



RENEW ARLINGTON CRA ADVISORY BOARD

Hybrid Virtual & In-Person Meeting
117 West Duval Street
Mezzanine Floor, Pers-Exam Room 3
Jacksonville, FL 32202
Wednesday, April 13, 2022 – 3:30 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

RA/CRA Advisory Board Members Present: Advisory Board Chair Matt Tuohy; Advisory Board Vice Chair Stephen Matchett; Advisory Board Members Dedee Harper, Monty Selim and Ramsey Salem

RA/CRA Advisory Board Members Not Present: Advisory Board Member Randy Goodwin, Danyuell Newkirk, Raj Adhikari and Bandele Onasanya

Staff Present: Kirk Wendland, OED Executive Director; Karen Nasrallah, Redevelopment Manager; Brian Wheeler, OED staff and Michelle Stephens, Recording Secretary

Representing the Office of General Counsel: Susan Grandin

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair M. Tuohy called the meeting to order at approximately 3:33 p.m.

II. ACTION ITEMS

APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 12, 2022 RENEW ARLINGTON COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AREA (RA/CRA) ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

A MOTION WAS MADE BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER D. HARPER AND SECONDED BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER RAMSEY SALEM APPROVING THE JANUARY 12, 2022 RENEW ARLINGTON CRA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0-0.

CONSIDERATION OF THE FY 2022/2023 PROPOSED BUDGET

Mr. Wendland reviewed the FY 2022/2023 Proposed Budget that goes into effect October 1, 2022. He noted that as in years past, the budget is preliminary and will change as it goes through the city budget process. The Property Tax amount of \$2,129,999 is a preliminary estimate that reflects current levels adding that final revenues should be available after July 1, 2022. The Investment Pool Earnings amount of \$46,000 is a preliminary estimate based on FY 2022 annualized actuals and is also subject to change.

Mr. Wendland advised that after the Administrative Expenses and Financial Obligations there is an estimated remaining amount of \$1,567,667 that will initially go into the Unallocated Plan Authorized Expenditure line item, which the Advisory Board will make recommendations for allocating throughout the year starting October 1, 2022.

Mr. Wendland advised staff will keep the Advisory Board updated as they go through the budget process. He added that money remaining in Unallocated Plan Authorized Expenditures for FY 2021/2022 will need to be allocated at a future meeting.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER D. HARPER AND SECONDED BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER RAMSEY SALEM RECOMMENDING ADOPTION BY THE RA/CRA AGENCY BOARD OF THE FY 2022/2023 PROPOSED BUDGET. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0-0.

CONSIDERATION OF RENEW ARLINGTON MCGP PROJECTS

Mr. Wheeler reviewed projects that are ready to go to grant agreement or are expected to be ready in the next few weeks.

7435 Merrill Road – Hair Formations:

They ran into a PUD Zoning delay and after extended deliberation, the applicant rezoned the property from a PUD back to CO, which allowed them to keep the hair salon Certificate of Use in CO Zoning. With the rezoning in place, they were able to move forward and get a site plan and other plan components approved through RADR. The only outstanding item that will need to be added to that amount is a JEA tap fee. They have a slight delay for final approval as they work through their outstanding issues with JEA.

5760 Arlington Road – Johns Automotive:

In September 2020, the RADR review ran into an intersection site line issue that delayed them from going forward. At this point, they have a construction bid of \$190,000 for their site plan work. They still need to get a second bid. We just got the site civil set submitted in 2021, but currently we have a zoning conflict related to parcel size and because the applicant is constructing a new building, it triggers full conformance with the Overlay as if it were a brand-new automotive service repair facility. It is required to be on a one-acre lot size, so we have a piece of legislation to address the issue for strictly service garages. The revision will allow for a grandfather provision for an Administrative Deviation if an existing automotive repair facility can demonstrate that they otherwise meet all of the site plan criteria in the overlay. They can stay in place even if they must construct a new building that is over the 50% threshold. They are doing everything we want them to do, but in this case, they ran into a zoning conflict. They will not actually be able to pull the building permits until the zoning issue is resolved by ordinance. They are going to submit an Administrative Deviation concurrently with the zoning legislation assuming the approval of City Council.

