

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**MINUTES OF THE  
CITY OF NEW SMYRNA BEACH  
COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY  
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 2, 2011  
CITY COMMISSION CHAMBER, CITY HALL, 210 SAMS AVE.  
NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLORIDA**

Chair Charles Belote called the CRA meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

**Answering to roll call:**

**Charles Belote  
Steve Dennis  
Doug Hodson  
James Kosmas  
Chad Schilsky  
Thomas Williams  
James Peterson**

Also present were CRA Director Tony Otte; CRA Project Manager Michelle Martin; CRA Administrative Assistant Claudia Soulie and CRA Attorney Mark Hall.

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- A. Approval of Minutes – Regular CRA Meeting January 12, 2011
- B. Commercial Property Improvement Grant Applications for buildings owned by Richard Rosedale at: 501 Canal Street and 509/511 Canal Street
- C. South Orange Street Streetscape - Contract Time Extension

40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

**Mr. Dennis made the motion to approve the consent agenda with all items as presented, seconded by Mr. Hodson. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7 –0.**

**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.

None

**OLD BUSINESS**

1. Wayfinding System – Final Report

Mr. Otte stated that Glenn Herbert and Shaughnessy Hart, Bellomo-Herbert, are in the process of completing the revisions to the Wayfinding System based on comments received at the special meeting between the CRA and the City Commission on January 12, 2011 and were present to discuss the recommended changes in an effort to develop consensus for the final typography and symbolism to be used. Mr. Otte continued that the consultants would like to have the Board arrive at a consensus approving the basic components of the design, so that they can start negotiations with FDOT and begin developing construction documents for the project.

51 The consultants went over the proposed sign design changes and asked the CRA for a  
52 recommendation. A brief discussion ensued about modifying the Canal Street Historic  
53 District Identifier to include the word “Business”; using different colors or shapes to  
54 identify each district; using the surfer on the wave for the Flagler District Identifier;  
55 the need for great quality material on the brackets or whether or not to use brackets at  
56 all and a maintenance schedule.

57

58 **Mr. Dennis made the motion to recommend Icon Option Header B for the New**  
59 **Smyrna Beach Masthead; Icon Option Header A for both the Canal Street and**  
60 **Flagler Ave. District Identifier, modified to include a color differential for the**  
61 **Flagler Ave and Canal Street districts as well as the word “Business” for Canal**  
62 **Street and the use of high quality/low maintenance banner brackets to the City**  
63 **Commission for approval; seconded by Mr. Hodson. Motion carried on roll-call vote**  
64 **7 –0.**

65

66 Ms. Hart stated that she would make the changes to the signs as discussed.

67

## 68 2. Flagler Boardwalk Project: Phase 2

69

70 Mr. Otte stated that the City Commission chose the “modify” option for the Flagler  
71 Boardwalk structure at the December 14, 2010 City Commission meeting. At the  
72 January 12, 2011 joint special meeting with the CRA, the City Commission voted to  
73 accept the blue tile roof to be used on the modified Boardwalk Structure. Mr. Otte  
74 confirmed that the plans for the first phase of the project, the rehabilitation of the  
75 seawall, were now complete and ready for bidding.

76

77 Mr. Otte continued that the preparation of the construction plans and related duties for  
78 the Boardwalk Structure (Phase 2 of the Flagler Boardwalk project), were now ready to  
79 commence and that the project engineer had submitted a proposal for this phase.

80

81 Mr. Otte stated that the rehabilitation of the seawall and the modification and repair of  
82 the Boardwalk Structure will be combined into one project to be bid later this year so  
83 that work can begin after “turtle season” ends on November 1, 2011. Combining the two  
84 projects would also condense the amount of time that the area would be closed to  
85 visitors. Mr. Otte continued that staff was in the process of reviewing a scope of work  
86 for the design of new restroom facilities which will be coordinated with the design of the  
87 boardwalk structure. It was anticipated that this scope will be brought forward in March  
88 and that this scope, if approved, will be added to the seawall and boardwalk structure  
89 work to commence after “turtle season”.

90

91 Mr. Khalid Resheidat, Assistant City Manager and Public Works Director stated that  
92 staff had a meeting with Volusia County to discuss options for their Lifeguard station.

93

94 A brief discussion ensued about the restroom project being a CRA project or not. Mr.  
95 Williams stated that the restrooms and showers have been in operation and been  
96 maintained by either the County or the City and cautioned that using CRA funds now  
97 could cause an audit issue. Mr. Resheidat stated that this would be discussed once all the  
98 information had been reviewed.

