

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

**MINUTES OF THE
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 3, 2010
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBERS,
210 SAMS AVE.
NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLORIDA**

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

Vice-Chair Steve Dennis called the CRA meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

Answering to roll call:

45
46
47

**Steve Dennis
Cynthia Lybrand
Doug Hodson
Charles Belote
Thomas Williams
James Kosmas**

Also present were Tony Otte, Interim CRA Director; Michelle Martin, CRA Project Manager; Noeleen Foster, CRA Program Manager; Claudia Soulie, Administrative Specialist and Mark Hall, CRA Attorney. Chair Linda DeBorde was absent due to medical reasons.

Mr. Dennis asked the Commission's consensus for granting Ms. DeBorde a medical leave of absence for a period of ninety (90) days from February 3, 2010.

Mr. Belote made the motion to grant Ms. DeBorde a medical leave of absence for a period of ninety (90) days; seconded by Mr. Hodson. The motion carried on roll call vote 6 – 0.

Mr. Dennis stated that item 6. E. (CRA Commercial Impact Fee Assistance Program – Amendment) under Old Business had been withdrawn by staff.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of Minutes – January 13, 2010

Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the January 13, 2010 minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Williams. The motion carried on a roll call vote 6 – 0.

1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In accordance with the City Commission Resolution #11-89, a three-minute limitation will be imposed unless otherwise granted by the CRA Commissioners

Ruby Clark, representative for the Westside Neighborhood Group, stated that she had given a presentation to the CRA late last spring for a Myrtle Ave. Pilot Program, which proposed landscape/infrastructure improvements for Myrtle Ave. from Canal Street to

48 Mary Ave. Ms. Clark continued that she was working with staff to bring this project back
49 to the forefront and stated that the residents of this neighborhood had shown their support
50 of this program by attending several neighborhood meetings and participating in a recent
51 neighborhood cleanup. Ms. Clark thanked staff for their assistance.

52 Mr. Marc Monteson, 2006 S. Atlantic Ave. thanked the CRA for their financial support
53 of the Images of the Arts Festival that took place on January 30 and 31, 2010. Mr.
54 Monteson continued that this event had drawn a large crowd, which positively affected
55 local business.

56 Mr. Kosmas felt that expanding the event along Canal Street had been an excellent
57 decision.

58 Mr. Dennis stated that they had over 400 people go through the Visitor Center at the
59 Chamber of Commerce.

60 Mr. Bob Williams, President/CEO of Bert Fish Medical Center stated that the Hospital
61 Board had taken an action concerning the current hospital district payment due to the
62 CRA and he knew that the CRA was in receipt of the letter outlining the Hospital Board's
63 action, as it was going to be reviewed under New Business later in the meeting. Mr.
64 Williams stated that he was here today to help clarify why the SEVHD Board sent this
65 letter. Mr. Williams wanted to make it very clear that the Hospital District was and
66 remained extremely supportive of the efforts of the CRA to redevelop and improve the
67 community. Mr. Williams continued that in sending this letter to the CRA, the Hospital
68 Board was responding to significant vocal public input it had received from its residents
69 at their ad valorem tax process in the fall. Those citizens expressed concerns about the
70 transfer of Hospital District dollars to the CRA and had many questions about the
71 accountability of the Hospital District and the accountability of the CRA regarding those
72 dollars. Mr. Williams continued that the Hospital District would very much like to work
73 with the City/CRA to achieve an amicable resolution and was suggesting that this could
74 be accomplished through an Interlocal Agency Agreement, which was allowed and
75 anticipated for allowances in Chapter 163 of the Florida Statute. Mr. Williams felt that in
76 such an agreement, matters of future payments, use of the monies, and utilization of
77 existing CRA dollars could be dealt with. Mr. Williams continued that there was little, if
78 any benefit to the City, CRA and the Hospital District in resolving any dispute by
79 resorting to a legal process and the Hospital Board felt that, together, a mutually
80 beneficial agreement could be reached that would put the best interests of the Community
81 first. Mr. Bob Williams thanked the CRA for the opportunity to comment.

