

**DOWNTOWN-BALLOUGH ROAD
REDEVELOPMENT AREA BOARD
MINUTES
Tuesday, April 3, 2012**

A meeting of the Downtown-Balough Road Redevelopment Area Board was held Tuesday, April 3, 2012, at 12 PM in Commission Chambers of 301 S. Ridgewood Avenue, Daytona Beach, FL. The following people were present:

Board Members

Mr. Al Smith, Jr.
Mr. Robert Abraham
Mr. Harold Goodemote
Mr. Dan Harshaw
Mr. Bob Johnson
Ms. Tammy Kozinski
Mr. Larry Robinson
Ms. Cathy Washington
Mr. Scott Weidman

Staff Members Present

Mr. Reed Berger, Redevelopment Director
Mr. Jason Jeffries, Redevelopment Project Manager
Ms. Carrie Latham, Deputy City Attorney
Ms. Jeanne Tolley, Redevelopment Technician
Ms. Dana Williams, Recording Secretary

1. Call to Order

Mr. Goodemote called the meeting to order at 12:05 PM.

2. Roll Call

Ms. Williams called the roll and noted members present as stated above.

3. Approval of Minutes of March 3, 2012

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the minutes of March 3, 2012. Mr. Harshaw seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously (9-0).

4. **DEV2011-010, Conceptual Review, Renaissance Place**

Mr. Jeffries presented the concept site plan and explained the proposed project was an assisted living facility at 113 Mullally Street on the former Beach Street Condo RPUD site. He stated the applicant was proposing to separate the Beach Street Condo RPUD into two separate projects, with the frontage on Beach Street proposed to be rezoned to RDD-3. He stated the project would be reviewed by the Redevelopment Area Board and the Planning Board with final approval by the City Commission. He stated the site for the proposed assisted living facility was being requested to be rezoned to a new RPUD to allow the project. He stated the conceptual plan and architectural style were before the Board for their feedback.

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Rob Merrell, representing 400 Beach Street Acquisition, LLC, explained the market for the previous plan was nonexistent and that the subsequent property owners' overall intent was to make the property useful again. He stated the proposal included a 2+ acre adult living facility which provided assistance to the residents with the exception of medical care. He described the project as between an apartment/condo complex and nursing home and stated all residents would be ambulatory. He stated the facility would further the goals of the Downtown area by having people living there.

Mr. Merrell stated demolition of the former car dealerships had been delayed during Bike Week and environmental issues. He stated the site was a Brownfield area and they had partnered with the City for the Phase II assessment, but he did not think it would affect the project. He stated he had met with the neighborhood group who seemed to welcome the project and were pleased with the lesser scale and intensity.

Mr. Smith asked if the entire area, as outlined on the display boards, was considered Brownfield and if so, how it would affect the project and potential funding.

Mr. Merrell stated the entire area was considered Brownfield but it did not preclude building on it. He stated the designation could have an effect on his client's ability to receive funding they did not know yet. He stated he would welcome any input or answer questions from the Board regarding the concept plan but it was his understanding that no vote was required

Mr. Goodemote asked if the project were considered a residential home.

Ms. Lathan read from the Code and *Florida Statutes* requirements related to Chapter 429 Assisted Care Communities, and stated that according to the LDC the project would be considered a community residential home.

Mr. Merrell stated that when the *F.S.* changes were implemented, variations on the theme of adult living varied from having one or two people living in a personal residence to a

full-scale nursing home with those being heavily regulated by the State. He stated that under the current Statutes, the proposed facility was prohibited from providing medical care. He stated that because the proposal was a planned development, it was the Board's determination as to what was desired in the Redevelopment Area.

Mr. Abraham asked the height of the structure.

Mr. Merrell stated structures to the west were 1-2 stories and the proposal was planned for 3 stories. He stated the height limitation was 35' therefore, the proposed project would be transitional.

Mr. Mark Dowst, project engineer, stated the proposed project was 35' high.

Mr. Jeffries stated the project had to comply with the compatibility buffers to the west.

Mr. Johnson stated the site plan did not provide for much parking and asked if it met the parking requirements.

Mr. Merrell explained there was not a lot of parking required or needed. He stated residents of that type facility typically did not have vehicles although they were ambulatory and could walk to shopping and dining in the Downtown area.

Mr. Harshaw stated there needed to be employee parking including the kitchen staff, hairdresser and spa staff; but if the residents did not have vehicles the facility would be operating more like a convalescent or in-house lock down.

Mr. Dowst stated the available parking met Code and the designers felt comfortable there was sufficient parking available.

Discussion followed on the parking parameters, the likelihood of residents having "retired" their cars, and how residents would travel to places for their medical needs. Also discussed was parking availability for visitors and deliveries to the facility as well as the frequent use of group outings for residents,

Mr. Weidman asked if any safety issues had been identified or addressed, particularly related to people wandering about the property and its set back location.

Mr. Merrell stated it was a quiet area and there had been an extensive technical review. He stated the area was located Downtown which had its own issues, although it was located in one of the quieter areas of Downtown.

Mr. Dowst stated there would be wrought iron fencing around the perimeter requiring the use of the front doors, which would make it relatively secure.

