



## **RENEW ARLINGTON CRA ADVISORY BOARD**

Hybrid Virtual & In-Person Meeting  
117 West Duval Street  
Mezzanine Floor, Pers-Exam Room 1  
Jacksonville, FL 32202  
Wednesday, January 12, 2022 – 3:30 p.m.

### **MEETING MINUTES**

**Location:** The RA/CRA Advisory Board meeting was held as a Hybrid Virtual & In-Person meeting. There was an issue with the meeting location and the meeting was moved to the second floor of City Hall in Conference Room 2C.

**RA/CRA Advisory Board Members Present:** Advisory Board Chair Matt Tuohy; Advisory Board Vice Chair Stephen Matchett; Advisory Board Members Dedee Harper, Bandele Onasanya; Monty Selim and Ramsey Salem

**RA/CRA Advisory Board Members Present via Zoom:** Advisory Board Member Raj Adhikari

**RA/CRA Advisory Board Members Not Present:** Advisory Board Member Randy Goodwin and Danyuell Newkirk

**Staff Present:** Kirk Wendland, OED Executive Director; Karen Nasrallah, Redevelopment Manager; Brian Wheeler, OED staff and Michelle Stephens, Recording Secretary

**Representing the Office of General Counsel:** Susan Grandin

**Zoom Participants:** Councilwoman J. Morgan; Chet Akins, ECA for CW Morgan and Councilmember Ron Salem, AL-2.

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair M. Tuohy called the meeting to order at approximately 3:38 p.m.

#### **II. ACTION ITEMS**

#### **APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 11, 2021 RENEW ARLINGTON COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AREA (RA/CRA) ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

It was noted on page 1 of the August 11, 2021 RA/CRA Advisory Board Meeting Minutes that Advisory Board Member Ramsey Salem's name needed to be added to the board members present and Advisory Board Member Bandele Onasanya's last name was spelled incorrectly. On page 1 under Call to Order, Mr. Mike Anania's name was spelled incorrectly.

***A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED APPROVING THE AUGUST 11, 2021 RENEW ARLINGTON CRA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES, AS AMENDED. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0-0.***

#### **APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 13, 2021 RENEW ARLINGTON COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AREA (RA/CRA) ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

It was noted on page 1 of the October 13, 2021 RA/CRA Advisory Board Meeting Minutes that Advisory Board Member Ramsey Salem's first name was spelled incorrectly as well Advisory Board Member Bandele Onasanya's last name. On page 1, Representing City Council, it was noted that Councilmember Ron Salem's first name was spelled incorrectly.

***A MOTION WAS MADE AND SECONDED APPROVING THE OCTOBER 13, 2021 RENEW ARLINGTON CRA ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES, AS AMENDED. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0-0.***

### **ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

Chair M. Tuohy opened the floor for nominations of Chair for the calendar year 2022.

Advisory Board Member M. Selim nominated the RA/CRA Advisory Board current Chair, Matt Touhy to serve another year as Chair of the RA/CRA Advisory Board. Chair M. Tuohy accepted the nomination. There were no further nominations for Chair.

***A MOTION WAS MADE BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER MONTY SELIM AND SECONDED BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER BANDELE ONASANYA TO RE-ELECT MATT TUOHY AS CHAIR OF THE RENEW ARLINGTON CRA ADVISORY BOARD FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2022. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0-0.***

Chair M. Tuohy opened the floor for nominations of Vice Chair for the calendar year 2022.

Advisory Board Member Bandele Onasanya nominated the RA/CRA Advisory Board current Vice Chair, Steve Matchett to serve another year as Vice Chair of the RA/CRA Advisory Board. Vice Chair Steve Matchett accepted the nomination. There were no further nominations for Vice Chair.

***A MOTION WAS MADE BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER BANDELE ONASANYA AND SECONDED BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER DEDEE HARPER TO RE-ELECT STEVE MATCHETT AS VICE CHAIR OF THE RENEW ARLINGTON CRA ADVISORY BOARD FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2022. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 6-0-0.***

### **III. GENERAL INFORMATION**

#### **MUNICIPAL CODE ENFORCEMENT UPDATE**

Mr. Michael Chao, Chief of Municipal Code Compliance, provided an update regarding Code Enforcement issues within the RA/CRA Zoning Overlay. He advised that they cited 232 cases, issued 393 citations and almost 400 written violations. The five top citations issued are noted below.

1. Window signs
2. Burglar bars on windows
3. Illegal placement of signs
4. COUs (Certificate of Use), which can be good and bad because a COU means that there are new businesses going in they just have not applied for the COU. Warnings have been issued.
5. Failure to maintain signs (assignment signs, street signs, or issues with site visibility)

Mr. Chao advised that most of violations allow for 30 days to comply. Warning citations were issued the first of December 2021 to make the property owner aware of the issue. Code Compliance staff will be

going back out in a January-February and issue \$250 citations to anyone who has not complied or tried to comply with the warning citations issued in December. Code Compliance will work with property owners as long as they can provide proof that they are working with City and the COU is in the process of being issued.

