

City of DeBary
Regular Economic Development Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday
January 15, 2004
6:00 PM

Florence K. Little Town Hall
12 Colomba Road
DeBary, Florida 32713

MINUTES

1. Call to Order - Chair Carol Lawrence

2. Roll Call

Present: Chair Carol Lawrence, Donald E. Kitner, Tom Donohoe, Dick Tosh, and Tracy Good

Absent: Jane Wright, Betty Gigantino, and Don Woodruff

Also Present: City Manager Diamond, Assistant City Manager Courson, and Vice Mayor Coleman

3. Approval of Minutes - November 20, 2003 Minutes

Minutes were approved as corrected.

**4. Review Draft Report of CRA Finding of Necessity Report
GAI Consultants, Inc.**

Doug Kelly and Dennis Smeltz, Planning Department Manager of GAI Planning and Engineering were introduced. Mr. Kelly noted that Chris Jones who had worked on the market projections would be appearing at the January 31, 2004 Business Round Table Meeting; that a draft copy of the report was being presented and would be summarized for the roundtable meeting; and that input from the Committee would be sought to finalize the CRA boundaries. Mr. Kelly discussed the map showing the area of DeBary included in the CRA; that Gemini Springs was not included, as it is County land, and the newer residential subdivisions were excluded. Mr. Kelly discussed that approximately 2100 acres, or 22% of DeBary was included in the study area; that the population in the study area totaled approximately 16% of DeBary's total population; that this figure was important to the *Finding of Necessity* when compared to the City as a whole; and that three or four of the necessary criteria for the creation of a CRA had been identified.

Crime statistics would be included as one of the applicable criteria; that Fire Rescue calls were at a level that also qualified as CRA criteria due to the population density; that there was preliminary information that there were development deficiencies, such as defective street layouts, unpaved areas and dilapidated buildings that might qualify for redevelopment; that code violations in a five-year period for the area

would also meet the criteria to qualify for the development of a CRA; that septic permits in DeBary had increased over five years in the area included in the study which also could be included in the *Finding of Necessity*.

Mr. Kelly noted that the report would be refined; that a summary of pertinent information would be included in the final document; that handouts would be provided at the January Roundtable meeting; that the marketing analysis included a 20-year growth projection; that population projections showed an additional 20,000 people in the DeBary and Orange City areas; that the Study would relate population growth impact to the area; that in the proposed CRA area, projections showed that 25% of the population growth would occur in that area; that preliminary figures projected that at a maximum 95% ad valorem tax collection rate, bonding capacity would be at \$15 million; and that all of the figures and information would be finalized with recommended numbers for the tax increment funding projections.

Mr. Kelly discussed that if the *Finding of Necessity* was approved by the City Council and the County Council, an updated tax increment revenue analysis would be prepared; that on January 31st updated numbers would be provided; that midline projections were included in the draft information; and that Mr. Jones would be able to provide more detailed information on financial matters at the January 31st meeting.

A question and answer period with the Committee discussed the prevalence of rental storage facilities, what projections those businesses contributed in relation to those in the study and the small probability of the development of apartments and the impact of single-family rentals; that projections in the study were for typical industrial development; that projected growth was not currently reflected in the Future Land Use Plan by the availability of properties; and that there might be a greater demand for multiple-family units.

Raw land development was discussed; that much of the development in DeBary was already platted; that property value increases would occur primarily in the Village Overlay area; that projections for residential development did not appear to allow for raw land development; that there might be an increase of requests to change single-family zoning to multi-family; that Comprehensive Plans did not always have market analysis data included; that multi-family zoning might be requested in areas south of Dirksen; that there was a greater desire in DeBary to utilize the CRA to preserve and improve the area and to avoid an urban sprawl scenario; that the projections did not take the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use into account; that the project was to justify redevelopment and the feasibility of creating a CRA; and that the projections did not necessarily reflect the predicted development that would be identified in the CRA Plan and tied into the market projections.

It was further discussed that the projections appeared to be more academic than realistic to DeBary; that the market analysis was to provide an estimate of possible tax increment funds; that the figures given were to provide a guideline to tie the CRA Plan to actual zoning and the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use; and that if the CRA boundaries were too restrictive, a viable area would not be created to produce the desired tax increment revenue.

There was discussion that the presentation to the public had to make clear that the projections were flexible upon implementation; that the projections given were to qualify the need for the CRA; that there should be substantial public participation when the CRA Plan was actually created; that the data provided

in the study could be unclear and easily misunderstood if not presented appropriately to the public; and that the process had to be made clear at the presentation. It was discussed whether additional areas should be included, such as the Progress Energy land; that tax-sharing agreements between the City and County would allow recapture of revenue; that this is a negotiable area when discussions with the County are undertaken; that the study encompassed more than what would be needed and the revenue numbers would be needed when the CRA trust fund was created; that additional properties could be included in the CRA area; that the Progress Energy property could be included since it was already zoned PUD; and that additional comparisons would have to be made in the study to determine if the numbers would still be accurate with the increase in land area.

City Manager Diamond discussed that if the Progress Energy land was made part of a CRA, then revenue could not go to the City General Fund for general services; that caution should be used to allow for sufficient growth funds for the City as well; that the County revenues would also be a consideration; and that the current FPL power plant was included in the study. It was discussed that there appeared to be sufficient criteria to qualify a particular CRA area; that the report would justify the legal criteria and, once in place, land use and population issues could be addressed; that one of the criteria for rental rates also was not yet completed and might still qualify as well; and that more than one CRA area could be created at different times.

