



Martin County
Community Redevelopment Agency
Minutes

Commission Chambers
Martin County
Administration Bldg.
2401 SE Monterey Road
Stuart, FL 34996

Monday, August 30, 2021

PRESENT

Position	Name	Term Expiration
Chairperson	Cindy Hall	January 4, 2025
Vice Chair	Catherine Winters	December 31, 2023
Members	Richard Kennedy	January 7, 2023
	Blake Capps	January 27, 2023

ABSENT

Position	Name	Term Expiration
Members	Rex Sentell	January 4, 2025
	Michael Readling	January 4, 2025
	Saadia Tsafarides via phone	January 4, 2025

STAFF PRESENT

Position	Name
CRA Manager	Susan Kores
CRA Project Manager	James Clasby
CRA Senior Project Manager	Jordan Pastorius
CRA Development Specialist	Jana Cox
Senior Assistant County Attorney	Krista Storey
Principal Planner	Irene Szedlmayer

* Indicates a motion

** Indicates a vote

*** For the record comment

CALL TO ORDER – Meeting was called to order at 5:00 pm.

S. Kores discussed the policy for quorum rules. One of our board members is on the phone for this meeting. This member is allowed to listen and participate but is not be able to vote. We must have a seated quorum present at the meeting.

DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST – None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Agenda Item: 21-1073 Draft Meeting Minutes – July 26, 2021

MOTION

- * C. Winters motioned to approve the proposed July 26, 2021 meeting minutes as presented
- ** B. Capps seconded, and the motion carried UNANIMOUSLY

COMMENTS

1. PUBLIC - none

2. MEMBERS

- C. Winters – The Mapp Road ribbon cutting event was awesome. Thank you to the staff for a wonderful event.

3. STAFF

- S. Kores – We do have a project manager who resigned. We have reassigned his projects to the two project managers on our staff. We have posted the position and will be interviewing for the replacement.

PRESENTATIONS

Agenda Item: 21-1022, CRA Capital Projects – August 30, 2021

Susan Kores, CRA Manager presented the capital project updates highlighting Golden Gate Dixie Highway Beautification, Golden Gate Camino Trail, Rio Property Acquisition, Old Palm City Mapp Road Town Center, Old Palm City Place & Patio, and the Old Palm City Ripple projects.

Agenda Item: 21-1021, Update of Regulations Applicable in the CRA – An Amendment to Chapter 5, Alcoholic Beverages, General Ordinances, Martin County Code

Irene Szedlmayer, Principal Planner, presented the update.

- C. Winters – Letter C in the document, why do you not include residential?
- I. Szedlmayer – First of all the general subdistrict permits residential. These other districts are not the key areas where we expect the most walkable, compact, downtown center to be located. The 50 feet is quite modest. In most of these areas, if you cross the street, you are already at 50 feet. We feel that this is a modest protection of the residential properties and the quality of life.
- C. Winters – Do any of these recommendations impede on a parish in these districts for example that have bingo night and they sell beer?
- I. Szedlmayer – Theoretically, they are subject to these rules, but I believe they get a special permit for this. We are not proposing any changes to these rules and how they are implemented.
- B. Capps – The separation requirements for places of worship and schools are grounded in good reason and I don't see a great need to change that inside of the CRAs. I think those have really solid purposes and I think there are plenty of places outside the CRA to have an alcoholic beverage.
- I. Szedlmayer – These changes will not affect entities that already exist. I think the vision for a compact, walkable community calls for a mix of uses.
- C. Hall – If you take the smallest CRA, which is Jensen Beach, you can definitely see where this would be a problem.
- I. Szedlmayer – In Jensen Beach there was no separation in 2001 and it was carried forward to the regulations that exist now.
- C. Winters – So are you saying that you like the way Jensen is set up?
- C. Hall – I'm saying that if they don't make these changes, it could hurt development in Jensen Beach. Maybe not so much in the other CRAs, but Jensen for sure.
- I. Szedlmayer – Jensen Beach is pretty much protected.
- R. Kennedy – I would find it helpful to go through some of the illustrations that you provided. I am especially concerned with the residential 50-foot and eliminating that and particularly in Rio, Port Salerno, and Hobe Sound.
- R. Kennedy – The 50-foot line is from the actual building to the residential property line?
- I. Szedlmayer – Yes, all measurements are from the boundary of a park or the actual school property to the licensed premise (the building). With the place of worship, you measure from the building, not the parking or property.
- R. Kennedy – There are so many places where the 50-foot setback is useful. We have residences that would not want to live within 50 feet of a bar or restaurant. I see the importance of having the 50 feet for residential areas.
- I. Szedlmayer – One modification would be to change that yes.

