

**MIDTOWN REDEVELOPMENT AREA BOARD
MINUTES
Tuesday, February 12, 2013**

A meeting of the Midtown Redevelopment Area Board was held Tuesday, February 12, 2013, at 6:00 p.m. in the Commission Chambers, Daytona Beach City Hall, 301 S. Ridgewood Avenue, Daytona Beach, FL. The following people were present:

Board Members

Ms. Patricia Heard
Ms. Margaret Symonette
Ms. Denise Cato
Dr. Irma Browne Jamison
Mr. Kenneth McGee
Mr. Wilburn Williams
Mr. Hemis Ivey, Chair
Ms. Shirley Benjamin
Mr. Martin Tooley

Staff Members Present

Mr. Reed Berger, Redevelopment Director
Mr. Charles Bryant, Redevelopment Project Manager
Ms. Ben Gross, Assistant City Attorney
Mr. Hector Garcia, Community Standards Compliance Manager
Mr. Eddie Lopez, Code Enforcement Inspector
Ms. Becky Groom, Recording Secretary

1. Call to Order

Mr. Ivey called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

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

3. Invocation

Ms. Cato gave the invocation.

4. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

Mr. Williams led the Pledge of Allegiance.

5. Approval of Minutes for January 8, 2013

Mr. Tooley made a motion to approve the minutes of January 8, 2013, with any necessary corrections. Dr. Jamison seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously (9-0).

Ms. Cato stated that on Page 4, the second paragraph from the bottom reads a statement made by Dr. Benjamin. (The video was reviewed for the January 8, 2013, meeting and Ms. Benjamin made the statement regarding 327 S. Martin Luther King Boulevard).

Ms. Cato stated that on Page 8, the fourth paragraph stated her comments regarding rental rates for community centers. She stated that she did not include the Midtown Cultural Center but stated the Dickerson Center and did not include Ingram.

6. Staff Report

Police Department

A copy of the Compstat Report dated January 6, 2013 was included in the Board packet.

Code Enforcement

Ms. Cato stated she had concerns about windows covered with signage and businesses that opened without coming before the Midtown Board. She stated that LBS Tax service on Orange Avenue had opened and never appeared before the Midtown Redevelopment Area Board. She stated that a beauty salon and t-shirt business also opened that had not appeared before the Board. She stated the opening of the businesses made the Master Plan seem like a joke because there were businesses noted in the Plan that the Board wanted to prohibit because there were enough of the same type in the area.

Mr. Lopez stated that a Notice of Violation had been issued to the property owner as well as the tenant of LBS Tax Service. He stated that the violation was presented to the Special Magistrate and a fine was imposed of \$6,000 plus an administrative fee of \$985 to the property owner and tenant. Mr. Lopez stated that he had spoken with the tenant prior to the meeting about the fines and the signage. Mr. Lopez stated that over 1,000 signs had been picked up for LBS Tax Service throughout the City. He stated that a fine had been imposed to LBS Tax Service for the window signage. The applicant must obtain a permit for signage. Mr. Lopez stated that he will speak with the legal staff regarding the box truck parked in the front of the property.

Ms. Cato stated that there was a discussion at last month's meeting regarding tenant spaces. She asked if the property owner was required to obtain permits for a rental unit or should the tenant obtain the permits for the business.

Mr. Lopez stated that any business doing business in the City should obtain a business license. He stated that the property owner leased the property but the property owner was not responsible for the business license. Mr. Lopez stated that the first thing that must be done to open a business was to determine the proper zoning and then obtain the business license.

Ms. Cato stated that business owners had stated to her that the business owner relied on the property owner to obtain permits.

Mr. Garcia stated that a property owner can lease space but prior to the business owner opening the business on the property, the business owner must obtain a business license. He stated that a permit from the City must be obtained for signage and only 25% of a window can be covered with signage.

