

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](http://www.martin.fl.us/accessibility-feedback).



**Martin County  
Community Redevelopment Agency  
Minutes**

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

**Monday, January 25, 2021**

**PRESENT**

| <b>Position</b> | <b>Name</b>       | <b>Term Expiration</b> |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Chairperson     | Cindy Hall        | January 4, 2025        |
| Members         | Catherine Winters | December 31, 2023      |
|                 | Michael Banas     | December 31, 2023      |
|                 | Richard Kennedy   | January 7, 2023        |
|                 | Rex Sentell       | January 4, 2025        |
|                 | Michael Reading   | January 4, 2025        |
|                 | Saadia Tsafarides | January 4, 2025        |

**STAFF PRESENT**

| <b>Position</b>            | <b>Name</b>       |
|----------------------------|-------------------|
| CRA Manager                | Susan Kores       |
| CRA Senior Project Manager | Jordan Pastorius  |
| CRA Project Manager        | Joshua Mills      |
| CRA Development Specialist | Jana Cox          |
| Assistant County Attorney  | Elizabeth Lenihan |

**\* Indicates a motion**

**\*\* Indicates a vote**

**\*\*\* For the record comment**

**CALL TO ORDER** – Meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm.

**DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST** – None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Agenda Item: 21-0301 Draft Meeting Minutes – November 23, 2020

**MOTION**

\* M. Reading motioned to approve the proposed November 23, 2020 meeting minutes as presented

\*\* C. Winters seconded, and the motion carried UNANIMOUSLY

**COMMENTS**

1. PUBLIC

- J. Priest – The Rio Civic Club is sponsoring “Adopt-a-Road” February 6, 2021 at 8:30 am.

2. MEMBERS

- C. Hall – Welcome Rex Sentell to the CRA Board.

3. STAFF

- S. Kores – I would like to reorganize the agenda placing the CRA Article 12 Glitch Bill 2.0 at the beginning followed by the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter report and the Capital Projects report will go third.

**MOTION**

\* **R. Kennedy** motioned to accept the reorganized agenda

\*\* **C. Winters** seconded, and the motion carried UNANIMOUSLY

## PRESENTATIONS

### Agenda Item: 21-0327, CRA Article 12, Divisions 1-7, Land Development Regulations Glitch Bill 2.0

Dana Little, Urban Design Director, Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council presented the agenda item.

- D. Little – The Glitch Bill 2.0 consists of edits and changes for the adopted code.
- M. Readling – I do have a question before you go forward regarding Home Occupations. You said that this is copied or brought into Article 12 from somewhere else so that it could meet the intent of the CRA code. Where is it currently?
- D. Little – I don't know the article that it is in? Would it be Article 3? (Dana is asking E. Lenihan). I do know that it is in the existing code.
- M. Readling – So when the first one says, "The home occupation shall not change the outdoor appearance of the building or premises", what does that mean?
- M. Banas – If you have a business at your house, you don't take your house and turn it into a storefront.
- M. Readling – That is what I was trying to figure out.
- D. Little – Let me just note this so that I can go back and confirm.
- R. Kennedy – I have a question on the same section. On 5. e. where it says "A home occupation that involves retail sales or services requires Alternative Compliance; do they still need to comply with the other standards? In particular "The home occupation shall generate no more traffic than typical for a single-family dwelling in a residential neighborhood?"
- D. Little – Yes that is correct.
- R. Kennedy – That seems difficult to achieve. Okay so once you have people coming to your home for things, I don't know how you sustain the same traffic.
- D. Little – I can't answer that as a member of staff who pushes Alternative Compliance through, but if I had to guess, if you are going to have retail sales, you are going to have more traffic and that would trigger the Alternative Compliance in which case there would be a further discussion of the hours of operation, the volume of traffic etc. because it would exceed the normal volume of a Home Occupation.
- R. Kennedy – The same with Instructional Services, they would be restricted by the traffic limitation.
- D. Little – Yes, I believe that is correct. As you read through this, please feel free to reach out to me or Susan. We want to answer any questions you have.
- D. Little – If you look at page 14, Section 12.1.04, Item 5. Open Space, we emphasized what is currently in the code and has already been adopted because we felt that this is such an important topic that we didn't want anyone to miss it.
- C. Winters – I have a question regarding Item 5.c. I think this just happened where a developer had his parking located elsewhere. So, this is regarding open space as opposed to parking. Is this going to be a last resort for developers to work within the constraints of the code and then the developer can say "I can pay money"? If so, where does this money go?
- S. Kores – No, this is not a last resort. Mapp Road in Palm City is a good example. For someone to develop successfully on Mapp Road, open space and detention/retention areas, in some cases, would have to be designed to be right on the road. This is not what we want redevelopment to look like and is not the highest and best use of the land. So, this is just another tool in the toolbox to help infill development. We will be working within each CRA to develop an Open Space plan and then that money would go into the trust fund for that CRA.
- R. Kennedy – Should this section point out that the Open Space at another location within the CRA because it doesn't say that.
- S. Kores – It is within the comp plan and we want to make sure you see that and point to it when necessary.
- D. Little – One of the things that we tried to achieve through this entire process, is that when a small site, less than ½ acre, has to meet the same site plan requirements of a larger site, it makes it less likely for there to be a smaller incremental type of redevelopment, which is what everyone says they love. It makes sense to acquire a conglomerate of land because that is the only way that you can comply with the