Mr. Harshaw asked about the tie in of stucco and metal roofs to the existing Florida clapboard surroundings.

Mr. Merrell stated the stucco and lap siding were nice finishes to the eclectic mix of the area and they also picked up on the architectural features from when the cottages were first built.

Mr. Smith asked for Mr. Berger's thoughts on the project.

Mr. Berger stated his initial concern when approached about the project was the nature of the residents particularly regarding their independence and ambulatory status. He was also concerned about utilizing a prime development site, although the applicant had since moved the project to the west. He stated the project was compatible with the neighborhood and that with the buffer, there was availability for more commercial development on Beach Street, making the project suitable for the location.

Mr. Smith spoke about the quality and quantity of the residents and whether or not they would have an economic impact on the Downtown area.

Mr. Merrell stated the money from the construction costs would increase the TIF and be regenerated into the Redevelopment Area.

Mr. Harshaw asked about the economic scale of the ALF and who could afford to purchase a unit particularly if potential residents were living solely on Social Security payments.

Mr. Merrell stated it would be a higher-end facility.

Mr. Goodemote asked if the applicant was a national chain.

Mr. Merrell explained his client was the property owner not an ALF developer, although they were working on the site plan stage so that plans for development of the site could continue. Mr. Merrell stated the project was a very-low traffic generator and that staff had made certain the facility could not be used for any kind of drug, alcohol, crime or physical rehabilitation.

Mr. Weidman talked about the impact on neighboring properties to the east and the need to be mindful so as not to restrict what could be built.

Mr. Johnson stated that based on everything that had been presented he was in favor of the project in that it made sense and had no heavy impact on traffic.

5. Discussion Item: Board Priorities

Mr. Jeffries stated the Board-established priorities from 2-3 years ago were:

- An update of the LDC,
- Business/Residential Incentives,
- Marketing Plan Implementation,
- Riverfront Master Plan Implementation, and the
- Public Market

Mr. Jeffries stated the LDC update was an ongoing project and that the 2nd module had been reviewed with the 3rd module, which focused on appearance and supplemental standards, and would be presented in the summer. He stated business and residential incentives had been adopted and amended and the focus would be on the key efforts of Bob Gibbs. The Marketing Plan implementation had funding allocated, but the focus was solely with the DDA. Mr. Jeffries stated the Riverfront Master Plan had been adopted and was being implemented along with identifying smaller pieces of the Master Plan. He continued the priority for the public market was to complete the feasibility study which was being done by the Farmers' Market manager.

Mr. Jeffries presented revenues and capital projects, a copy of which is attached hereto and made part of the record. He stated that \$1.7 million in capital projects had been budgeted and there was approximately \$1.2 million remaining.

Mr. Goodemote stated he would like to see the Master Plan projects implemented. He added sidewalks, which were originally thought to be a small project in terms of cost, had not been done. He would like to go through the Plan to see if there was something which could be implemented immediately.

Mr. Berger stated there was no way to move ahead with Beach Street and that quite a bit of money was designated for the ISB streetscape, although the professional services portion was stalled. He added he was waiting for the contract revisions to see how it would change the overall picture. He stated the proposed public market on Magnolia Avenue and City Island was being evaluated to determine if that section of the Plan could be done now. He stated the Dog Park, discussed at the previous month's meeting had not been narrowed down and all parks were being considered as Ms. Steechi evaluated the sites.

Mr. Weidman asked about an odd dollar amount in the Dog Park budget.

Mr. Jeffries stated that all monies in the redevelopment budget had to be allocated so there may have been funds remaining that rolled over from one year to the next.

Ms. Kozinski stated there was a dog park in Sanford that had caused the opening of other businesses around the park, as Ms. Steechi had mentioned previously. She stated that many of the businesses on Beach Street appeared to be closed during Front Porch Friday's and asked if there was lighting or streetscape that could be implemented to make it appear more open and alive at night.

Mr. Jeffries stated the Public Works Department was looking at lighting but there had been problems with the GFI's. He added there would be noticeable small-scale items of streetscaping over the next couple of months, such as new trash cans, lights, banners in the medians and possibly new planters on ISB between Palmetto Avenue and Beach Street in part as a result of the recommendations from Mr. Gibbs' visit.

Mr. Smith stated money spent for promotions on Main Street was at 1%, down from approximately 2-3% prior. He stated he was concerned about the focus on a branding campaign rather than activities that would bring people Downtown.

Mr. Jeffries stated how the Downtown area was marketed was important but the DDA allocated approximately \$120,000 for marketing.

Other discussion followed on the lighting of Palm trees along the streets, can vs. rope lighting, the ISB delays, and traffic issues in preparation for the Orange Avenue bridge closure.

Mr. Jeffries referred to Ballough Road priorities as follows:

- Update of the LDC
- Salvation Army Relocation
- Root Canal Mixed Use Redevelopment
- A Pocket Park, and
- Streetscape Improvements

Mr. Jeffries stated the area generated approximately \$200,000 of revenue annually with the majority of money (63%) spent on grant programs with a large portion being in obligations to Sunset Harbor as part of a TIF agreement. Mr. Jeffries stated capital projects were:

- Streetscape Improvements
- Land Acquisition, and
- Ballough Road Bridge

Mr. Weidman asked how five years worth of revenues had been accumulated.

