



Meeting Minutes
Lealman Community Redevelopment Area Advisory Committee Meeting
July 22, 2020

Committee Members Present: Father Viet Nguyen, Gary Grooms, Marsha McCoy, Steve Cleveland, Oscar Seguban, Enoch Nicholson, Rick Orr and Brian Ellis

Members Absent: Teresa Van Alstine

Pinellas County Staff Present: David Sadowsky, Chris Moore, Rachel Booth, Tanya Kurtin, Evan Johnson, Allie Keene, Caroline Lanford, Brian Lowack and Tom Almonte

I. Call to Order

The virtual meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.

II. Introductions:

Committee members and Pinellas County staff introduced themselves.

III. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the January 22, 2020 meeting were approved unanimously.

IV. Acceptance of FY19 Annual Report

Staff presented the FY19 Annual Report, informing the Committee that this report was previously scheduled to be presented at their March 25, 2020 meeting, which was canceled due to COVID-19. The report has been submitted to the County Administrator's office for receipt and file order to meet CRA statutory reporting requirements. However, in accordance with our Committee's by-laws the report needs to be reviewed and accepted each year. After a brief discussion about TIF and non-TIF spending within the CRA, the report was recommended for receipt and file by a unanimous vote.

V. Lealman Project Updates

Lealman Heights Request for Negotiation (RFN):

Staff reported that the County's RFN review panel met on April 14, 2020 and selected proposals from NorthStar, Southport Community Development and Habitat for Humanity to proceed with negotiations. A formal recommendation is anticipated to be brought before the Board of County Commissioners in October.

Raymond H. Neri Park:

Staff shared that the Opinion of Probable Cost for the park masterplan came in at 6.4 million dollars, however, with only 3.7 million included Capital Improvement Plan, staff had to value engineer and redesign some of the proposed amenities to reduce cost. The redesign attempted to prioritize amenities that were identified as being the most important to the community during the planning process, and that the redesign provides options to include amenities that were removed if additional funding becomes available in the future.

Lealman Exchange Generator:

Staff indicated that a whole building generator is scheduled to be installed at the Exchange toward the end of September that will completely power the two-story building which is planned to be used as a community shelter during tropical storm and hurricane events. This building improvement is budgeted to cost \$850,000 and will greatly increase the facilities capabilities to handle special needs citizens in the case of a hurricane.

Lealman Exchange Computer Labs:

Staff shared that the computer labs at the Exchange have been completed and that the 1st floor area was designed for open community use, while the 2nd floor lab was designed for facilitator-led trainings either by facility tenants or external community partners. Staff mentioned the labs had YMCA have already used the labs during its essential worker childcare and summer camps to support virtual learning needs brought on by COVID-19. Currently, the County is having discussions with Career Source of Pinellas to manage the 1st floor computer lab to offer workforce development services/resources. The Pinellas Public Library Cooperative also intends to utilize the 1st floor lab to provide virtual library resources. Both opportunities are still under review and we anticipate those to be open to the public soon.

VI. FY21 CRA Budget & Work Plan

Staff presented on the proposed FY21 Lealman CRA Budget and Work Plan. Committee Chair Steve Cleveland wanted to know if the proposed budget included assistance for businesses impacted by COVID. Staff indicated it did explore options and possible small business grants to provide additional financial assistance for residents and business owners in Lealman, however given Federal resources became available through the CARES Act, TIF funds were not utilized for this specific purpose, though the budget does include funding for residential and commercial improvement grants. The Chairman asked for information to be provided to the Committee on the CARES Act funding.

Staff then presented the Work Plan and announced that the Lealman CRA Residential & Commercial Improvement Grants have opened as of today. Chairman Cleveland questioned the possibility of utilizing TIF funds for funding an arts and crafts festival in Lealman. Staff indicated that due to legislative changes that occurred in 2019, CRA's have limited ability to utilize TIF funding beyond affordable housing, infrastructure, and capital or otherwise physical improvements, but that it would explore opportunities to support an event like this.

