

City of Gainesville

*City Hall
200 East University Avenue
Gainesville, Florida 32601*



Meeting Minutes

Thursday, May 8, 2008

3:00 PM

City Hall, Room 16

Community Development Committee

*Commissioner Scherwin Henry, Chair
Commissioner Jack Donovan, Member
Commissioner Craig Lowe, Member*

Persons with disabilities who require assistance to participate in this meeting are requested to notify the Office of Equal Opportunity at 334-5051 or call the TDD phone line at 334-2069 at least two business days in advance.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:07 PM.

ROLL CALL

Present: Craig Lowe, Jack Donovan and Scherwin Henry

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

070957. Minutes of March 13, 2008 (B)

RECOMMENDATION *The Community Development Committee approve the minutes of March 13, 2008.*

Approved as Recommended

071175. Minutes of April 24, 2008 (B)

RECOMMENDATION *The Community Development Committee approve the minutes of April 24, 2008.*

Approved as Recommended

DISCUSSION OF PENDING REFERRALS

060910. Temporary Signage at Car Dealerships (B)

Mr. Jim Garrett, Code Enforcement Manager, stated that in the past some of the car dealerships had complained that sign enforcement was somewhat selective towards their businesses. Staff addressed those concerns, and found that 5.5% of all sign enforcement came from the area where automotive dealerships were located, and that the area had approximately 14% of the total sign cases. He stated that he and Mr. Hilliard discussed creating a brochure for all the auto dealerships. He stated that enforcement will take place after all the dealerships have been alerted and educated to the changes in the Sign Ordinance. The educational process should start sometime in June 8, 2008.

Chair Henry asked how the staff manpower will be affected.

Mr. Garrett stated that each officer will be assigned to visit 2-3 auto dealerships.

The Committee discussed enforcement of window signs and suggested that there be some type of educational handouts, or to have a business orientation workshop once a quarter outlining sign regulations.

Commissioner Lowe suggested that the City should provide information about the Sign Ordinance when a business first opens.

Commissioner Donovan stated that there needed to be a new strategy for targeting window signs. He suggested that it would resolve the problem of businesses saying that the City is targeting one group. He stated that it could be done by a mailer, or dropping a brochure off at each business to let them know that the Sign Ordinance would be enforced.

Mr. Garrett stated that he would start with the automotive dealers first to see what the success ratio is. He indicated that he would then work with GRU so they can include the brochure in their newsletter.

RECOMMENDATION *Staff to report back at a subsequent meeting on the degree of success with the Sign Ordinance.*

Approved as Recommended

060910_20070301.pdf

060910_200707301300.pdf

060910_200805081300.pdf

070826.

Rental Assistance Using TIF in the CRA Districts (B)

Anthony Lyons, CRA Manager, gave a report on the issue of using TIF funds for rental assistance in CRA Districts (similar to Section 8). Mr. Lyons reviewed the provisions of the CRA Act for what is permissible and how the City currently handles affordable housing matters through its Transformational Incentive Program. Mr. Lyons stated that staff looked at using TIF increment funds for rental assistance, but Chapter 163, of the Florida Statutes found no support for developing affordable housing using TIF funds. He explained that, to encourage affordable housing, the CRA rewrote the Transformational Incentive Program to mandate that 10% of housing units (either rental or ownership) be set aside as affordable housing units. The analysis indicated that support is there for affordable housing and the City should look at ways of encouraging more participation.

Chair Henry asked if there were other existing programs in the CRA that are viable.

Mr. Lyons stated that the CRA had made suggestions for the Model Block Program, and that the CRA can choose to do more to promote the development of affordable housing units.

Commissioner Lowe stated that there were good reasons for the availability of

affordable housing within the CRA districts. He cited concerns about the concentration of affordable housing, particularly in the eastside. He stated that the eastside in general has a disproportionately large amount of affordable housing, which impacts individuals who live there (whether in affordable housing complexes or not) and the economic segregation of the City as a whole. He indicated that the City Commission should be developing affordable housing in a way that does not exacerbate the current situation, and increase the availability in other parts of the City. He suggested that when the CDC reported back to the City Commission, it should ask for a new referral to look at the wide-range of means for distributing affordable housing in an equitable manner throughout the City.

Chair Henry spoke to the definition of "affordable housing". He suggested that the City be sure that when a study is performed on rental stock, that it be reviewed in a thorough manner, and not just lumped in with "family homeownership".

Commissioner Lowe stated that he is interested in a county-wide approach to affordable housing (an inclusionary housing ordinance), because if it only involved the City, there would be a negative incentive for developers to develop there. He indicated that if it were county-wide, it would level the playing field with regards to the possible impact. He suggested that the City explore the pros/cons of the matter, and noted that it might be worthwhile to put the item on the next Joint City/County Meeting Agenda.

Chair Henry suggested sharing this with the County Wide Visioning Planning Committee (CWVPC).

Commissioner Donovan noted that "affordable" or "workforce housing" were not necessarily for people who needed more support than housing alone. He noted that in the Downtown and College Park University Heights area there was not an overload of lower-income people or people making the workforce wage level. He doesn't want the City to burden any neighborhood with higher levels of certain types of housing. He stated that if people couldn't find adequate housing in the City, they will move to green space development and that will not only kill the environment at a faster rate, but will weaken the economic base, infrastructure and services.