82 Hearing no further requests, Mr. Dennis closed the public participation portion of the
83 meeting.

84

85 **2. PRESENTATION**

86

87 **A. Arts District or Cottage Industry Overlay District**

88

89 Ms. Gail Henrikson, Chief Planner with the City of New Smyrna Beach, stated that staff
90 had been approached by Jennifer Kerr-Marsch, who proposed that the City consider
91 creating a zoning classification or revise its ordinances in order to allow home-based

92 industries and businesses throughout the City. Ms. Henrikson continued that the primary
93 concern was to allow artists to live and work from their residences and to allow them to
94 have a small retail facility from which to sell their art. Ms. Henrikson stated that Ms.
95 Kerr-Marsch provided information from Humboldt County, CA where cottage industry
96 regulations have been adopted. Ms. Henrikson continued that the City already allows
97 home-based businesses within the city limits of New Smyrna Beach with the stipulation
98 that the home address cannot be reflected on any advertising and that a sign cannot be
99 posted on the property. The overlay district would make allowances for this type of
100 advertising. Ms. Henrikson stated that staff, in addition to hearing any comments or
101 concerns, was particularly interested in receiving feedback on the following questions:

- 102
- 103 1. Are the current home occupation regulations sufficient or should additional
104 changes or new districts be created to allow increased opportunities for home-
105 based businesses?
- 106 2. If changes to the home occupation regulations were designed, should they be
107 applied City-wide or only in the existing historic district?
- 108 3. If a Cottage Industry Overlay District were to be created, should it be limited to
109 artists and businesses that would support an arts district or, should it be open to
110 any type of business?

111

112 Ms. Kerr-Marsch, 808 Magnolia Street, stated that she had a vision for New Smyrna
113 where the proposed Overlay districts could create additional revenue for the City and its
114 residents, which in turn would breed growth and a reputation for economic freedom. Ms.
115 Kerr-Marsch commented on what she felt to be the current limitations with the City's
116 home-based business regulations and explained the perceived benefits/possibilities of the
117 Overlay district. Ms. Kerr-Marsch suggested a series of workshops to inform potential
118 home-based business owners of the rules & regulations and do's & don'ts of the current
119 requirements. Ms. Henrikson and Ms. Kerr-Marsch thanked the CRA for their time and
120 consideration.

121

122 Commissioner Tom Williams was glad that this topic was being presented and stated that
123 the two (2) issues he faced when opening his local business were parking and ADA
124 requirements. Mr. Williams would like to see an alleviation of the current parking
125 requirements and, if possible, a review of the ADA requirements. Mr. Williams suggested
126 getting the Artists' input on which part of the City they may want to have this district
127 established.

128

129 Ms. Lybrand felt that parking was a difficult issue and the CRA needed to carefully
130 consider this, so that any changes would not cause a hardship for neighboring houses.

131

132 Mr. Komas felt that the CRA district may not be suited for such an overlay district and
133 suggested that areas on the Westside, outside of the CRA district, might be better suited.

134

135 Mr. Hodson inquired how the City would prevent basic offices from opening up in these
136 areas if an Artist overlay district was approved. Ms. Henrikson stated that an ordinance
137 could be drawn up that would require special review and approval for professional offices
138 to open up in an Arts Overlay district. Ms. Henrikson continued that staff was merely

139 proposing an Artist overlay district and that the CRA had the prerogative to broaden
140 those parameters

141

142 Mr. Belote asked who would determine what was considered as art. Ms. Henrikson stated
143 that this was a question that had previously been raised as art was subjective. Ms. Kerr-
144 Marsch felt that this was getting off subject, as current parameters already determined
145 this question and that the only difference would be the permission to advertise the
146 business address and post a 2x2 ft sign on the property.

147

148 Ms. Henrikson clarified the current City rules and regulations pertaining to home based
149 businesses.

150

151 Mr. Dennis liked the concept and suggested creating the artist district in the core area in
152 such a way that it promotes walk-ability.

153

154 Mr. Glenn Storch stated that art districts have been successful in other towns and if a
155 standard for art could be created than this would be a great benefit and viable concept for
156 New Smyrna.