99

100 **Mr. Dennis made the motion to accept staff’s recommendation and to move forward**  
101 **with the Phase 2 scope of work submitted by Quentin L. Hampton Engineers;**  
102 **seconded by Mr. Williams. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7 –0.**

103  
104 3. CRA Master Plan – Discussion on Business Incentive Programs  
105

106 Mr. Otte stated that on January 12, 2011 the CRA and City Commission held a special  
107 joint meeting and discussed the formulation of a business development incentive  
108 program. Mr. Otte continued that the present CRA grant programs are available  
109 throughout the CRA and that it was suggested by the consultant from the Institute of  
110 Government that special incentives should be offered in the areas that the CRA wants to  
111 re-develop. Therefore, location criteria are needed and staff was proposing a new  
112 program with the following elements:

- 113
- 114 • Take a block of funds out of the Business Development Assistance line item in  
115 the CRA budget
- 116 • Term the program an “Opportunity Request for Proposal” program
- 117 • Publicize the program
- 118
- 119

120 Mr. Otte stated that the goal of the program is to encourage the development and  
121 expansion of business types as cited in the CRA Master Plan Update, in the locations  
122 cited in the Plan based on a scoring system and not only by meeting all the program  
123 criteria.

124

125 Mr. Dennis commented on his proposed CRA Hospitality Matching Grant Program and  
126 stated that the program’s primary objectives are to assist existing hospitality businesses to  
127 expand their facilities, venues and activities; encourage the development of new  
128 hospitality businesses in locations not currently in use and develop hospitality activities  
129 and venues not currently experienced by visitors.

130

131 A brief discussion ensued about reimbursement amounts; possibly staggering  
132 reimbursement of funds based on progress; mortgage or liens; adding points for being  
133 near water or a core area; measuring of the project’s impact and return to the community;  
134 and what the difference between Mr. Otte’s and Mr. Dennis’ program was.

135

136 Mr. Kosmas stated that the CRA should create an atmosphere to attract business  
137 development and felt that the CRA was now trying to get into partnerships with private  
138 businesses. Mr. Kosmas had an issue with liens and stated that a business’ viability  
139 needed to be verified. Mr. Kosmas preferred larger projects versus small private  
140 businesses.

141

142 Mr. Belote stated that he would like to see incentives to address what possible hardship a  
143 business was experiencing because of being in the CRA district. He also had issues with  
144 partnerships.

145

146 Mr. Williams suggested rephrasing the questions “how do these incentives help the  
147 business” to “how do these incentives help the district” as this would keep the CRA’s  
148 purpose in the forefront.

149 Mr. Hodson felt that a lot of valid points had been presented during this meeting and that  
150 staff should merge the two programs based on the suggestions, so the CRA can move  
151 forward.

152

153 The CRA agreed that staff should merge Mr. Otte's and Mr. Dennis' proposed programs  
154 with focus on the maintenance, change in business, creation of jobs and impact on  
155 community.

156

157 **NEW BUSINESS**

158 **1. 407 Lytle – Clarification for future Grant Request**

159

160 Mr. Otte stated that CRA staff had been contacted by one of the owners of the Lytle  
161 Townhomes Association, Inc. at 407 Lytle Avenue in regards to submitting a CRA grant  
162 application for their townhomes. The caller stated that they needed to improve the  
163 appearance of their front yards, facing Lytle Ave., with landscaping and irrigation and  
164 were proposing the installation of a hedge to buffer the view of Lytle Ave as well as an  
165 irrigation system.

166

167 Mr. Otte continued that the question they asked was whether this request fell under a  
168 commercial or a residential grant. The Planning Department informed CRA staff that  
169 this area is zoned Mixed Use (MU), but the actual use of the property is residential.  
170 Therefore, CRA staff recommended that the applicant fill out a Residential Property  
171 Improvement Grant Application under the Lytle Townhomes Association's name; since  
172 the area to be improved is common area and belongs to the Association (and not the  
173 Townhome owners).

174

175 Mr. Otte stated that the caller also inquired if they could expand the  
176 landscaping/irrigation improvements to the yard areas on the east and west side of their  
177 building. Based on Planning staff's comments, a corner lot has two (2) front yards,  
178 which in this case would be the area south and west of the building. So the applicant  
179 would be allowed to improve these areas. However, they would like to include the  
180 installation of a swale on the east side of their property as part of the landscaping, since  
181 their parking lot floods even during light rains. This area is not considered part of their  
182 front yard, thus not an eligible item. CRA staff had been to the site and felt that allowing  
183 the applicant to also improve the east side yard would be beneficial to the overall  
184 appearance of the property, while improving the quality of life for the residents. Staff  
185 was planning on revising the Residential Improvement Grant guidelines to expand  
186 eligible expenses and as such was recommending the CRA allow the applicant to submit  
187 a separate cost estimate for installation of the swale with their application, with the  
188 condition that work on that item can only start after the CRA and the City Commission  
189 have reviewed and approved the proposed Guidelines revisions (estimated approval date  
190 by CRA would be the March 3, 2011 meeting and the CC April 12, 2011).