Ms. Cato asked at what point did a business that wanted to open within the boundaries of Midtown appear before the Midtown Board.

Mr. Garcia stated that he was not aware of any business appearing before the Midtown Board prior to opening.

Mr. Ivey stated that there were two businesses on the agenda before the Board because they were required to appear before the Board to get permission to open. He stated that the Booth's mobile store on ISB came through the Midtown Board since the building construction was reviewed by the Board. Booth's Mobile was able to apply for a license since it was contained in one structure that had been reviewed by the Board. Mr. Ivey stated that a strip mall where the outside was not changing and no new landscaping was required would not have to appear before the Midtown Board to apply for a permit.

Mr. Gross stated that a mere change in the use of the building where there was no structural change would not trigger a site plan review.

Mr. Ivey stated that the businesses where the windows were covered 100% needed to be looked at.

Mr. Garcia stated that was being addressed. He stated that some of the windows were covered with a film and if you were able to see through the windows, a determination must be made by the Legal Department as to whether that was considered signage.

Mr. Gross stated that if the code stated that a sign cannot be installed without a permit, the tenant would be required to obtain the permit.

Mr. Garcia stated that the property owner would be notified if a sign was installed without a permit and the tenant was also cited.

Mr. Gross stated that a lot of violations were what he considered spot violations. He stated a notice of violation can be written, and then the sign is taken down.

Mr. Ivey stated that the idea was to have the business owner go through the process.

Mr. Garcia stated that when the officers go out to speak to any property or business owner, the main objective was to obtain compliance. If the violation occurred again, the Code Officer would again visit the business and attempt to gain voluntary compliance and a case file was opened. If the violation occurred a third time, the matter would be brought before the Code Enforcement Board. The Code Officer would request a finding of non-compliance at the time of violation and a fine will be imposed if there was another violation. A fine will be imposed every time a violation existed.

Mr. Ivey stated there was a store at 709 Orange Avenue with a red and orange sign. He stated that he had not seen an application for signage presented to the Midtown Board. Mr. Ivey asked if that violation had been presented to the Code Enforcement Board.

Mr. Lopez stated that the property owner and tenant had been cited for not having a permit. Currently, the tenant was working with Zoning to obtain the proper permit. Mr. Lopez stated that the tenant was unable to make contact with the business that installed the sign. He stated that the sign should be removed within the next week

Mr. Williams asked why only 25% of windows were covered.

Mr. Garcia stated that a lot of it had to do with safety; but the code only permitted a certain amount of square footage for signage for each site.

Mr. Williams stated that the coverings were similar to tint on a car.

Mr. Garcia stated that was something he would discuss with Legal.

Mr. Tooley stated that he thought the reason Code Enforcement was asked to appear at the meeting was to discuss the issue of churches and itinerant vendors. He stated that vendors were not obtaining permits.

Mr. Garcia stated that he was not aware of that issue and will have to research it.

Mr. Ivey stated that there were certain churches that allowed vendors every Saturday.

Mr. Garcia asked if the person selling the bar-b-que was a church member who was raising money for the church.

Mr. Bryant stated there were instances of people that moved from church to church. When the vendors were confronted by the Police Department and Code Enforcement, they moved to another church.

Dr. Jamison stated that at the last meeting this item was discussed and the Board suggested that Code Enforcement send a letter to the church stating that if they were allowing private individuals to sell on their property, they were jeopardizing their non-profit status.

Mr. Garcia stated that would have to come from the Legal Department and he did not have the power to revoke their 501© status. He stated that he will discuss this with Mr. Berger and Mr. Gross.

Dr. Jamison asked if a private property owner can have someone sell bar-b-que on their property every Saturday.

Mr. Garcia stated no. He stated that churches fall in a different category.

Dr. Jamison stated then it was okay to open any type of business as long as it was on church property.

Mr. Garcia stated not necessarily.