157

158 Ms. Henrikson thanked the CRA for their direction and stated that she would present
159 draft regulations and an overlay map to the CRA at their March 3, 2010 meeting.

160

161 Mr. Belote asked if the CRA was only to make a recommendation and not an approval,
162 which Mr. Dennis affirmed.

163

164

165 **3. OLD BUSINESS**

166 **A. CRA Plan Update – Additional Information**

167

168 Mr. Pete Sechler, Principal with AECOM (fka Glatting Jackson) stated that he and his
169 team, in conjunction with CRA staff, were working on refining the Community
170 Redevelopment Plan update to strike the right balance between the report and the
171 appendix piece, which supported the report and included all manner of discussion during
172 the evaluation process (e.g. elaborate on intent of narratives, find already implemented
173 examples for form-based codes). Mr. Sechler continued that he would like the CRA's
174 input for finalization of the report.

175

176 Mr. Belote and Mr. Dennis were concerned that the dollar amounts and ranking priorities
177 associated with the projects in the report might give the impression that the CRA had
178 committed to spending the indicated amount for each project. Mr. Sechler suggested
179 changing the name from *cost estimates* to *preliminary budget figures* and only reflecting
180 them in the appendix to avoid any misinterpretation.

181

182 A brief discussion ensued about how the priority ranking, the dollar amounts and the
183 project score were derived, their purpose, their importance, the use of possible Grant
184 monies and suggestions for making the report/appendices more understandable to the end
185 user.

186 Ms. Lybrand stated it was important to be informed whether or not any of these projects
187 could be subsidized by a grant or partnership and that this information should be reflected
188 in the actual report.

189
190 Mr. Kosmas felt that removing the project priority ranking from the report would allow
191 the CRA more flexibility in selecting projects on the list based on an economic viability
192 versus a perceived numerical importance.

193
194 Mr. Sechler summarized the CRA's suggestions as follows:

- 195
- 196 • Keep the A, B and C prioritization but take the numerical priority ranking, cost
197 figures and subtotal information out of the report and only indicate them in the
198 appendix piece. Delete the scores completely as they were not statistically valid.
 - 199
 - 200 • Indicate each project with an asterisk or indentation for the potential of grant or
201 partnership funding

202
203 Mr. Belote pointed out a few scrivener errors and Mr. Sechler stated that the document
204 would be thoroughly reviewed prior to its publication.

205
206 Mr. Dennis and Mr. Kosmas complimented Mr. Sechler on getting all the conceptual
207 conversations and ideas presented over the past ten months into this report in such a
208 concise fashion.

209
210 Mr. Sechler stated that he had received incredible Community input and thanked
211 everybody for their time and effort.

212
213 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the proposed Community Redevelopment**
214 **Plan update pending the inclusion of the changes discussed in the meeting and to**
215 **authorize staff to accept those changes to move forward, seconded by Mr. Williams.**
216 **Motion carried on roll-call vote 6-0.**

217
218 Mr. Otte stated that it had come to his attention that some projects on the Plan update list
219 had inadequate to no funding and he suggested holding a special meeting on February 17,
220 2010 to fine-tune these budget issues.

221
222 Ms. Dennis acknowledged Ms. Purkiss in the audience and stated that he was not able to
223 call on her during a vote. He offered her to come to the Podium to address the CRA now
224 that the roll had been called.

225
226 Ms. Purkiss questioned the CRA's action on taking out all the ranking information and
227 asked for clarification, as she felt that this information had been derived through several
228 public meetings.

229
230 Mr. Dennis explained that this information was only removed from the Plan Update
231 report, but was still indicated in the appendices. Mr. Dennis continued that these two

232 documents completed each other and that this information was readily available for
233 public review.

234

235 Mr. Sechler clarified that the A, B and C letter ranking of the projects would remain in
236 the report, the cost figures were going to be re-described as preliminary budget figures
237 and that all this would be listed in the appendix as well. Mr. Sechler continued that the
238 specific 1 – 30 rankings would remain in the appendix, but would not be listed in the
239 report.