Advisory Board S. Matchett commented that he had a conversation with little John and he mentioned the trip clause regarding overnight parking of the serviced vehicles in the existing code right now. There was concern about theoretically there is not supposed to be overnight parking of vehicles being serviced.

Mr. Wheeler replied that because they are in a fenced in-area behind the building, they are considered to be screened. So they can have the overnight parking. That is one of the reasons we are pulling the building forward and bringing the service bays in from the rear. The way it is configured there is a fence between the two properties that will allow a big truck to come all the way through. The doors will continue to open in the back. With the new construction, we are going to close the drop curb and put landscaping in so their circulation pattern will work from the rear.

Advisory Board Member M. Selim referencing the legislation asked if it was an umbrella for all of the CRA or just unique to this site.

Ms. Grandin replied that it is for auto service facilities only. Ms. Nasrallah commented that the reason they did this was because they did not want to hurt the existing auto service businesses, but did not want to encourage any new ones to come in. That is why we made the one-acre site a requirement when we were going through the Zoning Overlay process. Chair Tuohy added that they still have to get an Administrative Deviation.

2711 University Blvd. N. – Chanatry Chiropractic:

Chanatry Chiropractic is located near the roundabout on University. They are adding a small addition to an existing building, a new entrance, and a new front façade on the building. Brian added that they are doing a little bit of interior work just enough to keep them under the 50% threshold. The plan is being reviewed and will go through the 10-set because of the building addition, it triggers mobility fees and some other things. This is a concept plan to add new parking and handicap parking. The project is projected to be \$220,000 and the owner has two bids coming in the next two weeks.

2104 University Blvd. N – Smart Tire Auto Service

- 7th application received in 04/2021
- Fairly large site with double the normal automotive site
- Landscape – Demo & Conversion of parking lot to meet code(s)
- Soft Cost – Professional & permit expense to accomplish retrofit
- No CRA participation in FDOT infrastructure
- Projected cost is \$250,000

1604 University Blvd. N – Cargo Transmission

- 10th application received in 05/2021
- Fence – Demo and replacement with opaque style per code

- Signage – Demo & conversion to building wall design per code(s)
- Landscape – Demo & conversion of parking lot to meet code(s)
- Soft Cost – Professional & permit expense to accomplish retrofit
- No CRA funding participation in FDOT infrastructure
- Low Qualified Bid - \$205,787

Mr. Wendland commented to keep in mind that anything above \$100,000 must be reviewed by the Advisory Board and they will make a recommendation for approval to the Agency Board. He added that he is looking at some of this stuff as it is coming through, and it is considerably more expensive than previously anticipated. Mr. Wendland commented that the project numbers are coming in higher, but the good news is that revenues are also coming in higher. What it is telling us is that for the near future all of our dollars are going to be going towards the compliance grant program.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER S. MATCHETT AND SECONDED BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER D. HARPER APPROVING THE MCGP PROJECT AT 7435 MERRILL ROAD – HAIR FORMATIONS. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0-0.

Advisory Board Ramsey Salem asked for an explanation regarding the JEA Tap Fees. Mr. Wheeler responded that the existing property has a septic tank and drain field in it that is too close to the residential property next door and therefore it has to have a fence and landscape buffer. There is a conflict. Instead of trying to remove pavement the way we usually must accommodate the landscape buffers it turns out that there is a sanitary manhole so all they have to do is come out of the building and connect. That can be as much as a \$16,000 depending on what needs to be done in and around the manhole with the age of the pipes, etc. They are in the process of getting JEA to look at it and give them a firm quote. There is a direct nexus in that we cannot meet code without connecting the sewer.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER D. HARPER AND SECONDED BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER S. MATCHETT RECOMMENDING APPROVAL BY THE AGENCY BOARD FOR MCGP PROJECT AT 5760 ARLINGTON ROAD – JOHNS AUTOMOTIVE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$190,000. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0-0.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER D. HARPER AND SECONDED BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER S. MATCHETT RECOMMENDING APPROVAL BY THE AGENCY BOARD FOR MCGP PROJECT AT 2711 UNIVERSITY BLVD. N – CHANATRY CHIROPRACTIC IN THE AMOUNT OF \$220,000. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0-0.

