

Mimms, Dean L.

From: hadeedlaw@cfl.rr.com
Sent: Thursday, June 30, 2016 6:15 PM
To: Persons, Andrew W.; Orlando Santos; Harris, Kimberly D.; Folkers, Paul E.; Phillips, Steven R.; Russell and Elizabeth Williams; John Perkins; James Coats; Zach West; Brian Shelden; Kathi; Maureen Hadeed; Roberta Gastmeyer; Mimms, Dean L.
Cc: Mimms, Dean L.; folkersp@cityofgainesville.org
Subject: Re: Meeting regarding the US Army Reserve property

Unfortunately, I am out of town at a conference and have limited ability to address the City Plan Board. Please accept my apologies for the late submission. Because of the conference I am composing this in less than ideal conditions. I would like my comments read into the record by staff now that I have evaluated all of the materials.

First, I want to applaud the City's efforts to obtain title to this property and commencing true maintenance that benefits the surrounding neighborhoods.

Second, I want to strongly support the use of the property by Phalanx Defense Systems. Its "footprint" of activities will not be disruptive to the neighborhoods, nor dissuade homeowners from investing in improvements to their properties. I also believe it will encourage prospective homeowners to buy when they see the "upswing" in activities and the City's active intervention to sustain the livability of the surrounding neighborhoods. This includes the City's commitment to develop the adjoining park along the lines advocated by Friends of the Reserve Park.

The characteristics of how this company is operating is value added to our economic diversity. The fact that it is committed to "green technology" also contributes to the City's desire to be an innovation center. That the company will be creating employment of decent jobs is undoubtedly a big plus as well. But as it relates to our neighborhoods, the business will have no negative impact in how it operates (no industrial noise, no manufacturing of the recycled body armor inserts, no chemicals or emissions of odors, and no constant movement of commercial vehicles). They will only have a positive impact which will take nothing away from area residents.

While fully support of the land use changes to enable this use, I find I cannot be supportive of the MUL land use category without a parcel specific limiting policy. This parcel is only slightly more than 3 acres, not the typical acreage for the breadth of uses permitted under MUL.

Given the size of the parcel, the adjoining neighborhood park, and the need for revitalization of the present housing stock, I am urging a limiting policy that eliminates some of the uses by right which would be incompatible with the unique circumstances of this property and its surroundings. Specifically, I believe that allowing 5 stories for building heights for nonresidential uses is out of character for this low height environment. Likewise, the allowance of towers over 100 feet will not have a positive impact on neighborhood revitalization.

Further, certain non-retail uses would not be appropriate at this location including building construction, plumbing, HVAC, painting, sheetrock hanging, and electrical contractors. I have no problem whatsoever with these types of businesses, indeed they are vital for our community. However, the characteristics of how those businesses operate and specifically use the land will hinder neighborhood revitalization. They typically use yards for vehicles, inventory, and equipment and would not be reasonably expected to add enhancing architectural features to the buildings or structure they construct to operate their businesses. Not that they would be bad neighbors, but they would not create an atmosphere conducive to neighborhood improvement, particularly for improvements that come from owner investments.

Additionally, allowing land uses for social welfare residential uses at this site also would not be compatible with a goal of relying on self-improvement of these neighborhoods. I am not opposed to such uses and they should be integrated appropriately into the community. But to place them here would only reinforce the dampening of values for the housing stock. It would signal that these areas are not likely to turn up in value and therefore dissuade owners from making substantial improvements to their properties and put off potential new purchasers because the long term vision of the neighborhoods is not dependable. Allowing these uses as of right would tend to concentrate more of this kind of housing that already exists in this particular area.

If the City chooses not to place a limiting policy on the MUL land use, then down the road if Phalanx outgrows the facility or chooses to relocate, then the MUL signals to all what they may be entitled to build. They may invest time and money into exploring proposals that do not fit into the community vision. It may prove to be a frustrating and futile effort for them, especially with neighborhood opposition and putting elected and appointed officials (and staff) in a very difficult spot.

Even assuming that over the long term future neighborhood revitalization is a failure, the limiting policy would not foreclose these uses if fundamental circumstances change significantly. A land use amendment can be made if the circumstances have so changed as to make the limiting policy or parts of it obsolete.

Consequently, I ask the staff and Plan Board to explore a limiting policy for the reasons mentioned. I would point out that this is purely a legislative proceeding for which there is wide latitude. DEO and its predecessor DCA have accepted such limiting conditions on land use amendments where unique circumstances merit such conditions.

I have chosen to invest in the neighborhood, believing in the worth of revitalization. I and my family have been strong supporters of Gainesville as an innovation center and as a community that values sustainability. WE operate entrepreneurial businesses in Gainesville that have received national recognition due in no small part to the innovation objectives of the City, combined with the support of our universities, the Chamber and business community. The City wants these neighborhoods to turn up in value, for quality of life and for added ad valorem tax revenues. The City needs investment in these neighborhoods by its present and future residents. The limiting conditions will remove an obstacle to the realization to that goal because of the expectation that this land use action creates. It conveys confidence by its thoughtful intent.

Thank you for your earnest consideration. Again, I apologize for the circumstances of this submittal. It just could not be helped under my present circumstances. Thank you.

---- "Harris wrote:

> Good Afternoon,

>

> You are receiving this email because you asked to be notified of any public meetings regarding the sale and future use of the US Army Reserve building and property located at 1125 NE 8th Avenue. If you no longer wish to receive this information, please let me know.

>

> The Gainesville Plan Board will meet on Thursday, June 30 at 6:30pm in the City Hall Auditorium, 200 E. University Avenue, and is expected to discuss a zoning change for this property.

Here<<https://gainesville.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>> is a link to the agenda; this item is the first one under "New Business". If the Plan Board passes the zoning change, the petition will be heard at the Gainesville City Commission meeting on Thursday, July 21st and another notice will follow with details.

>

> If you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me.

>

- > Best regards,
- >
- > Kim Harris
- > Executive Assistant Senior
- > City of Gainesville
- > City Manager's Office
- > (352) 393-8674
- >
- > My Scheduled Work Hours:
- > Monday thru Thursday 7 AM to 6 PM
- > City Hall
- > 200 E. University Ave.
- >
- > Mon.-Thurs., 7 a.m.-6 p.m.
- > Friday, 8 a.m.-4 p.m.
- >
- > Parks, Recreation and Cultural Affairs Thomas Center B
- > 306 NE Sixth Ave.
- >
- > Mon.-Thurs., 7 a.m.-6 p.m.
- > Friday, 8 a.m.-1 p.m.
- >
- > Planning & Development Services
- > Thomas Center B
- > 306 NE Sixth Ave
- >
- > Mon.-Thurs., 7 a.m.-6 p.m.
- > Friday, 7 a.m.-4 p.m.
- >
- >
- > FYI: Under Florida's public records law, most written communications to or from City offices and employees regarding City business are public records and are available to the public upon request. Your email communications may be subject to public disclosure.
- >