Mr. Chao provided an update on the Bethelite property. The last conversation Code Enforcement had with their attorneys was that they were going to enter into a settlement agreement with the city for approximately \$1,500-\$2,500, which will allow them to comply within the 12-18 month period. There are 13 buildings on the property and all 13 are receiving a \$250 per day rolling fine. The owner of the property plans to demolish all buildings on the property noting that during the 12-18 month period they will continue to be charged \$250 per day. They will pay a fee upfront with the stipulation that they are going to do what they said they were going to do within the 12-18-month timeframe and at the end of the 12-18 months Code Enforcement will go back out and check on their progress. If they did exactly what they said they were going to do then whatever the value of the fine is at that time will be reduced and settled with them.

Vice Chair S. Matchett reported that he has received a few phone calls from folks that were issued citations. He received a phone call from a hairstylist on Arlington Rd. that was issued a COU warning citation. She went to apply for her COU and was told that she needed a set of architectural drawings for the building for them to review and she has no access to them. He asked Mr. Chao what he recommends for the hairstylist to do with a building where no plans exist anymore.

Mr. Chao replied that he was not sure adding that such architectural drawings are more in the realm of Josh Gideon and his team in the Planning Department. He added that Code Enforcement is not involved in the COU process. Vice Chair S. Matchett replied that prior to consolidation there was a lot of development in Arlington that was built and there are no building plans for the files.

Mr. Chao suggested that Vice Chair S. Matchett provide the customer that called him with his contact information (904) 255-7015 and he will help her through the process. Mr. Chao added that all citations are issued at either the property owner's or business owner's personal address because they need an original signature and to ensure they are aware of what is going on regarding the citation issued on the property.

Vice Chair S. Matchett commented that the other situation he heard a lot about were dumpsters and apartment complexes. He commented that he thought Code Enforcement has had ample opportunity to write those up. Mr. Chao replied that they did.

Vice Chair S. Matchett commented that there is nothing but apartment complexes along Arco Drive. He asked what was done about that and what is being communicated to the owners as to what is supposed to be taking place.

Mr. Chao commented that dumpsters and dumpster enclosures are an issue throughout the City. When you drive down the street you should not see any dumpsters. Dumpsters should be enclosed on all four sides. He commented that when they were in the Arlington area, they did cite properties with dumpster issues. Further, they also cited approximately 45 properties, which did include a lot of apartment complexes. Obviously, the apartment complex owner and management and apartment company's say that the dumpster is provided and tenants chose to throw the trash on the ground versus in the dumpsters provided. He noted that they have come across some instances where the containers are clean and people just put their trash on the outside of the dumpsters. He noted that all apartments have maintenance staff and they make recommendations to the apartment management staff, but they cannot make them comply adding that for

dumpsters that are used and overflowing they recommend increasing their pick-up cycle from once a week to twice a week.

Vice Chair S. Matchett commented that he does not know of a single dumpster on Arco Drive that is enclosed on all four sides. Mr. Chao replied that if the dumpster is located within the apartment complex and it cannot be seen from the street an enclosure on all four sides is not required.

Vice Chair S. Matchett referenced that there are eight apartment complexes on Arco Drive adding that two of them face the entry way to the street going into the subdivision. He asked for confirmation that if a dumpster is enclosed on all four sides, it requires the driver of the truck to get out of their vehicle and open the gate to the dumpster and empty the trash and reclose the gate. Mr. Chao concurred that is the process. Mr. Chao added that they should not be on a public street. Mr. Chao asked Vice Chair Matchett for an address and he would check to see if the property in question was cited. Vice Chair S. Matchett replied if they go down the street, they should be able to see it. Mr. Chao confirmed that the approximate 400 citations issued were all within the RA/CRA.

Advisory Board Member Ramsey Salem asked if Code Enforcement issues citations where landscaping at an intersection is blocking the view of the driver from traffic. Mr. Chao replied Code Enforcement only gets involved if it is private property. If the landscaping is in a city right of way, Public Works is responsible, or it may be a FDOT road and they are responsible.

Ms. Grandin responded to Advisory Board Member Ramsey Salem's inquiry regarding the view of a driver being obstructed in an intersection. She noted that the code currently says no obstruction is supposed to be within 25 feet of the intersection of the right of way lines, which is of course beyond private property. She advised that Councilwoman Morgan sponsored legislation (2021-0841) to change that because we were having problems with roads that go into other roads and the 25 foot set back was mutually exclusive within the RA Zoning Overlay requirement to pull the building up to the right of way.

Advisory Board Member Ramsey Salem referencing ORD 2021-0837, a sign waiver request by JU to reduce the minimum setback from 10 feet to 4.6 feet asked Mr. Chao if they were cited by Code Enforcement because of the signs being within the 10 feet of the roundabout which is out of compliance. He asked that if a sign waiver request is within the boundaries of the RA/CRA should it come to the Advisory Board for consideration adding that he did not see it on the agenda.

Ms. Nasrallah responded that the JU property was included in the RDA, but not in the CRA because if JU were to sell property making some of it private, we wanted to be able to demonstrate that it was part of the blighted condition at the time the Finding of Necessity Study was conducted. Chair M. Tuohy added that it was not necessarily to get around a sign ordinance but rather it was so they would not benefit from CRA funding.