It was discussed that a recommendation to the City Council could be made; that GAI required direction from the Committee to create a final report based on the current boundary; and that the Study could be formally submitted at that time. There was additional discussion of the boundaries; that an area had been excluded even though non-conforming lots existed, since the residential area seemed adequate; that more commercial area and the overlay district was included; and that eventually a full legal description of the boundary area would be provided. There was some discussion of expectation of County participation; that comparisons of other areas in Volusia would be made to obtain that information; that some of the information provided by Chris Jones regarded floor area ratios; that it appeared that some recommendations might conflict with the Gateway Standards; that redevelopment needed to create a pedestrian environment; that incentives for improvements could be implemented in the CRA plan when it was created; and that retention areas were often a catalyst for a pedestrian corridor.

The Committee discussed whether recommendation should be made to GAI to finalize the report based on the boundaries presented; that there were commercial areas north of Spring Vista not included; and that additional amendments to the boundaries could be made. Motion was made and seconded to proceed. It was discussed that the motion was to include the boundaries presented; to examine whether the additional Progress Energy area could be included; that an amendment to the CRA could be made, but would have to be evaluated; that the boundary would have to be accepted by City Council Resolution; that there would be no additional fee to review that area; and that expanding the boundary area at this time would not preclude changing that area before the CRA was finalized. It was restated that the motion made and seconded was to recommend to GAI to finalize the report with the boundaries as presented with the addition of the Spring Vista commercial portion. Mr. Kelly discussed that there was still time to communicate additional changes if needed; that the Business Round Table was scheduled for January 31, 2004; that the balance of the data could be obtained by that time; that GAI could hold the final report until after the Round Table; that they would address the public at the Business Round Table meeting in either event; and that brief, concise and accurate information would be provided. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Kelly noted that seven days prior to the Workshop, the copy of the handout would be provided for review and that the report would be completed by the first week in February.

5. Discussion of Business Round Table (January 31st)

It was discussed that the City was sending out letters regarding the Business Round Table meeting; that a tentative agenda included the GAI presentation and an update of the streetscape improvement project and the expiration of the amortization of non-conforming signs pursuant to the Land Development Code; and that Volusia County Planner Scott Ashley would attend.

6. Committee Reappointment Request

It was discussed that the EDAC appointments were expiring as of February 1, 2004; that the City Council would be meeting on February 4, 2004; and that requests for reappointment to Council Members should be made prior to that time.

7. Other Business

Vice Mayor Coleman requested additional information concerning the GAI presentation and that there appeared to be information included from Orange City. Mr. Kelly discussed that the market projections included figures from the DeBary and Orange City area, but would be tied into the CRA area only. Vice Mayor Coleman also asked about the PUD area of the Progress Energy property and the Florida Power and Light property. It was discussed that Meadowlea, near the FPL plant, was picked up as part of the CRA area; that there was virtually no tax revenue from that area for the City. It was further discussed whether multi family areas were being included and what impact the tax increment financing would have on other residential areas; that only the tax amount generated by increases to value would go back into the CRA area; that the base taxes would remain with the City and County; and that taxes would not be increased in other areas. It was discussed that a workshop with the City Council could be held as well; that the City Council Members had been invited to the Business Round Table; and that the information to be provided by GAI would also help to inform the City Council Members.

It was asked by a member of the public exactly what the CRA would provide and what the impact to residents would be; it was discussed that there would be no real impact to residents as far as any increase to taxes; that the increase in property values would provide improvements to the area selected for a CRA; and that the finalized information would be available at the meeting of January 31, 2004. It was further discussed that grant funds might be made available to defray costs of future growth such as utility improvements; that figures would not be available until after a CRA was found feasible; and that written information was available from City Hall.

Joseph McShea, 71 Alano Road, questioned the information regarding “slum and blight” conditions; that he was on well and septic systems and was concerned with the effect of this finding on his property; and that literature should be made available to the public who were unable to attend meetings. There was discussion that information on the City’s website was being improved and was still a work in progress.

Robert Gorman, 35 Seminole Drive, discussed that the CRA would cause areas to be declared blighted and having a high crime rate; that he was concerned with the effects on property values, especially if a CRA was not created; and that he did not agree with some of the comparisons to CRA's in other areas. It was discussed that the definitions of "slum and blight" did not necessarily denote an area as having dilapidated areas; that these were Florida Statue definitions, that non-conforming lot configurations and similar impacts were included in that definition; and that the process of obtaining this information had to be completed in the best interests of the City.

Mr. Gorman reiterated that he was concerned with the negative impact of the terminology and did not feel that DeBary met the definitions as in other communities and that he had concerns with issues of eminent domain. There was further discussion that the positive aspects of the CRA had to be emphasized; that the descriptions imposed by Florida Statue definitions were more restrictive than might be desirable; that improvements to the US Highway 17/92 corridor would have long-term positive impact on the residential areas and values; and that there would be several processes occurring before any final decisions would be made.

City Manager Diamond introduced the new City Planner, Anita Gonzalez, who was welcomed to the City.

8. Adjournment The meeting adjourned at 7 PM.

**APPROVED February 26, 2004
CITY OF DeBARY
Economic Development Advisory Committee**

Carol Lawrence, Chair