Committee member Father Viet Nguyen asked for clarification on the Lealman Exchange Outdoor Public Wi-Fi project. Staff replied it is exploring expanding the Wi-Fi out to the parking lot and to other public areas on the campus and gave examples of the need and benefits for Wi-Fi in these areas. Committee member Enoch Nicholson asked for additional details about the PSTA transit stop improvements. Staff explained it would be for bus stops shelter and pads and that the locations for these improvements have not been finalized yet. Mr. Nicholson gave 1st motion to approve the FY21 CRA Budget and Work Plan and Committee member Gary Grooms gave 2nd motion to approve, and the Committee unanimously voted to approve.

VII. Form-Based Code

Staff presented a power point on the proposed Form Base Code. The primary intent of this Code is to provide a framework to achieve some of the redevelopment goals and strategies that were identified in the CRA Plan that was adopted in 2016. Specifically, the Code would assist the area to achieve an urban form character and would further the commercial and housing redevelopment goals outlined within the Plan. Staff also shared an overview of the Code's development process, public engagement and outreach efforts and beta testing that was conducted. Finally, staff shared the development advantages and process improvements that the Code would achieve once adopted, such as: reduced building setbacks, elimination of lot size standards, reduction in parking, adaptive reuse incentives, and flexibly in building types and permitted land uses, and density/intensity bonuses.

At the conclusion of the presentation staff asked the Committee for feedback. A discussion ensued with the Committee ultimately concluding it was not prepared to make a recommendation to the Board of County

Commissioners until additional information was provided. The discussion can be summarized in the following categories:

- Infrastructure: Questions centered on how the County will ensure the necessary stormwater, water, wastewater, transportation infrastructure is in place to support the new development/redevelopment the code promotes.
- Missing Middle Housing: The Committee requested examples of the “look and feel” of these types of developments, as well as examples in the Tampa Bay area where they have been implemented.
- Vertical Mixed-Use Bonus: Similar to Missing Middle housing, the Committee requested more information on the impacts this incentive would have on the community.
- Code Administrator: The Committee requested more information on who this individual would be, the specific authority they would have and how this authority would differ from what is in place with the current land development code governing the CRA.
- Mobile Home Parks: The Committee expressed concern over the “park model” units permitted in the code and whether this would perpetuate the existing mobile home parks that the community desires to see redeveloped by other means.
- Parking: Questions were raised about parking reductions provided in the code and the impact of encouraging on-street parking in single-family neighborhoods.

While Committee members voiced support for a new code generally as a means to spur redevelopment, the consensus was that they did not feel comfortable making a recommendation until additional information could be provided in the areas identified above. Mr. Grooms made a motion to postpone the item going before the BCC until the Committee receives the requested supplemental information. The motion was 2nd by Mr. Nicholson and passed unanimously.

VIII. Advisory Committee Member Comments

Mr. Seguban voiced a desire to meet in person instead of using Zoom. Committee members Orr, Grooms, Vice Chairman Nicholson and Chairman Cleveland all were in favor of meeting in person when the Form Based Code was brought back to the Committee if the meeting adhered to CDC guidelines.

IX. Citizen Input

Mr. Robert Ryan Carter stated that his primary concern was his view that his neighborhood was not properly notified during the public engagement process. Mr. Carter also expressed concern over on-street parking given the existing conditions in his neighborhood that have drainage ditches and narrow road widths and requested additional information on the proposed Maker’s District.

A resident with the screen name “Bibi” commented that she agrees with the Committee’s recommendation to postpone approving the Code and would like to see the examples of the different housing types referenced. She requested the opportunity for the community to review the follow-up material in advance of the item being brought back to the Committee.

David Lee commented this is the first time in the County that missing middle housing is being proposed and he raised concerns with how it is compatible with single-family neighborhoods. Mr. Lee also commented that County staff previously indicated that density would not increase as a result of this code, however he felt the proposed 50% density bonus and inclusion of vertical integrated mix-use allowances would in practice increase density. Finally, Mr. Lee expressed concern with the new authority provided to the Code Administrator and how this would change the public hearing process and the community’s ability to be notified of potential new development.

X. Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 8:24 PM.