Councilwoman Morgan asked Ms. Grandin to talk about ORD 2021-837, JU's sign waiver and about ORD 2021-841 noting that both will be before the LUZ Committee on Wed., 01/19/2022.

Ms. Grandin explained ORD 2021-0841, as it relates amending Sections of 656. She noted that there are a few places in the ORD Code that talk about the "site triangle," which is the driver's perspective coming up to an intersection of being able to see and make sure there are no cars coming before they proceed to the intersection. If you have two drive aisles coming together you should not have any kind of landscaping or any kind of obstruction between two and eight feet so that the driver can see. There can be a tree trunk but not bushes, etc. so that everyone around the parking lot can see. It also had the driving aisle intersection

with a street and it had the same 25 feet to 25 feet back from that. It was talking about the point of the right of way where the right of way line meets, not the center of the roads, but where the right of way lines meets going 25 feet back from there and 25 feet back along the roadway where they meet that you could not have any obstruction in there. It's a traffic safety issue. The traffic code had the same 25 foot back from the intersection of the right of way line you could not have any obstructions. That code was talking about signs, banners, flags, temporary things. The Zoning Administrator was also interpreting that to include buildings so the question came up how all the buildings downtown got built. They go right up to the right of way line. Our traffic engineer was questioning where the 25 feet would come from, and nobody knew where it came from. It does not make any sense and FDOT has in their design manual focus more on from the driver's eye perspective. It gives different charts and speed limits and different kinds of things for the driver pulling up to the intersection. It is all based on where the driver sits and how they can see.

#### **APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE 2021-784-E**

Ms. Nasrallah provided background regarding the Renew Arlington Redevelopment Plan noting that it has CPTED (Crime

When we were doing the Zoning

Overlay those of you who were on the Advisory Board remember that we included the CPTED principles when writing and drafting the Overlay.

Ms. Nasrallah commented that one of the very important measurements of CPTED is transparency of one of those and that is a part of the Overlay. It requires that windows be 40 percent of the façade. The background behind that is if you are inside of the building you want to be able to see what is out on the street and if you are out on the street you want to be able to see effectively what is inside the building. It is a safety measurement. As you heard from John's Automotive that was an issue with them because also in the Zoning Overlay is the fact that they trigger the 50 percent rule with what they are doing on their project. Therefore, as a service garage, they have to move their bay doors to the back of the building. When they move their bay doors to the back of the building it means that all of their equipment and everything goes to the front of the building. If 40 percent of their façade is windows, the person on the street is going to see their equipment, tools, etc. things that we don't want to see from the street. It takes away from the façade. CW Morgan introduced legislation so that we could solve for this that reducing the requirement to 20 percent for just service garages. It raises windows up five feet from the ground. At least their containers, equipment, tools, etc. will not be seen from the street. It still allows the transparency and solved for their problem with unsightly properties. City Council unanimously approved the legislation on 12/16/2021 (16-0-0).

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

No new business was discussed.

#### **V. OLD BUSINESS**

##### **NORMAN STUDIOS**

Follow up to the December 2, 2021 Advisory Board Meeting and Vice Chair S. Matchett's inquiry regarding if there was anything in the CRA Plan that may be helpful to Norman Studios. Ms. Nasrallah replied that Norman Studios is mentioned as being in the Cultural Heritage Corridor in the CRA Plan but nothing in the Plan that would allow for allocation of CRA funding.

Chair M. Tuohy noted that the next meeting is scheduled for Wed., February 9, 2022. Ms. Nasrallah asked the Advisory Board to hold their calendars on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Tuesday of every month at 3:30 pm noting all of the meetings may not be needed.

Chair M. Tuohy replied that he does not believe in meeting just to meet; however, he thinks there are informational things that the Advisory Board could discuss. He suggested rather than defaulting to no meeting if there are not any compliance grant items, they could meet on other topics. Ms. Nasrallah commented that the information items could be conducted via Zoom since a quorum would not be needed for nonvoting items. Mr. Wendland asked the Advisory Board Members to contact staff if they had any suggestions on topics they would like to review.

It was noted that the Ace Hardware sign is not in compliance.

Councilwoman Morgan advised that she is having a Town Hall meeting on Mon., 01/24/2022 at Terry Parker Baptist Church.

Advisory Board Member M. Selim asked for an update on the Merrill Road Traffic Engineering report. Ms. Nasrallah replied that the report is a huge document and she will provide it to Advisory Board Member Selim. She noted that there is about \$1 million that has been allocated to the design of the Merrill Road Complete Streets Project. Traffic Engineering has just hired a consultant and they are going to start working on it. They may have to dip into some of the money that we set aside for Complete Streets to finish funding the full cost of the project.

## **VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments from the public.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chair M. Tuohy adjourned the RA/CRA Advisory Board Meeting at approximately 4:31 p.m.

The written minutes for this meeting are only an overview of what was discussed. For verbatim comments of this meeting, an audio file of the meeting is available in its entirety and is available upon request. Please contact Karen Nasrallah at (904) 255-5449, or by email at [karenn@coj.net](mailto:karenn@coj.net).