROVIDING A PURPOSE, DEFINITIONS, CRITERIA, AND METHODOLOGY FOR PROVIDING FUNDS TO ASSIST QUALIFIED PURCHASERS IN THE WORKFORCE TARGET INCOME GROUP WITH THE PURCHASE OF RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS WITHIN THE CITY OF COCONUT CREEK. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Grants Administrator Dan Nelson provided an overview of the proposed Workforce Homebuyer Purchase Assistance Program, explaining how rising costs affected housing. He discussed federal and state funds that were utilized for housing assistance programs, including the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), the State Housing Initiatives Partnership (SHIP) programs and the income groups those programs served. He shared information regarding the City's Affordable Housing Trust Fund and the workforce housing programs provided with the local funds. He explained how the ordinance would provide the City with flexibility to implement programs or partnerships with developers to provide down payment purchase assistance for workforce housing units. He reviewed eligibility requirements and funding sources for the programs. Continuing, he explained that the ordinance included a transparent and fair lottery process for applicant selection and summarized the application process. He explained the terms of the program, highlighting that assistance was provided as a deferred, no-interest loan and established long-term affordability requirements and repayment requirements if the homeowner failed to meet the recapture terms. In closing, Mr. Nelson discussed program oversight and compliance measures to protect public funds.

Chair LaPlant opened the floor for board questions.

Board Member Troy Gras asked whether there were any residency restrictions on who could apply. Mr. Nelson explained that an applicant did not need to be a current resident. Mr. Gras asked how the terms compare to other City programs. Mr. Nelson explained that the program had been structured after the City's current programs but differed in the term of the recapture period of ten (10) years instead of fifteen (15) years and did not require first time homebuyer status. Mr. Gras asked what the maximum or minimum amount of assistance would be, and Mr. Nelson noted that the maximum assistance was up to \$80,000. Mr. Gras wanted to confirm that the City had the capacity to administer the program, and Mr. Nelson confirmed they did.

Mr. Light asked for confirmation that the program would fund the down payment and then requested further explanation of how the note and mortgage aspects would work. Mr. Nelson explained that the terms of the Second Mortgage and Promissory Note to be executed and

recorded in the public record. Mr. Light inquired whether there were any impacts with the IRS regarding imputed interest. Mr. Nelson stated that since the inception of the City's housing programs, that issue had not arisen. Mr. Light asked whether funding could be used to purchase condominiums, or if it was just for single-family houses. Mr. Nelson explained that the ordinance does not specify housing type, but the future program-specific agreements could include those provisions. Mr. Light asked about repaid funds, and Mr. Nelson explained that recaptured funds for any applicants who did not satisfy the terms of the note would return to the Housing Trust Fund for future programs.

Vice Chair Barker asked for confirmation that this was an entirely new program, and staff confirmed. He requested that staff explain the difference between a city-initiated program and the City/developer partnership option. Staff gave an example of how a City/developer partnership had been utilized to fund purchase assistance at the time the Paloma Lakes residential development was built, which provided assistance for twenty-one (21) households to purchase units in the community and explained that a similar program could be done with just City funds through resolution.

Chair LaPlant asked for examples of those who would qualify for the program. Mr. Nelson explained that qualification was based on the Area Median Income (AMI) and provided an example AMI for a household size of four (4), which was \$92,000. Staff explained that the program would typically assist two (2) to three (3)-bedroom households. Chair LaPlant inquired how the lottery would be advertised. Staff said it would be advertised in the newspaper and on the city website, in addition to the developer establishing a marketing program.

Mr. Light inquired why a developer would be interested in participating in the program, and Mr. Nelson pointed out that it brings in publicity, addresses a community need, and provided an avenue for a developer of a multi-use development project, to satisfy their affordable housing requirements.

Mr. Escoriaza asked whether funding could be utilized for a new build or existing housing. Staff stated they define workforce housing as below 140% AMI, so existing units would qualify as long as the applicant met the program criteria.

Chair LaPlant opened the public hearing on the item. There were no questions or comments from the public, and Chair LaPlant closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Barker/Escoriaza – To recommend approval of Agenda Item 9, as presented.

Upon roll call, the Motion passed by a 5-0 vote.