Mr. Gross stated that a determination must be made if the business was something traditionally associated with churches. He noted that churches frequently had bake sales. He stated he would have to do some research to determine where the line can be set.

Ms. Heard stated that 327 N. Martin Luther King Boulevard was located in front of the Dickerson Center and church services were being held there. She stated that there were 52-53 churches in Midtown and services had been held at this location for over a year. She stated that on Sunday morning a sign goes up for church service and asked if this was legal.

Mr. Gross stated he would have to research the item.

Ms. Heard stated that the church was listed in the Daytona Times every week.

Mr. Garcia stated that he had checked the Daytona Times and had not seen it advertised and stated that Mr. Lopez had visited the property and was informed that church services were not being conducted there.

Ms. Heard stated there were no parking spaces at 327 N. Martin Luther King Boulevard and people parked on the grass.

Mr. Garcia stated that the officers must see the violation and noted that no one worked on Sunday morning.

Ms. Heard stated that the Citgo Gas Station at 600 ISB had painted the building but there continued to be outside sales.

Mr. Lopez stated that he had visited the site twice and the vendors had a permit and were legal.

Mr. Ivey stated that he would like to have Colleen Miles attend the next workshop to explain the process.

Ms. Heard stated that the truck at the tax office on Orange Avenue blocked the entrances to other businesses.

Mr. Garcia stated he would address that issue and will get with Legal regarding the Board's concerns.

Ms. Heard stated that signs were being placed on telephone poles advertising dances.

Mr. Garcia stated that he had one officer assigned to go throughout the City on a daily basis to remove signs.

Ms. Heard asked what was done to the individual that placed the illegal signs.

Mr. Garcia stated that for dances and social events, the signs were discarded. Property owners and tenants were cited for business signs.

Ms. Benjamin asked about the signs around the City that say they buy junk cars.

Mr. Garcia stated those signs were all over the state and the telephone number continually changed.

Ms. Benjamin stated there was a house on ISB between Adams Street and Magnolia Avenue that had been reported to Code Enforcement several times. She stated she had found out what was happening with the house but when she asked a question, she would like to receive an answer.

Mr. Ivey stated that the focus of the Board was to clean up Midtown. He stated that he would like to have the issues addressed in a workshop with Ms. Miles.

Mr. Ivey recognized Pastor Jeffrey Robinson of the Mt. Carmel Missionary Baptist Church. He stated that he would like to invite churches in Midtown to lead the Board in the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance.

Pastor Robinson stated that he would like to thank the Board for all they were doing to improve Midtown.

7. DEV2013-014: West Street, Small Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Mr. Pete Zahn, 244 S. Palmetto Avenue, representing the applicant, Alex Spanos

stated that during the site plan review process, it was determined that the portion of the property along West Street did not meet the Future Land Use requirement. He stated the zoning was correct and the business had been at the location for at least 3 years therefore his request was for a correction to the Future Land Use Plan.

Ms. Cato stated that in looking at the plans, there were two residences noted on the plan and asked if they were part of the request.

Mr. Zahn stated yes the residences were on the west end. He stated that staff asked that those two residences be added to the application.

Ms. Cato asked if both residences were occupied.

Mr. Zahn stated yes.

Ms. Cato asked if they had business dealings with Spanos and asked if they would be forced out.

Mr. Zahn stated that the residences had nothing to do with Spanos. He stated the residents were asked if they wanted to be part of the request and they stated yes.

Ms. Cato asked if the residences would be compensated with comfortable living since the rear of the property would be used for detailing and mechanics.

Mr. Zahn stated that would be on the opposite end of the property. He stated that the part that would change was on the eastern end on Charles Street.

Ms. Cato asked if cars being serviced will affect the resident's way of living.

Mr. Zahn stated that the current operation had been there for at least 3 years.

Ms. Symonette stated that she visited the area and if the residents were not concerned about the business, she was comfortable with it.

Mr. Zahn stated that the residents were part of the application.