Mr. Jeffries stated the monies had not been spent.

Mr. Johnson asked if the funds would expire.

Mr. Jeffries stated yes so they needed to discuss new strategies. He continued the money was initially allocated for an offer to purchase the Salvation Army, the highest priority for that area, but without a reciprocated offer, it may be time to look at other options for projects to benefit the area.

Mr. Goodemote stated that without a new location, the Salvation Army was not going to sell their current location. He also discussed the potential for creating opportunities and

for businesses to take advantage of the protected waterway by dredging under and heightening the bridge if it was determined the useful life had been reached.

Mr. Johnson stated parking was needed near Caribbean Jacks.

Mr. Berger stated there was interest from property owners to solve the parking issue and assemble property. He stated that they were looking to the private sector for partnership opportunities as well as grants to deal with the dredging and other opportunities.

Mr. Harshaw asked if anyone had considered Orange Isle for streetscape and to clean up the inner streets and install rental docks.

Mr. Goodemote stated Orange Isle was not in the redevelopment area.

Mr. Weidman asked if Ballough Road was a separate CRA.

Mr. Jeffries stated yes from an accounting standpoint there were five redevelopment trust funds. He stated he had received good feedback from the Board and he would organize it for both Downtown and Ballough Road.

6. Discussion Item: Retail Strategy

Mr. Jeffries stated Mr. Gibbs was reviewing the City's design standards and would have a report for the May meeting.

Ms. Kozinski asked about code violations at 200 S. Beach Street.

Mr. Jeffries stated that Code Enforcement had visited Beach Street properties asking them to remove posters from the windows. He stated 200 S. Beach Street also had building maintenance issues but that as far as the use, the nightclub use was a grandfathered use.

Mr. Smith asked about posters in store windows.

Mr. Jeffries stated some merchants put event posters near the cash register or other locations in their stores rather than taping them to the windows. He stated he had spoken with Bullseye Marketing who was handling promotions for Art of the Automobile, and asked about reducing the number of individual merchant posters and doing a few larger ones that could be placed in the directory kiosks.

Mr. Harshaw asked if merchants were being informed of the window poster regulations.

Mr. Jeffries stated that any inquiries could be directed to him or the Redevelopment staff, but only posters taped to the windows required a permit. He stated there were other methods of presenting event posters such as window displays.

7. Redevelopment Project Updates

Mr. Jeffries reported on several DDA project updates.

- Farmers' Market,
- spring advertising to include Front Porch Friday's and commercial ads through Brighthouse in conjunction with the Daytona Cubs
- the Tactical Plan compiled by Gold and Associates, and
- website development also coordinated through Gold and Associates

Mr. Abraham asked Mr. Jeffries to summarize DDA expenditures. He stated the money was used to support events rather than put on events.

Mr. Jeffries stated the following projects were funded by the DDA:

- approximately \$12-15,000 in support of the Halifax Art Show for the permits, prizes and advertising,
- \$15,000 spent during the holiday season creating the email list and radio and television advertising for shopping Downtown,
- \$30,000 contract with Gold and Associates for the tactical plan and website development
- advertising support for the Wine 'n Chocolate Walk
- spring advertising
- marketing support and event permit fees for the Art of the Automobile

Mr. Jeffries stated the most recent Code Enforcement report had been included in the packet and he would answer any questions. He stated there had been some compliance related to the maintenance issues.

Mr. Harshaw stated the awning on the car wash on ISB behind Walgreens, had been torn since 2004 and needed to be repaired or removed.

8. Public Comments

Mr. Scott Chesley, of CKS Productions, 140 Beach Street, provided an overview of a festival he planned for Beach Street, from Orange Avenue to Fairview Avenue including City Island, scheduled for June 27 through July 8. He listed a number of events and activities associated with the festival, talked about the extensive advertising for the event, and a partnership with four local charities for a portion of the gate revenues.

Mr. John Nicholson, 413 N. Grandview Avenue, spoke briefly on four topics.

1. With the respect to the ALF discussed earlier, if the residents had disposable income, the Peabody Auditorium and News-Journal Center would benefit greatly.

2. With regard to Beach Street lighting, he felt the archway lighting should be repaired rather than just illuminating the palm trees, particularly when the pavers had come up around the roots creating safety and appearance issues.
3. Orange Avenue Bridge was slated to be closed for 2 – 2 ½ years and asked that it be considered as the Board made future plans.
4. Suggested the Board consider purchasing Lloyd Buick property on Beach Street from Fairview Avenue at the job in the street in order to straighten Beach Street

Mr. Chesley stated regarding the New Smyrna Beach Hot Air Balloon Festival a third-party survey was distributed which revealed 14% of the attendees stayed at least one night in the area and 47% were from outside Volusia County. He stated the economic impact from the event was \$2.2 million.

9. **Board Comments**

There were no Board comments.

10. **Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 PM.



Harold Goodemote, *Chairman*



not available for signature

D. Williams, *Recording Secretary*