240

241 B. Flagler Avenue Hotel - Update

242

243 Mr. Otte commented on the activity that had occurred since the January 13, 2010 CRA
244 meeting:

245

- 246 • CRA attorney had prepared a draft contract between Coronado Methodist Church
247 (owner of parking lot) and the City of New Smyrna Beach for the leasing of
248 parking spaces at the lot across from the proposed Hotel project
- 249
- 250 • the attorney for the developer had submitted a letter that outlined the “milestones”
251 for the project
- 252
- 253 • the New Smyrna City Manager and Mr. Otte had prepared a letter outlining all
254 activities to date and what possible actions were contemplated in the near future
- 255
- 256 • The City Commission approved rezoning of the property and a related agreement
257 at their January 26, 2010 meeting.
- 258

259

260 Attorney Glenn Storch, Law Firm Storch, Morris and Harris representing the Developer,
261 informed the CRA of all the necessary permits and approvals that had to be obtained and
262 all agreements that needed to be entered into in order to proceed with the proposed hotel
263 project and stated that progress was being made and welcomed any questions the CRA
264 Commissioners may have.

264

265 Mr. Kosmas asked for clarification on the discrepancy between the annual TIF figures
266 listed in Mr. Otte’s letter and Mr. Storch’s verbal report. Staff and Mr. Storch will
267 investigate on how each side arrived with those figures.

268

269 Mr. Kosmas would like to see more details about possible parking issues and how CRA
270 staff and the developer proposed to resolve them.

271

272 Mr. Dennis cautioned that the CRA would be obligated to pay the lease for the parking
273 spaces between the CRA and Cormeth, even if the Developer decided to seek parking
274 elsewhere. Mr. Otte and Mr. Storch both commented that the Developer would sign a
275 “mirror” parking lease agreement to protect all parties involved.

276

277 Ms. Lybrand inquired about a comment that was made at a subsequent CRA meeting that
278 this property owned by Cormeth might be deed restricted and inquired if staff had looked
279 into this.

280
281 Mr. Otte stated that he had had conversations with the Pastor of this Church and was
282 informed that they were no restrictions.

283
284 A brief discussion ensued about how many public parking spaces were in the parking lot
285 and how many would be committed to the Hotel.

286
287 Mr. Dennis inquired when the CRA could expect further updates. Mr. Storch felt that he
288 would be able to have an update to the CRA at their March meeting.

289
290 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the proposed Community Redevelopment**
291 **Plan update pending the inclusion of the changes discussed in the meeting and to**
292 **authorize staff to accept those changes to move forward, seconded by Mr. Williams.**
293 **Motion carried on roll-call vote 6-0.**

294
295 C. Environmental Assessment Engineering Services - Agreement

296
297 Mr. Otte stated that staff had developed an Environmental Assessment Engineering
298 Services Agreement to enter into an umbrella contract with the four final environmental
299 services firms (Kimley-Horn, Nodarse, Concurrent Technologies Corporation (CTC), and
300 Environmental Consulting Technologies (ECT). Mr. Otte continued that this agreement
301 did not commit the CRA to any specific expenditures or work, but simply set up the
302 contractual relationship through which the CRA could hire each firm.

303
304 Mr. Otte stated that staff had also prepared a scope of work for 533 Canal Street for CTC
305 under this proposed agreement to, among other things, obtain funding and develop a site
306 remediation plan.

307
308 Mr. Otte recommended that the CRA approve the Environmental Assessment and
309 Engineering Services Agreement (pending CRA/ City Attorneys review), the proposed
310 scope of work for cleanup of 533 Canal Street and staff being able to authorize minor
311 changes in said agreements to facilitate implementation.

312
313 Mr. Otte continued that the City had been approved for a federal grant for citywide site
314 assessments/cleanup plan implementation as well as a State grant for cleanup work at 533
315 Canal Street. The City had received a demolition cost estimate of \$10,000.00 and Mr.
316 Otte stated that the funding options needed to be discussed.