Ms. Nasrallah noted that their fencing has been completed on the project and they have requested disbursement of \$7,309.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER RAMSEY SALEM AND SECONDED BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER D. HARPER RECOMMENDING APPROVAL BY THE AGENCY BOARD FOR MCGP PROJECT AT 2104 UNIVERSITY BLVD. N – SMART TIRE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$250,000. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0-0.

Mr. Wendland commented for clarification that projected amounts are the most current and are subject to change.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER D. HARPER AND SECONDED BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER M. SELIM RECOMMENDING APPROVAL BY THE AGENCY BOARD FOR MCGP PROJECT AT 1604 UNIVERSITY BLVD. N – CARGO TRANSMISSION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$205,787. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0-0.

CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE RENEW ARLINGTON MCGP GUIDELINES

The Advisory Board Members were provided with a copy of the RA/CRA Zoning Overlay MCGP for Fencing, Signs and Landscaping/Landscape Buffers Goals, Policies and Guidelines document. Ms. Nasrallah noted at the bottom of the first page that projects need to be submitted by May 1, 2025 adding that for now she thinks that date is sufficient.

Ms. Nasrallah referenced on page 2, 9th bullet down, “Mandatory Compliance Grant Agreements that exceed \$100,000 will require approval by the Renew Arlington Agency Board”. She advised that the way the projects are starting to come in, and as you can see, they are not only exceeding \$100,000 they are exceeding \$200,000. She commented that when they talked to some of the Agency Board Members about this informing them that it is going to require a few more meetings than the regularly scheduled four quarterly meetings, it appeared that may be a little burdensome for them. We wanted to start the discussion about maybe what you might recommend that amount be changed to if we were to go to the Agency Board and talk to them about a higher threshold, so we are not constantly having to call special meetings to get the agreements approved. These projects take so much time on the front end and especially when they have to go through the RADR process to have to wait for a quarterly meeting is asking a little too much especially if they just missed the last meeting and they have to wait a few more months. If we could present them with an entire threshold where everyone feels comfortable approving them that would probably help.

Chair Tuohy commented that as we have seen in the past just because they are advertised as quarterly, they do not always happen quarterly. He commented that his first look at this is if the Smart Tire project is already at \$250,000 what is going to happen when Bill Cesery gives us his shopping center project for Merrill Road, etc. We are going to see some bigger numbers. Obviously, that will exceed what anyone is going to give us permission to approve. He personally thinks we need to go to \$300,000. He stated that he did not know if that would make the Council Members choke on that number or not, but he thought it would be a good idea.

Mr. Wendland added that he would ask what the basis would be for the Agency Board to deny a project. We have gone through the Overlay/grant process, and we say look the cost of this is going to be \$245,000. He is not sure how someone would vote no on what conditions that are simply required. He added that the Auditor's as well as the Council President support the concept.

Advisory Board Member M. Selim commented that the bid timeframe concerns him. If someone gives you a price, they are going to guarantee it for 90 days and by the time it goes through the process and Brian approves it, and then the Advisory Board and then the Agency Board they may miss a quarter and the bid will have expired.

Advisory Board Member M. Selim commented for clarification on how Mr. Wheeler is managing that process to separate what items are building related versus site related and the soft costs associated with those. For instance, if an applicant is choosing to go ahead and redo the façade of the building and we have to address ADA access either to the old building entrance or to the new building entrance it is the same site work. Mr. Wheeler added that they had the same thing with College Park. They were asking for tons of money to do all of their site compliance when actually there were very specific things that needed to be done per the ordinance and not all the rest of the stuff that needed to be done maybe per code because of all the redevelopment, so we were able to parse out all the general redevelopment expense from just the code percentages. Ms. Nasrallah added that they are line itemed in their eligible expenses and total budget.