Mr. McGee asked if Spanos owned the structure.

Mr. Zahn stated that Spanos owned the property with the structure which was the existing Spanos business from ISB to the west. He stated that the houses were separate and independent and Spanos did not own the two residential parcels.

Mr. McGee asked who prepared the documents for the application.

Mr. Zahn stated he prepared the plans and the exhibits were prepared by the City.

Mr. McGee stated it was a very fine job. He stated that this was the first time the

Board had received information that showed how it fit into the Master Plan.

Mr. Zahn stated that credit would go to the City staff since they put the exhibits together.

Dr. Jamison stated the residents agreed to be a part of the application, if it was re-zoned to retail and they wanted to sell their property or vacate their property, then that could no longer be a residential home.

Mr. Zahn stated it was not being re-zoned. The Future Land Use was being corrected to retail to conform to the neighborhood and the approvals run with the land.

Mr. Gross stated if the residential uses were abandoned, they would not be able to reestablish residential uses since the current zoning was retail.

Mr. Ivey stated that if the house burned down, it could not be replaced.

Mr. Gross stated that if the house burned down, the zoning was in place. The zoning made something non-conforming, not the Comprehensive Plan. The houses were legal non-conforming since the zoning was business-automotive.

Mr. Tooley stated that Economy Electric was adjacent to the properties and the request was a matter of correcting the land use.

Ms. Heard stated she had no problems with the request since the residents had no concern.

Mr. Ivey asked about the building on the east corner next to Spanos.

Mr. Zahn stated it was not part of the request and would come back to the Board as a site plan review.

Mr. Ivey stated that it seemed the Board did not have a problem with the request. He stated that he wanted to make sure that everyone was in agreement that it was a land use change.

Board Action

Mr. McGee made a motion to approve DEV2013-014, West Street, Small Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment, land use only. Ms. Heard seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously (9-0).

8. Discussion: Oak and Fulton Duplex

Mr. Ivey stated that he wanted to disclose that he was a consultant on the project as part of the investment team.

Mr. Gross stated that a disclosure form would have to be completed for this item and be disclosed when the item came up for approval.

Mr. Joe Hopkins, Performance Group, 100 Marina Point Drive, stated that the issue was designing the project to meet the current Land Development Code. He stated that the subject lot was 54 feet wide and the zoning required it to be a minimum of 60 feet. The lot was 150 feet deep and the depth was on Fulton Street. The lot was non-conforming and did not conform to the dimensional requirements of the Land Development Code. Mr. Hopkins was proposing a duplex on the property and the project would require 5 variances for development. He stated that under the guidelines of the Midtown Master Plan, no variances would be required. Mr. Hopkins stated that the plan that had been developed met the architectural guidelines and the dimensional requirements as provided in the Master Plan. Mr. Hopkins stated he was working with staff to see how he can proceed and the variances will have to be processed. Mr. Hopkins stated that a case could be presented to the Board of Adjustment in support of the variance requests, but the Board of Adjustment must determine if the variance request was self-imposed. Mr. Hopkins stated that the building could be smaller to avoid the setbacks but the end project would not be desirable, sellable, or occupiable.

Mr. McGee asked if it was a zero lot line.

Mr. Hopkins stated no. He stated a 25 foot setback was required and the proposed project showed a 10 foot setback which would result in a 15 foot setback. He stated the rear yard did not comply and a 25 foot setback was required. Mr. Hopkins stated that when you have a 54 foot wide lot and 25 feet was taken off the front and 25 feet off the back, there was only 4 feet of land to develop.

Ms. Cato stated that according to the Master Plan, Page 68, it was her understanding that this was the type of architectural design that would be put into Midtown. She stated that in reviewing the plans there would be no parking in the front and the parking would be in the rear. She stated that her concern was ingress/egress and asked if there was sufficient space for parking and a garage in the rear.