317
318 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the draft environmental engineering**
319 **services agreement to be used as an umbrella contract for the four (4) selected firms**
320 **and authorize the CRA Chair to sign it, as well as to approve the Scope of work for**
321 **CTC seconded by Mr. Williams. Motion carried on roll-call 6 – 0.**

322
323

324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371

D. Flagler Dunes Property – Agreement Points

Commissioner Williams abstained from voting on this agenda item due to a conflict of interest and completed FORM 8B MEMORANDUM OF VOTING CONFLICT (attached).

Mr. Otte reiterated that the CRA, at their January 9th, 2010 meeting, authorized staff to pursue discussion with the owner of the Flagler Dunes property who wished to partner with the CRA to create a parking lot on this property. Mr. Otte continued that “Agreement Points” had been identified as follows:

1. The CRA would pay for the construction of the lot on the property owned by the other party to the agreement.
2. The owner would then provide a lease of the parking spaces to the CRA.
3. The term of the lease would be determined once the lease amount per space was formulated. For example, if the CRA pays \$50,000 to construct the lot and the lease amount per space is \$500, and the lot contains 20 spaces, each year the CRA would have received a value of \$10,000 of leased spaces. The term of the lease in this example was five years, as it would take 5 years to “use up” the lease value of \$500 per space for 20 spaces.
4. If the owner wished to terminate the lease, the owner would pay the CRA whatever value was remaining in the lease.

Mr. Belote asked if there was any restrictive use on this lot or if it was open to the general public. A brief discussion ensued about two (2) separate parcels being involved in this agreement, parking space designation or non-exclusive use and that these questions could be answered in detail in the actual lease agreement to be brought back before the CRA at a subsequent CRA meeting.

Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve the suggested “Agreement Points” to be included in the lease agreement to be drawn up by the CRA Attorney and to authorize the CRA Chair to sign it, seconded by Ms. Lybrand. Motion carried on roll-call vote 5-0. Mr. Williams abstained.

E. CRA Commercial Impact Fee Assistance Program – Amendment

Withdrawn by staff.

F. Riverside Park project – Update

Mr. Otte stated that a meeting was held with City staff to discuss concerns with the seawall and the light fixtures at Riverside Park. Mr. Otte continued that an amount of \$400,000 was allocated by the CRA for the preparation of construction plans to address

372 those concerns. Mr. Khalid Resheidat, PW Director and Kyle Fegley, City Engineer were
373 present to talk on this topic.

374
375 Mr. Kyle Fegley stated that the Riverside Park project consisted of the currently ongoing
376 Phase 1 (design and permitting) and the proposed Phase II (construction). Mr. Fegley
377 commented on the costs for Phase I and stated that half of that amount was supported by
378 a Florida Inland Navigation District (FIND) grant based on the premise that City staff
379 would provide a signed contract for Phase II allowing for better access to the intercoastal
380 waterway. Mr. Fegley stated that FIND also agreed to fund half of Phase II, but staff did
381 not have that in writing. Mr. Fegley felt that staff might be able to have more details
382 “Mini Master Plan” to the CRA for review at their March 3rd, CRA meeting.

383
384 A brief discussion ensued about the benefits of mooring fields and floating docks as well
385 as staff researching any and all grant opportunities that might be available for this project.

386
387 Mr. Belote inquired about the general condition of the Manatee playground in Riverside
388 Park. Mr. Resheidat stated that it was in fair condition and that the “Mini Master Plan”
389 would also include the playground.

390
391 Mr. Fegley and Mr. Resheidat thanked the CRA for their time.

392
393

394 **4. NEW BUSINESS**

395

396 **A. Property Improvement Grant Application – 113 S. Orange Ave**

397

398 Ms. Foster stated that the application (Panheads Pizza) had received the necessary points
399 and qualified for the CRA Property Improvement Grant. Mr. Foster asked if the CRA had
400 any questions.

401

402 **Mr. Hodson made the motion to approve that the Property Improvement Grant**
403 **application for 113 S. Orange Ave (Panheads Pizza), seconded by Ms. Lybrand.**
404 **Motion carried on roll-call vote 6-0.**

405

406

407 **B. Review of the January 28 letter from the Southeast Volusia Hospital District**

408

409 Mr. Dennis commented on a reference that Mr. Williams (Bert Fish President/CEO) had
410 made during the Public Participation portion of the meeting about the Hospital and the
411 CRA coming to an Interlocal Agency agreement and continued that these Trust Fund
412 payments were generated and required by Florida statues. Mr. Dennis continued that he
413 was not opposed to any discussions but felt that the CRA did not have the authority to
414 negotiate these contributions.