requirements. We try to give a little bit of flexibility to encourage or incent smaller incremental development.

- R. Kennedy – Page 17: Section 12.1.04 Building Transitions, e. Exemptions, number ii, why did we have to add that?
- D. Little – We wanted to clarify this: let's say that I am in the core subdistrict within a CRA. The core is meant to be the most intense downtown character. Jensen Beach is a good example. Those little artists' cottages for example, they are in the core and it is very interesting to see those building types. However, we felt that just because you in the core, you should not be subjected to those distancing requirements and it might be okay to be next to a single-family residence if you are in the core subdistrict. Does that make sense?
- R. Kennedy – Okay I don't agree. I don't know why you would have reached that conclusion without talking to us. We have lots of open space currently that is up against single family homes that might be developed in the future and significantly change the character.
- D. Little – This is limited specifically to the core.
- R. Kennedy – I understand.
- M. Banas – Rich you are concerned with the core in Rio, correct?
- R. Kennedy – The core in Rio borders up on a bunch of single-family homes.
- D. Little – I need to go back and see if that language was brought from another location. The intent was to provide more intense development in the core.
- R. Kennedy – Ok, but I do not remember a conversation previously about reducing those transition zones between single family homes and the core. I am acutely aware of this because I have had neighbors talk to me about it.
- C. Winters – I am building a detached garage. This has been a challenge; we are making progress and I finally have a permit.
- D. Little – Is it a challenge because of the regulations and the setbacks?
- C. Winters – It is a challenge because of communication between me, the resident and growth management and/or the building department. It takes awhile to communicate what must be done.
- D. Little – Pertaining to Section 12.2.09 – Landscape Standards item 6. Service Areas, we felt dumpsters need to be addressed not only for aesthetic reasons, but the health and welfare issue. We felt that 2 years from the effective date of the adoption of codes gave folks enough time to comply.
- M. Reading – Does this apply to all CRA's?
- S. Kores – This is applicable to all CRA's and letters have been sent to all those businesses that have dumpsters. We have received some feedback with businesses expressing issues with complying and we will be looking at all of these. Like Dana said, they would have to submit an alternative compliance in each case where they feel that they cannot comply.
- S. Tsafarides – What about rentals Golden Gate? We have trash everywhere.
- S. Kores – This is focused on businesses or multi-family which would be more than two.
- S. Tsafarides – We have duplexes, triplexes.
- S. Kores – Do they have dumpsters?
- S. Tsafarides – No, but we would like to make them have dumpsters.
- R. Sentell – In regard to the trash dumpster enclosures, why does it have to be masonry instead of fencing or landscaping? Also, can neighboring businesses share a dumpster?
- D. Little – The thought was that fencing rots, it grows over and it gets run down. Masonry is more permanent and yes, it is going to be more expensive. It really is a question of the durability and the longevity of the enclosure. The owners can absolutely share if there is a formal agreement.
- C. Hall – I get the point around masonry, but it is the most expensive method and we are hitting businesses hard that have been affected by the pandemic. I would hope that there is a remedy that these businesses can take.
- C. Winters – I agree, and I don't like it either. With masonry, you still must paint them, pressure wash and maintain them. I think it would be a code enforcement issue with landscaping. If it is dead or damaged, then you need to replace it.
- R. Sentell – Also at the airport we put one in a smaller one with chain-link and webbing. You can still see through it, but it is a strong structure.