Mr. Hopkins stated that the parking would be in the rear with frontage on Fulton Street.

Mr. Hopkins stated duplex residential was exempt from stormwater regulations. He stated what was proposed in the site plan was permissible under the guidelines of the Master Plan and stated that several variances would be required under the current Land Development Code.

Ms. Cato stated the area did flood and asked what could be done to assure that it would not be destroyed if flooding occurred.

Mr. Hopkins stated that during the building process, it must be verified that the structure was in compliance with the City's flood ordinance and stated that the finished floor will have to be above the 100 year flood elevation.

Ms. Cato stated she was concerned about placing a building in an area where flooding occurred.

Mr. Hopkins stated there was an adequate system in place to assure that the project would be constructed above the flood plain.

Dr. Jamison welcomed the possibility of affordable housing in the area but she had a problem with people asking for variances. She stated that if variances were approved, there was no code. She stated that people attempt to maximize their return on a piece of property by overbuilding.

Mr. Hopkins stated that he had not mentioned affordable housing. He stated his point in making a presentation to the Board was because the Board had participated in the preparation of the Midtown Master Plan and the proposed project fit within the Master Plan and did not require variances. He stated that the current Land Development Code for the zoning district required multiple variances. He stated that he was in a quandary since he must address two standards.

Mr. Tooley stated the variances were being discussed because the LDC required a 25 foot setback but the Master Plan only required 10 feet. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Hopkins stated yes.

Mr. Berger stated that staff was supportive of the project and could make a strong recommendation to the Board of Adjustment on the case. He stated it was a small urban lot and reflected neighborhood preservation. Mr. Berger stated that Page 71 of the Master Plan outlined additional standards and those needed to be discussed. He stated that staff was excited about the proposed project.

Ms. Heard stated that it would be one of the first to be built under the Master Plan which was designed by Craig Huffman. She stated that Mr. Huffman worked on the design of the project and asked if that was a conflict.

Mr. Hopkins stated that he felt that was a compliment.

Ms. Heard stated the land was owned by Ivey & Associates.

Mr. Ivey stated that Ivey & Associates was not the owner.

Ms. Heard stated she was concerned about the variances requested and asked if each project that came before the Board would have similar variances.

Mr. Ivey stated they were trying to use the new Master Plan guidelines so future projects will not have to be presented for variances which will make the process smoother. He stated that there will not be a conflict of interest. He said he asked Professor Huffman to design the proposal based on the new guidelines because he created it. Mr. Hopkins was retained as the engineer to address the flood plain issues in that zone.

Ms. Heard stated that she went by and looked at the property and it was not a rectangle.

Mr. Hopkins stated the lot may appear to not be a rectangle but it was a rectangle.

Ms. Heard asked about the garage spacing at the rear.

Mr. Hopkins stated that it was a one car garage and the occupant would have to pull in and back out.

Ms. Heard asked how wide the building will be from the front porch to the back.

Mr. Hopkins stated that the house was 26 feet plus the garage which would be an additional 12 feet.

Dr. Jamison stated she was comfortable knowing that it was consistent with the Master Plan and hoped that the LDC rewrite will incorporate the Master Plan into it. She asked if the Board of Adjustment will be notified if the Midtown Board supports the variances.

Mr. Berger stated that final plans will be put together which will be presented to the Midtown Board. The Midtown Board will make a recommendation to the Board of Adjustment. The Board of Adjustment will hear the request and then a final site plan will be developed.

Mr. Hopkins stated he would want the Midtown Board's support for the variance requests.

Mr. William stated he was concerned about flooding in the area and hoped construction on the lot will not add to the flood problems.

Mr. Ivey stated that construction on the lot would be built under the 100 year flood plan. He stated there was a retention pond in the area to help alleviate flooding.

Mr. McGee asked what the proposed finished floor elevation will be and asked if it will be 10 feet 4 inches.