415

416 Mr. Hall stated that the Vice-Chair was accurate in his statement and continued that he
417 had created a draft response to the letter from Bert Fish Medical Center Chair dated

418 January 28, 2010 in which it was indicated that the SEVHD believed it should not be
419 required to submit this requested contribution. Mr. Hall asked the CRA to approve his
420 draft response letter be forwarded to the SEVHD's counsel informing them of their
421 obligations.

422

423 Ms. Lybrand inquired if the SEVHD did not have any recourse about the contributions,
424 since they did not come forward before their Ad Valorem taxes were certified. Mr. Hall
425 concurred.

426

427 Mr. Dennis asked if an Interlocal Agency agreement would supersede Florida Statutes.
428 Mr. Hall stated that this agreement would be under Florida Statutes and, as the City
429 Commission had reserved those powers, any proposed agreement would more than likely
430 be between the City Commission, the CRA and the SEVHD.

431

432 Mr. Tolley asked that the CRA Attorney read his draft response letter for the record
433 (letter attached).

434

435 Mr. Kosmas stated that he was surprised by the Hospital's actions pertaining to those
436 contributions, given the past working relationship between the CRA and the Hospital and
437 the CRA's willingness to invest in the redevelopment of the Hospital District,

438

439 Mr. Williams, Bert Fish CEO, felt that Mr. Kosmas' comments be best made before the
440 Hospital Board.

441

442 **Mr. Belote made the motion to approve that the CRA Attorney's response letter**
443 **dated February 3, 2010 be forwarded to the SEVHD's counsel, seconded by Mr.**
444 **Hodson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 6-0.**

445

446 Mr. Tom Williams asked if he could bring up a topic at this point due to the late hour of
447 this meeting. Mr. Williams presented two (2) art pieces that were purchased during the
448 recent Images – A festival of the Arts event and elaborated on the artists. Mr. Williams
449 stated that both pieces depicted Volusia County art from Volusia County Artists.

450

451 C. Myrtle Ave Project – Discussion

452

453 Mr. Otte stated that he put this item on the agenda to keep it “on the radar” and that he
454 would bring this item back to the special CRA meeting scheduled for February 17, 2010
455 for possible funding approval.

456

457 Ms. Martin stated that this project originally started out as a Pilot Program, where the
458 CRA would partner with the Westside Community agreeing that the CRA would provide
459 landscape materials and the Community would install/maintain.

460

461 Ms. Martin continued that Mt. Olive Primitive Baptist Church and Parsonage, Pleasant
462 Grove Baptist Church and New Hope Baptist Church were selected as three (3) key areas
463 where to commence this pilot program. Ms. Martin stated that it was proposed to re-
464 landscape/hardscape existing “corner-clip” areas at the SW corner of Myrtle Ave and

465 Washington St, the NE corner of Myrtle Ave and Washington St, and the SW corner of
466 Myrtle Ave and Mary Ave. The landscaping and hardscaping features would be furnished
467 and installed by the CRA and maintained by the churches. The responsibility for the cost
468 of irrigation had not yet been determined. Staff would draft letters of Agreement to get
469 the Churches, as well as the Community, involved in the effort.
470

471 Ms. Martin stated that another concept could be Myrtle Ave Right-of-Way (R/W)
472 Improvements, from West Canal Street to Mary Avenue, to obtain a 2 FT sidewalk
473 easement on the west side of the roadway, widen the shoulder by 2 FT and relocate the 4
474 FT sidewalk to the new west R/W line with a 2 FT utility strip for street trees and ground
475 cover, install irrigation, replace the west curbing, and resurface the roadway.
476

477 The Westside Community had just started a planning process to develop a neighborhood
478 plan for the area. The initial meeting was held on Monday, January 25, and was well
479 attended.
480