- C. Winters – Is the purpose of this State driven?
- S. Kores – No it is not.
- C. Winters – Why wouldn't we have made these uniformly the same as Jensen Beach where they don't have any of these restrictions?
- I. Szedlmayer – Jensen Beach is the only CRA where places of worship do not have the separation rule, I believe because of the small size and the location to city center.
- B. Capps – I think we need to zone in on the fact that the Board of County Commissioners has the power to waive these rules. Like you were saying before, the Board can step in on a case by case basis. I do see that churches are changing, and they have activities on Saturday night and through the week. The separation is there for a good reason.

MOTION

* R. Kennedy motioned to approve the proposed amendment to chapter 5 with the following modification: Keep the 50-foot buffer for the general and corridor subdistricts in place. In other words, eliminating the word "Corridor" from item d. of the recommendations.

Gayle Goldy (public comment) – I would like to thank you all for volunteering your time for this board. My question for this board is this - Is this first time that the board has been presented with the changes to Article 5?

S. Kores – Yes.

G. Goldy – My observation is why couldn't you make a motion for further review of this amendment. You can look at it more in depth. I would have more questions if I was a board member.

S. Tsafarides – I agree with her.

** C. Winters seconded, and the motion carried 3-1 with B. Capps dissenting

K. Storey – A note to the public speaker. This is not a final decision; it is a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. You could attend that meeting and make comments if you wish to do so.

NEW BUSINESS

Agenda Item: 21-0885, CRA Community Investment Programs

Susan Kores, CRA Manager presented the CRA Community Investment Program overview.

- S. Kores – It is important to target areas for these Investment Programs.
- C. Hall – What percentage of the TIF is being allocated for these programs?
- S. Kores – I do not know. Would you want to know the percentage of each specific CRA's TIF?
- C. Hall – Yes, because obviously Jensen Beach's TIF is different from the others because of size. Part of my concern is that if we are taking TIF dollars for this program, I don't want any other projects to suffer.
- S. Kores – We did not look at it as a percentage in each CRA. I can get that for you and bring it to the next meeting.
- S. Kores - For example, Hobe Sound has a healthy TIF and Bridge Road should receive a lot of support in this area. We have spent money to improve Bridge Road and now we need to build on it. Jensen is special since it is mostly commercial.
- C. Hall – Is the cost to promote this program to the businesses built into the CIP?
- S. Kores – No, because it cannot be tied to a specific capital project. It would be billed to our operating budget for promotional activities.
- B. Capps – I want some more clarity as to how some of the CRAs seem to have more money than others.
- S. Kores – Old Palm City for instance did not have any money to put into this program. Hobe Sound on the other hand has a lot of TIF money to contribute to Investment Programs and has accrued these funds over two years.
- B. Capps – Is the boundary on both sides of Bridge Road for this program?
- S. Kores – I believe so, yes.
- S. Kores – Some of the corrections that I need to make on these documents include: 1. All of these programs need to have the sentence "all improvements to the property shall be visible from the public right of way" and 2. "all properties to be improved must be free of county liens, judgments or

encumbrances of any kind and remain free under the terms of the grant agreement". These need to be across the board on all these programs.