Mr. Hopkins stated the final finished floor level had not been set. He stated that

the City adopted flood plain maps in 2002 and then a study was completed by Taylor Engineering and that study was on file. He stated that as a designer, he was obligated to adhere to the best information available. He stated he was evaluating the study to determine what the flood level was in the new plan as opposed to the maps.

Mr. McGee asked conceptually, how you would get to the kitchen from the patio.

Mr. Hopkins stated that depending on the final elevation, there may be some small steps to combat the grade differential.

Mr. McGee asked how far the garage was above the street and how do you handle the grade from the driveway to the property to the north.

Mr. Hopkins stated that had not been designed yet but would be taken into consideration before a final presentation was made to the Board.

Mr. McGee stated he believed the project was a marvelous opportunity.

Ms. Symonette asked about the catch basin noted on the plans.

Mr. Hopkins stated it was an existing City maintained facility in the right of way.

Mr. Ivey stated he wanted to make sure the Board looked at the project to see the challenges that the Board will be faced with under the new Master Plan guidelines.

Mr. Shanks stated that most all of the single family vacant lots in the project area were less than the one proposed and the proposed plan would be the only thing that will work. He stated that most of the lots were vacant because the house cannot be replaced on the lot.

Mr. Ivey stated that the comments will be sent back to Mr. Huffman so the concerns can be addressed.

9. Discussion: 885/887 W. International Speedway Boulevard Conceptual Site Plan

Mr. Joe Hopkins, Performance Group, 100 Marina Point Drive, stated the property was located at the corner of Adams Street and International Speedway Blvd. and the existing building was constructed in 1955. He stated that he had put together a redevelopment plan to rehab the property to establish traffic patterns, improve the physical appearance of the existing structures, and improve the appearance of the existing sign. The sign will be refaced and repainted and the existing insurance building will be taken down. Mr. Hopkins presented a copy of the demolition plan and the proposed site plan where uniform traffic patterns will be established. He stated that fencing was proposed along the rear portion of the

property and a landscape plan was included. Mr. Hopkins stated that a request for final approval will be presented at the next Board meeting. He stated that the property was owned by Don Hawkins and he leased the building himself.

Mr. Ivey stated what was proposed was to clean up the property. There was no additional project proposed at this time.

Ms. Cato asked if the property will be used as a car dealership.

Mr. Hopkins stated that 887 was an insurance sales office and that will remain. He stated that the building on the east side has been used for automotive and the property owner has a tenant prospect that will be doing sales of vehicles and light service.

Ms. Cato asked if there was sufficient space for egress onto Adams Street.

Mr. Hopkins stated that the driveway was only a single vehicle lane although it was used for going in and out of the property. He stated that it will be changed to only allow traffic to exit.

Ms. Cato asked how many cars will be on the property.

Mr. Hopkins stated it will be motorcycles and recreational type vehicles, not automobiles.

Mr. Ivey stated that in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, the south side of ISB was not to have automotive. He stated he thought the Board will be in favor of cleaning up the property but speaking for himself another car dealership will not be favorable on ISB.

Ms. Cato asked if the entire project would be resurfaced and asked about the egress/ingress.

Mr. Hopkins stated that the access to the rear will be off of Adams Street and that will be the only access to that area. He stated there will be no access from ISB to the rear portion.

Ms. Cato asked if the residents had been informed of the upcoming project.

Mr. Hopkins stated there was not a residence that abuts the property.

Ms. Cato asked how many jobs will be created with the project. She asked what would make the RV shop different from the others located close by. She stated there was a lot of money being invested in landscaping and asked if that was feasible. She stated if the landscaping was installed, it needed to be maintained. She asked about the hours of operation and the noise barriers when test driving vehicles.

Mr. Hopkins stated he would relay Ms. Cato's concerns to the property owner.

Ms. McGee stated that the radius extended well beyond the curb and asked if that area would be landscaped.