481 Mr. Otte stated that this agenda item was for informational purposes only and asked that
482 the CRA continue this item and that staff would bring back a more detailed plan and
483 budget figures at the special CRA meeting scheduled for February 17, 2010.
484

485 Mr. Williams liked the improvement concepts; however he had some concerns that the
486 easements may affect the properties' front yard setbacks and made them non-conforming.
487 Mr. Williams suggested verbiage in the easement agreement to grandfather-in these
488 properties so they could be re-built without any issues should the need arise in the future
489 (e.g. damaged by fire). Mr. Otte stated that staff would check into this, but stated that in
490 his experience, this was not typically an issue.
491

492 Mr. Kosmas stated that, in his experience with title actions, it could be a daring task to
493 locate ownership and encumbrances in older, more established neighborhoods and
494 suggested a preliminary title search of the properties in question to determine if an
495 easement request was even feasible.

496 Mr. Hall stated that typically a base map survey was being created to establish an
497 ownership/encumbrances list.
498

499 Ms. Martin stated that, in addition to the Pilot program, there were three (3) additional
500 projects proposed for different areas of Myrtle Ave., of which two (2) were listed in the
501 recent Redevelopment Plan update and one (1) was delegated to Public Works. Ms.
502 Martin stated that she already had a survey for West Canal Street to Mary Ave. and
503 suggested that all parties involved could get together and combine their efforts.
504

505 Mr. Belote inquired if combining everything into on larger project versus several smaller
506 ones might impact ease of funding and implementation.
507

508 Ms. Lybrand asked if Mr. Hall would start on the process of the title search and Mr. Hall
509 stated that he would coordinate with staff to have a listing of ownerships to the CRA by
510 their special meeting on 02/17/10 or at their regular meeting on March, 3rd.
511

512 Mr. Williams clarified that the CRA's decision to remove the project priority ranking
513 numbers from the Redevelopment Plan update was done in an effort to be able to pick
514 projects from the list without being bound by a ranking number. Mr. Williams continued
515 that detailed information would remain in the appendices to the Plan update.

516

517 Mr. Kosmas addressed Ms. Purkiss during the Myrtle Ave. discussion reassuring her that
518 having taken the rating numbers out of the report would not negatively affect any
519 projects, and it could even be beneficial.

520

521 **Mr. Kosmas made the motion to direct staff to continue working with Neighborhood**
522 **representatives and put together a proposal, including easement research, and**
523 **present it to the CRA at their February 17, 2010 special meeting, seconded by Mr.**
524 **Hodson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 6-0.**

525

526 D. Temporary Parking lot use agreement – corner of Julia and Lewis Streets

527

528 Ms. Martin stated that staff had been approached by Hanson Professional Services, Inc
529 asking permission to use fifteen (15) parking spaces in the CRA parking lot at the corner
530 of Julia Street and Lewis Street for overflow parking from late February until late August
531 2010 during one of their construction projects. Ms. Martin continued that the contractor
532 was made aware that no construction material or equipment was to be stored in this lot.

533

534 Mr. Dennis asked that the contractor be informed that the CRA normally charges \$150
535 per space and that they would waive this charge.

536

537 **Mr. Williams made the motion to approve the temporary parking lot use agreement**
538 **for Hanson Professional Services, Inc. as presented by staff and waive the \$150 per**
539 **space/per year fee, seconded by Ms. Lybrand. Motion carried on roll-call vote 6-0.**

540

541

542 E. Amtrak/FEC Corridor / FDOT Plans for US1 and Canal Street

543

544 Amtrak/FEC Corridor

545

546 Chad Lingenfelter, the City's transportation planner and representative on the Volusia
547 County Metropolitan Planning organization Technical Coordinating Committee, stated
548 that he and other staff had attended a meeting in Daytona Beach and were informed that
549 an application to re-establish passenger rail on the FEC track between Jacksonville and
550 Miami had been submitted for ARRA funding. Mr. Lingenfelter continued that Daytona
551 Beach was identified as one of eight stations. Mr. Lingenfelter stated that he had assessed
552 New Smyrna's unique position to develop a proposal for the next phase of station
553 development. This proposal would enable New Smyrna Beach to approach local and state
554 representatives for project support to acquire a train station on the corner of Canal Street
555 and US1.