191

192 A brief discussion ensued that the current Residential Grant Guidelines did not take into  
193 consideration Multi-family structures; including mention of Multi-family residences in  
194 the commercial grant guidelines; the pros and cons of revising grant guidelines solely  
195 based on an individual scenario; including all yards that are visible by the public and  
196 having staff check into the drainage situation.

197

198 Staff duly noted these suggestions.

199

200

## 2. Commercial Matching Revitalization Grant Revisions

201

202

203

Mr. Otte stated that the CRA Commercial Matching Revitalization Grant Program had been established in September 2009 to provide funds to perform general construction improvements of the interior of a building in order to comply with current city, county and state codes.

206

207

208

Mr. Otte continued that staff has streamlined the guidelines and included a list of code-related items that may be eligible for reimbursement under this grant. Also, staff has determined the need for a mandatory visit of the interior of the building for which a grant is sought with the applicant, the City's Chief Building Official and Planning staff. This will enable CRA staff to correctly assess which submitted items would be eligible for reimbursement.

213

214

215

### Further discussion points included:

216

- Changing the wording from ... only one grant per ~~structure~~ to ...only one grant per business
- Getting the property owner to sign the grant application (if applicant is the tenant)
- Getting two (2) estimates from licensed contractors and/or architects
- Having the applicant provide an executed lease for the property for which the grant is sought prior to any work commencing.
- Stipulations on existing businesses relocating within the CRA district

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

A brief discussion ensued about the definition of "business" and to include a definition about business activities; checking into why not-for-profits were ineligible; the need of having an executed lease and revising that language.

226

227

228

229

Mr. Otte stated that staff would look into the topic of not for profits as well as including the definition of "business" in the grant guidelines and bring that item back at the next meeting.

231

232

233

Mr. Dennis suggested including extra points for businesses that have operating hours which extend past 7:00 pm on weekdays and are open on weekends.

234

235

236

## 2. Change Order # 2 for S. Orange Street Streetscape

237

238

Mr. Otte stated that staff had several meetings with the project contractor and Utilities Commission (UC) staff about resolving utility pipe conflicts for the S. Orange Street Streetscape. The total additional costs for this change order came to \$28,350 however; the UC was going to work directly with the contractor on some of these utility pipe conflicts, which reduced the amount of the change order to \$15,700. Mr. Otte continued that upon approval by the CRA this item would go before the City Commission on February 22, 2011 for ratification.

244

245

246

Ms. Martin gave a brief update of the progress of the streetscape work.

247

248

249 **Mr. Williams made the motion to approve Change Order # 2 in the amount of**  
250 **\$15,700; seconded by Mr. Dennis. Motion carried on roll-call vote 7 –0.**  
251  
252

## 253 REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

### 254 A. Director's Report

255

256 Mr. Otte stated that staff had been in touch with City's Chief Building Official and was  
257 told that the City had signed an agreement with the demolition contractor to demolish  
258 several structures within the City. The contractor had rearranged their equipment in a  
259 more orderly fashion on the former Dunn Lumber site and that the Chief Building  
260 Official estimated that all equipment would be removed from this site and staged  
261 somewhere else by this week's end.  
262

263 Mr. Otte stated that four (4) finalists for the CRA Marketing Coordinator position had  
264 been interviewed and a follow up interview was scheduled with one of the finalists.  
265

266 Ms. Martin stated that she had received one quote in regards to the beautification of the  
267 sidewalk in front of the former Dunn Lumber site and informed the CRA of possible  
268 repair options she was given. Ms. Martin continued that she would keep the CRA  
269 informed.  
270

271 Mr. Kosmas inquired if staff had contacted the owners of the buildings on either side of  
272 the recently demolished Fox Firestone building to make them aware of the possibility of  
273 CRA grant funding to repaint the exposed sides of their facades. Mr. Otte stated that the  
274 owner of the Arcade Building had been to the CRA office to pick up an application  
275 pertaining to the Commercial Property Improvement grant.  
276

277 A brief discussion ensued about notifying the property owners of the New Smyrna Fish  
278 House about the availability of CRA grants to aid in the repainting of a wall that was  
279 exposed during the construction of the Flagler Dunes parking lot.  
280

### 281 CRA Attorney's Report

282

283 Mr. Hall stated that he had nothing to report at this time, but was available for any  
284 questions the Commissioners may have.  
285

### 286 Commissioner Report

287

288 Mr. Schilsky stated that staff needed to touch base with Black Crow Media to further  
289 discuss the proposed program where Flagler Ave. Merchants would purchase their own  
290 equipment to broadcast a FM station. Mr. Otte stated that he had met with all interested  
291 parties and that further information would be brought forward at a future CRA meeting.  
292

293 Hearing no further comments, Mr. Belote entertained a motion to adjourn.  
294

## 295 ADJOURNMENT

296

297 **A motion was made to adjourn; all agreed. Meeting adjourned at 4:40 pm.**