Mr. Hopkins stated he was not proposing any work within the right of way or along the property boundary. He stated there would be internal striping to help with traffic patterns.

Mr. McGee asked about the egress onto Adams Street and the distance from the corner to the egress.

Mr. Hopkins stated there was sufficient room to stage out onto Adams Street. He stated that Adams Street was extremely low in traffic volume. He stated that the insurance operation was fenced that denied him access to the south. This will allow for an option to exit into the neighborhood. Mr. Hopkins stated the patterns were recommended and the project was under review by staff and will take into consideration any staff comments.

Mr. McGee stated he thought it would benefit the Board to see a small exhibit as to how the lot will fit in the Master Plan drawing. He stated that the duplex was an excellent project but he did not have the same feeling about this one.

Mr. Ivey stated he would like Mr. Hopkins to look at how the project will fit into the Master Plan and this may have to be discussed again.

Mr. Hopkins stated that in the meantime, he will continue to process it through the TRT at the staff level.

10. Redevelopment Project Updates

Mr. Bryant stated that the wayfinding meeting will be held on February 21 to discuss signage.

Mr. Bryant stated that there will be a meeting to discuss Orange Avenue on February 26.

Mr. Bryant complimented Mr. Williams on the publicity he has received for the programs in which he is involved.

Mr. Bryant stated that he will be attending the ICSC conference in Tampa next week and working to bring a grocery store to Midtown.

11. Public Comments

Ms. Johnnie Ponder, 885 Maley Street, stated that she was working with the Health Department on the Midtown Heat Board which wanted to work with the

Midtown Board to help with the Midtown Master Plan.

Mr. Ivey recognized Coach Fallon and stated that the City Commission recognized Ms. Fallon and the Daytona Beach Tigers cheerleaders. He stated that Coach Fallon saved the lives of two people at the cultural center where a shooting took place. Mr. Ivey stated that Chief Chitwood donated \$750 to the Daytona Beach Tigers and he was trying to raise \$2,000 for uniforms and asked for the Board to support the Daytona Beach Tigers.

Ms. Yvette Presley, 1121 Barbara Drive, asked if there was a schedule of activities for the Midtown Cultural Center. She stated she was interested in participating in activities for seniors and would like a schedule of activities.

Dr. Jamison stated that Leisure Services would have a schedule. She stated that every Wednesday from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. at the Dickerson Center there were senior programs and invited Ms. Presley to attend.

Mr. Ivey stated that he and Coach Fallon needed to talk to Mr. Berger regarding budget issues.

12. Board Comments

Ms. Symonette stated that each month items were discussed and nothing was done. She stated that Ms. Cato had asked about a vehicle parked in Midtown for two years and nothing happened. She stated she was frustrated because the same things were asked for each month and nothing was done.

Mr. Ivey stated that the Board's concerns should be presented to Commissioner Reed who represented Midtown. He asked that Commissioner Reed be invited to the next meeting to discuss the Board's concerns.

Ms. Cato stated she asked a question last month about money taken from the Midtown budget for street improvements on Orange Avenue and stated that she had not received an answer. She asked if the Redevelopment Boards received a copy of each year's budget.

Mr. Ivey stated that the strategic planning meetings were going on now and encouraged Board members to attend those meetings.

Mr. Berger stated there was a strategic planning meeting two weeks ago and dates of future meetings will be listed on the website or can be obtained from the Clerk's office.

Mr. Berger stated that the Orange Avenue funds were reserved for Orange Avenue and cannot be used for other projects.

Ms. Cato asked if funding was taken from the other Redevelopment Board's

budgets.

Mr. Ivey stated that Board members should attend the meeting on February 26 to discuss the Orange Avenue projects.

Ms. Cato thanked Mr. Berger, Mr. Bryant, and Mr. Gross for their hard work and wished everyone a Happy Valentine's Day.

Mr. Williams wished everyone a Happy Valentine's Day.