556

557 The CRA was supportive of the idea. Mr. Otte stated that this was an informational item
558 only and no action was required of the CRA.

559 Flare Elliott, 421 Canal Street, felt that Mr. Lingenfelter did a terrific job and stated that
560 this project called for grass-root support in terms of contacting local legislatures. Ms.
561 Elliott continued that support forms were available and asked the CRA to formally
562 endorse this project.

563

564 **Ms. Lybrand made the motion to authorize the CRA Vice-Chair to sign the**
565 **endorsement letter showing CRA support, seconded by Mr. Hodson. Motion carried**
566 **on roll-call vote 6-0.**

567

568 Mr. Lingenfelter thanked Ms. Elliott for her input.

569

570 FDOT Plans for US1 and Canal Street

571

572 Mr. Lingenfelter stated that FDOT was conceptualizing what kind of improvements
573 would need to be made at the corner of US 1 and Canal Street. Mr. Lingenfelter gave a
574 brief history on a study that was performed in 1999 for possibilities of handling
575 increasing traffic in fairly constrained intersections from Ormond Beach to Edgewater.
576 Mr. Lingenfelter continued that US1/Canal Street was one of the sixteen (16)
577 intersections on the priority list and that this presented a real opportunity to re-evaluate
578 the look and function of this intersection.

579

580 Mr. Dennis thanked Mr. Lingenfelter for this update.

581

582 **5. REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

583

A. Director's Report

584

585 Mr. Otte stated that he had initiated a meeting with Mr. Bob Williams, Bert Fish CEO, to
586 discuss a possible project in conjunction with the CRA Plan update and asked the CRA's
587 opinion if he should continue meeting with Bert Fish in lieu of the recent TIF payment
588 issues between the Hospital and the CRA.

589

590 Mr. Dennis felt that the CRA should continue to follow the plan update and asked the
591 CRA for a consensus. The CRA agreed.

592

593 Mr. Sechler asked to speak on the US 1 and Canal Street intersection item and wanted to
594 make the CRA aware that FDOT had one mission, which was to make regional traffic
595 faster and carry more vehicles per hour. Mr. Sechler continued that Communities had the
596 right to choose what they believed to be an acceptable level of service and that, when
597 FDOT spoke of improvements it meant improvements to their mission of moving more
598 cars - faster. Mr. Sechler felt that an important focus of this intersection would be a
599 pedestrian crossing and a gateway. Mr. Sechler stated that maintaining a property depth
600 for the Dunn Lumber property, that would keep it developable, was very important and
601 should be considered.

602

603 Mr. Dennis thanked Mr. Sechler for his comments and stated that they were well taken.

604

605 B. Commissioner Report

606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639

Mr. Williams stated that he had a great time attending Images – A Festival of the Arts and in selecting the artwork.

Ms. Lybrand felt that the US1 intersection needed a turning lane to make it safer and that was one of the reasons the CRA had acquired the Dunn Lumber property.

Mr. Belote pointed out that one of the lights at the entrance to the Administrative Office building had gotten run over some time ago and a cone had been simply placed over it. Mr. Belote asked for it to be fixed. Mr. Belote also commented on a non-conforming sign that was attached to a stop sign in that same area and felt that removing it would help improve the look.

Mr. Dennis suggested that Mr. Sechler be included into discussions/negotiations of incentives and land conveyance pertaining to the proposed Flagler hotel.

Mr. Williams made the motion to include Pete Sechler with AECOM in discussions of incentives and land conveyance for the proposed Flagler hotel as they proceed over the next thirty (30) days, seconded by Mr. Hodson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 6-0.

Mr. Belote was under the impression that another firm had been retained on a consulting level. Mr. Otte stated that RCLCO was under contract with the CRA to review the financial aspects of the developer’s sale/purchase agreement.

Mr. Dennis commented on CRA Chair health status of Ms. DeBorde. The CRA Commissioners took up a donation.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made to adjourn; all agreed. Meeting adjourned at 5:23 pm.