Chair Henry stated that in the past, Section 8 had a bad reputation. He noted that, a few years ago, residents who received Section 8 assistance did not feel like they belonged to the neighborhood in which they were living, and some residents felt that Section 8 housing was bringing down their neighborhood. He stated that such was the argument in East Gainesville, and that is why there was so much conversation about affordable housing.

Commissioner Donovan and Lowe stated that Section 8 shouldn't be concentrated in any one area. They noted that there has been a tendency to concentrate Section 8 housing, or housing that targets a similar socioeconomic group, in northeast Gainesville.

Commissioner Lowe stated that what occurs is that segregation is often developed based upon economic status. He noted that it created economic stresses for the neighborhood and for the people who are in the housing themselves. He indicated

that it was better for areas where there were mixed incomes.

Mr. Ralph Hilliard, Planning Manager, stated that there was a problem with Section 8 in many communities and there were areas where neighborhoods have a great deal of Section 8 housing. He stated that when he first moved to Gainesville, the northeast had a great deal of Section 8 renters, and at that point, the neighborhood declined. He noted that, when the market got better and people started buying up the homes, the number of Section 8 certificates became fewer. He stated that it had been a problem in the past, because people that are on Section 8 are marginally getting by.

RECOMMENDATION *Community Development Committee to the City Commission: 1) Remove this item from the referral list; and 2) Assign a new referral to the CDC to study the issue of affordable housing in a general sense, including but not limited to an inclusionary housing ordinance in conjunction with the County and other municipalities.*

Approved as Recommended

070826_200805081300.pdf

060854.

Healthy City, Healthy Region: An Update - Ten Years Later - January 2007 (B)

Erik Bredfeldt, Planning & Development Director, gave a powerpoint presentation and reviewed a memo that tried to attempt answering questions provided by Commissioner Donovan. Some of the issues that the Committee discussed were:

Problem of segregation in schools.

Growth trends that are put in place by the County exacerbate segregation.

Why would the County want to urbanize outside the City limits in a manner that is clearly not balanced.

"Gainesville is adequately representative" is a real challenge and something that actually is being discussed at the CWVPC with respect to arbitration of disputes, the Urban Reserve Area and annexation. The Arbitration Board should either be the County Commission, or a Board that is appointed by the County Commission that would be large enough to reflect the diversity of interest.

County is making density decisions for the municipalities in their Urban Reserve Area. Every municipality should have control over the land use and zoning practices in its Urban Reserve Area.

The CWVPC calls for joint-planning between the County and municipalities in the Urban Reserve Area, or in areas of mutual interest.

Annexation in the eastern corridor of the City/County - Eastern annexation is not on the radar for the City.

Density in the Charlotte, Mecklenburg model. Charlotte still has sprawl - they annex sprawl when it happens.

We aren't annexing, and we aren't curtailing sprawl.

The County should promote economic development inside the City of Gainesville.

If the criterion for annexation is an achieved density, then the City loses to sprawl to the County Commission. If the City has control over the Urban Reserve Area, then the City can control where the density occurs.

Each municipality controls its Urban Reserve Area, and develops on the principal that you try and develop as densely as possible within your urban area.

The concept would be to designate areas on a map (areas of mutual concern) and develop a Land Use Plan. Then enter into a four-party agreement, and once that is entered into, it would take all of the parties to change it. This would give a very strong level of protection.

Create a subset of Commissioners from each body for discussion.

Interpret "Joint Planning Commission" as being the CWVPC.

The CWVPC would propose agreements and go back to the individual Commissions for their approval.

If the City were to give up its control of planning functions to a wider group of people, it would be hard to find proper representation that everyone would feel comfortable with.

Proper representation would come into play where you have situations when people represent a particular interest trying to interpret a particular set of acts.

The direction is that the CWVPC is to provide a framework for municipalities to determine areas of mutual interest, and what the land use in those areas would be. Then it would go back to the Commissions for approval, and the City's would be party to a legal agreement. It would take all the parties together to undo an agreement. Once all the joint planning agreements are done, the CWVPC wouldn't be needed.

They are reconstituting the CWVPC and refining the vision. The next phase will be to define the areas and hammer out the land use to protect the rural character.

The goal is for the rural areas to be preserved, and to some degree in doing that, everyone will give up some control.

RECOMMENDATION

1) The CDC approved Report Recommendation No. 6 to read: "The City Commission endorse the CWVPC efforts to affect joint planning"; 2) Staff to report back on Report Recommendations 1& 2, and to provide a map of the Urban Reserve Areas; and 3) Staff to report back on Charlotte Mecklenburg's Joint Planning Commission as adopted by a

Unified Comprehensive Plan.

Approved as Recommended

060854_200701221300.pdf
060854_200805081300.pdf
060854a_200805081300.ppt.pdf
060854b_200805081300.ppt.pdf

NEXT MEETING DATE

May 19, 2008, 5:30 PM - RLUIPA

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.