Ms. Benjamin asked Mr. Berger about the Orange Avenue funding.

Mr. Berger stated that the Orange Avenue capital funds, over \$1,000,000, were set aside to help pay for some of the improvements on Orange Avenue.

Ms. Benjamin asked if that was the same \$1,000,000 that the previous commissioner asked that Midtown receive.

Mr. Berger stated he believed both the commissioner and the Mayor suggested that be done. He stated there was no motion by the City Commission but there was the request. Mr. Berger stated that the decision had been that the money will remain for Orange Avenue.

Ms. Benjamin asked if that money was in the Midtown budget.

Mr. Berger stated it was in the CRA budget.

Ms. Benjamin asked if some of the money would come from Beach Street.

Mr. Berger stated that Downtown had some funds that will potentially be used. He stated that Midtown and Downtown will be participating financially in some way. Mr. Berger stated that the purpose of the workshop was to talk about the kinds of improvements that should occur on Orange Avenue then costs can be determined and other sources of funding considered. He stated that Tiger grants were applied for and failed on three occasions.

Ms. Benjamin stated Palmetto Avenue had nice stop signs and there was nothing in Midtown. She stated they kept asking for the same thing but there was no progress and asked if they would ever get stop signs.

Mr. Berger stated that it was a matter of funding and right now there was not a lot of funding for improvements.

Ms. Benjamin stated that "unfinished business" needed to be added to the agenda since people asked questions and they were not answered.

Dr. Jamison asked if the meeting was held with the college students and the

consultant.

Mr. Ivey stated yes.

Dr. Jamison stated she liked the idea of inviting ministers and other organizations to attend the meetings. She asked if Board members could be provided with name tags so they were identified when attending meetings.

Mr. Ivey stated that the idea of inviting a pastor was suggested by a Board member so he implemented the idea. He stated that if there was a group that a Board member would like to recognize, he would be glad to address them.

Mr. Bryant stated that Board members may have a name tag made and they should contact him to schedule a time to come in to have a name tag made.

Mr. Tooley stated he thought the Board was moving in the right direction. He thanked Staff for putting things in place to show how they align with the Master Plan. Mr. Tooley stated that Mr. Williams will be participating in a panel discussion on February 16 in Palm Coast. He asked if anyone had talked to Public Works about speed bumps and stated that traffic flow needed to be regulated. He stated people needed to conform voluntarily instead of trying to be a policing agency.

Mr. McGee stated there was a round-about at Live Oak Avenue and Palmetto Avenue and it took that development district 7 years to get that installed. He stated 2 or 3 more of those were needed. He stated it would beautify the area. One could be placed at Orange Avenue and MLK and one at Mary McLeod Bethune Boulevard and MLK. He stated they needed to develop some sort of a landscape turn about at the middle of ISB and MLK. He stated that the City of Ormond Beach was building a 10 foot wide landscape flower bed through their business district on Route 40.

Ms. Heard stated that the rules for vendors did not stay the same. She stated that she did not know that Citgo can have vendors on the outside as long as the vendor had a permit from the City. She stated that others can only set up outside a business only selling goods that they sell inside. She stated that when Bike Week came along, the rules changed again.

Ms. Heard stated that the whole City and County should be responsible for paying for the Orange Avenue Bridge. She stated cars that used the bridge were not from Midtown. The people that used the bridge came from other areas but Midtown must pay for the bridge.

Ms. Heard asked if Mr. Ivey would continue to remain on the Board for the next two years.

Mr. Ivey stated he was not sure.

Ms. Heard stated she would be attending a concert on February 14 at the Ormond Center. She wished everyone a Happy Valentine's Day.

Mr. Shanks suggested that traffic speeds in Midtown be reduced to 30 MPH. He stated that the speed limit on the Bethune-Cookman campus should be 20 MPH.

13. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Hemis Ivey, Jr., Chairman

Becky Groom, Recording Secretary