- R. Kennedy – So the Property Improvement Program is only for commercial correct?
- S. Kores – Yes, this program is for commercial. The Paint, Plant and Pave program is for residential.
- C. Winters – For the Business Retention Program, it says "inclusive of a licensed business consultant's time", who is that? Is that you? Are they paying you? The word "inclusive" makes it very confusing.
- S. Kores – This is certainly not me.
- C. Winters – For a small business, this would eat up all the money.
- S. Kores – This is for a licensed consultant to come in and talk about training, design, social media, etc. and how they can be improved. The program pays for the consultant and then the business executes the recommendations.
- C. Hall – I have worked with some business consultants and I do not know that \$2500 is enough for a consultant.
- S. Kores – I think you are right and that is one thing that I have not looked at yet. I don't know what that costs.
- C. Hall – You are looking at a minimum of \$5,000 and I don't know that companies would actually do that. Quite frankly if you are an existing business and have been around for a while, one would hope that you have already figured this out and that is why you are still in business. I have a little bit of angst about this one.
- S. Kores – Another option is to hire one consultant to do all of the jobs.
- C. Hall – Is this something that TCRPC can help with?
- S. Kores – There are people out there who do this.
- C. Winters – My other comment is the statement "Applicants may reapply if deadlines are missed, which would result in the cancelling of the Program Agreement. (Reapplication does not guarantee availability of funding and/or approval.)" So, the applicant could get so far and then they would be cancelled or say that they can't have the money?
- C. Hall – That is only if they miss their deadlines.
- S. Kores – This is one of the things I wanted to review with you. Work to begin in 180 days seems like a long time. What do you think about 90 days?
- C. Hall – From the building industry end of it, the ordering of supplies needs a significant amount of lead time. We need to stay with the 180 days for the Property Improvement Program, but 90 days should be okay for the rest of these.
- K. Storey – The definition of a project should be specified. A milestone could be applying for and receiving a permit. This shows that you have shown good faith in this process. The project needs to be defined.
- S. Kores – The wording says, "work to begin". I believe in the actual agreement it says that the project must be completed in 2 years. The work to begin might have to be different for each program. I can come back with that.
- C. Hall – The New Business Grand Opening program could almost go down to 60 days. If you are new business applying for this grant, you are already open and would not hold off on a grand opening.
- S. Kores – The Fence/Landscape Program is a special opportunity to fix some serious code issues for instance in Golden Gate.
- R. Kennedy – Does this capture the new challenge we have around dumpsters?
- S. Kores – Yes, in the Property Improvement Program. I would like to put more money in this one as well. I would like to review everything that we talked about today and bring it back to you.
- R. Kennedy – Does it make sense to go to the NAC's and let them decide how much their CIP should be?
- S. Kores – They have already approved the budget for this activity.
- C. Hall – The only comment I have would be to bump up the Property Improvement Program to \$20,000 in an area like Hobe Sound, but not in an area like Jensen Beach.
- S. Kores – You are right. Especially not on Jensen Beach Boulevard.
- K. Storey – Is this only open to property owners or is it open to tenants?
- S. Kores – I have worked mostly with business owners. They are required to get permission from the property owner. The grant agreement consists of several documents.

- K. Storey – Some of the eligibility requirements need clarity like where it states “properties that are sold” is it the real property or the business?
- S. Kores – It is the real property.
- K. Storey – That is something that you need to clarify and the issue with the sale of property, liens, and judgements, is somebody going to constantly be checking these?
- S. Kores – That was on my list of questions – “property sold within 18 months or 24 months, need to repay”. I had one of those happen in my experience and it all worked out because they do well, and we do well. I think it depends on what we would like to happen and what do we want to see happen. As far as anybody checking, not that many of these kinds of things happen so if I have three investments programs in my CRA, yes, we will check three.
- K. Storey – If you are going to have a policy, it has to be enforced and the language has to be very clear. Also, what is the concern about a lien? A mortgage is a lien on a property. What is the concern here?
- S. Kores – We don’t want to give money to a property that has a lien on it. I don’t mean mortgage.
- K. Storey – I am not disagreeing, but I am trying to understand why we would point this out. Somebody is going to have to do a title search, court records.
- C. Hall – Does this specifically mean County lien, County code enforcement etc.?
- S. Kores – The CRA can waive a code enforcement if they chose to.
- S. Tsaftarides – I think we need to study this more.
- C. Hall – This is our first read and it will come back to us. This board will have the final approval on these applications correct.
- S. Kores – Yes, all the programs come back to you for approval.

COMMENTS

1. PUBLIC - none
2. MEMBERS - none
3. STAFF - none

ADJOURN – Meeting adjourned at 7:23 pm

Recorded and Prepared by:

Jana Cox, Community Development Specialist

Date

Cindy Hall, Chair

Date

ADA This document may be reproduced upon request in an alternative format by contacting the County ADA Coordinator (772) 320-3131, the County Administration Office (772) 288-5400, Florida Relay 711, or by completing our accessibility feedback form at: www.martin.fl.us/accessibility-feedback