- S. Kores – We are hearing all your comments and we will work with businesses on a case by case basis. We will do whatever it takes to help businesses comply.
- C. Hall – I don't have a problem with it on new construction. I just have an issue with existing businesses, and it seems to be finite. Do this or you will not comply.
- S. Kores – Businesses have come forward and let us know that they need help. There are some sites that this absolutely will not work, and we will have to make some exceptions.
- D. Little – Changes to the Hobe Sound Street Regulating Plan Page 157-158: Section 12.5.09 have addressed the issue of including primary and secondary streets and to bring it to the attention of future applicants who must comply with these same standards.
- R. Kennedy – Did the Hobe Sound NAC's approved these changes?
- D. Little – No, the way we are handling this Glitch Bill is that we will present these to the CRA, LPA and BCC.
- J. Priest – I have many issues and variations that I would like to see.
- D. Little – Just to remind you that the document that you are looking at, the sections that are yellow are where changes occurred and if it is not struck through or underlined, there is no change provided.

#### **MOTION**

\* **M. Reading** motioned to recommend this move forward to the LPA and the Board of County Commissioners to adopt the draft Article 12, Divisions 1-7, Glitch Bill 2.0 as presented

\*\* **M. Banas** seconded, and the motion carried UNANIMOUSLY

#### **Agenda Item: 21-0351, CRA FY 2021 – 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report**

Josh Mills, CRA Project Manager presented the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Report.

#### **Agenda Item: 21-0302, CRA Capital Project Update**

Susan Kores, CRA Manager, presented the CRA Capital Project Update highlighting Gomez Affording Housing, Bridge Road Main Street, Rio Stormwater/Flood Control, Mapp Road Town Center, Palm City Place & Patio, and the Ripple EcoArt Project.

- S. Tsafarides – When is the sewer project going to start in Golden Gate?
- S. Kores – They are in the mobilization stage and will start soon.
- C. Hall – In the category listed as Neighborhood Enhancements, is each NAC coming up with their own list for these?
- S. Kores – Each NAC will have a list and utilize their funds for new projects or as additional components of projects we already have. We can put a Neighborhood Enhancement item on each NAC agenda.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **Agenda Item: 21-0359, Recommendation to amend each Martin County Community Development Area's Community Redevelopment Plan and the Countywide Community Redevelopment Plan to Include All Updated Legal Descriptions and Maps.**

Susan Kores, CRA Manager, presented the agenda item.

#### **MOTION**

\* **C. Winters** motioned to recommend an amendment of the Countywide Community Redevelopment Plan to include the new, updated legal descriptions for all six CRA areas and the six CRA area Community Redevelopments Plans each to include the new, updated legal descriptions and related maps, to the Board of County Commissioners.

\*\* **S. Tsafarides** seconded, and the motion carried UNANIMOUSLY

#### **CRA Board Vice-Chair**

S. Tsafarides nominated Mike Banas for Vice-Chair and R. Kennedy seconded the nomination.

E. Lenihan reminded the board that this is just a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners and the BOCC will vote on this recommendation.

**MOTION**

- \* **C. Winters** motioned to recommend M. Banas for Vice-Chair of the CRA Board.
- \*\* **S. Tsafarides** seconded, and the motion carried UNANIMOUSLY

**COMMENTS**

1. PUBLIC - none
2. MEMBERS
  - S. Tsafarides - Could the CRA Board draft a letter of appreciation to Deputy Fitzgerald and Deputy Shiner for getting the dead-end signs installed in Golden Gate?
3. STAFF - none

**ADJOURN** – Meeting adjourned at 4:49 pm

Recorded and Prepared by:

Jana Cox  
 Jana Cox, Community Development Specialist

2-22-2021  
 Date

Cindy Hall  
 Cindy Hall, Chair

2-22-2021  
 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](http://www.martin.fl.us/accessibility-feedback)