Mr. Wendland clarified that if someone comes in and has \$10,000 for a fence, and \$20,000 for a sign and \$80,000 for landscaping. In aggregate it is over \$100,000, but they are treated as three separate agreements then we do not have to go to the Agency Board for approval.

Chair Tuohy asked what the Advisory Board Members think the number should be. He suggested starting with \$300,000. Advisory Board S. Matchett and Advisory Board Member D. Harper suggested \$250,000. Advisory Board Member Ramsey Salem replied \$250,000.

Ms. Grandin commented since we are treating them as separate contracts would you want to put a limit on each type maybe. Because the landscaping if they are just landscaping is going to cost \$220,000. Why would landscaping cost \$220,000 and they may not understand that you also have to dig up stuff and move stuff around, parking spaces, etc. Maybe that cost more than the fencing or the sign so maybe that is a way to do it because the landscaping which is not all the site work but just digging up the areas and putting the landscaping in that is part of it but the rest of the site work and the restriping, etc. should probably be on the owner and not the agency, but since that is the most expensive maybe you go up on that one if that is what is driving most of the high costs.

Mr. Wendland commented that if we were starting this from scratch, Susan has a good idea that you would go \$250,000 on landscaping, \$50,00 on signage and fencing. Having said that he would argue for keeping the math simple. If we are going in with a number, I would go in and ask for one number \$250,000 and keep it simple and not get into a long discussion.

Chair Tuohy commented that it is in their benefit to raise the amount. It is just a question of what their level of comfort is.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER S. MATCHETT AND SECONDED BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER D. HARPER RECOMMENDING APPROVAL BY THE AGENCY BOARD TO RAISE THE ADVISORY BOARD APPROVAL LEVEL FOR MCGP PROJECTS FROM \$100,000 TO \$250,000. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0-0.

III. GENERAL INFORMATION

Ms. Grandin commented that she has the dates for the Renew Arlington Overlay revision. It is going to City Council for first read on 04/26/2022, then to LUZ on 05/03/2022 and final Council vote on 05/10/2022.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

No new business was discussed.

V. OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Nasrallah provided an update on Bethelite. She advised that as of today, as you will recall it was approved that they be fined \$250.00 per structure – per day, which is \$3,250.00 daily. To date, they have paid \$40,000 towards their abatement liens. They are negotiating a payment of \$40,000 with finance for the remaining parcels. They have 13 settlement agreements (one for each building) that are being negotiated. Basically, they have one year to bring the property into compliance or to demo the structures. They have to take their proposal to City Council for approval. The developer told Code Compliance that they have taken their redevelopment plan to Councilwoman Morgan whether that has happened or not she does not know. She added that they have one year from the effective date of the agreement(s) to demo or have a plan that they are implementing with pulled permits. Ms. Nasrallah added that they still owe back taxes for 2020 and 2021 for a total of \$63,714.00.

Advisory Board Member D. Harper asked if there was anything going on with Regency noting there were rezoning signs posted or something of that nature. Ms. Nasrallah replied that she did not know.

Advisory Board Member Ramsey Salem commented that he thought the owner of College Park was interested in purchasing the Bethelite property. Ms. Nasrallah commented that he has expressed an interest adding that she does not know what plans have been reviewed with Councilwoman Morgan.

Chair Tuohy asked about the status of the Arlington Road restriping. Ms. Nasrallah replied that about two weeks ago they got a report from Traffic Engineering that the study has been completed, the report is approximately 170 pages. Mr. Wheeler has some questions for them and she sent them to traffic engineering. We will get with them to keep this moving forward.

Mr. Wendland advised that there is a process by which the CIP gets submitted and all department heads get the privilege of sitting in on the CIP meeting where different departments submit requests for future years CIPs. He mentioned this because there was a request for Norman Studios.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments from the public.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair M. Tuohy adjourned the RA/CRA Advisory Board Meeting at approximately 4:40 p.m.

The written minutes for this meeting are only an overview of what was discussed. For verbatim comments of this meeting, an audio file of the meeting is available in its entirety and is available upon request. Please contact Karen Nasrallah at (904) 255-5449, or by email at karenn@coj.net.