



***KINGSOUTEL CROSSING CRA (KSC/CRA) ADVISORY BOARD
HYBRID VIRTUAL AND IN-PERSON MEETING
CITY HALL, MEZZANINE LEVEL – EXAM ROOM 1
THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 2022 - 3:30 P.M.***

MEETING MINUTES

Location: The KSC/CRA Advisory Board meeting was held as a hybrid virtual and in-person meeting. The KSC/CRA Advisory Board Members met in person at City Hall, 117 West Duval Street, Mezzanine Level – Exam Room 1.

KSC/CRA Advisory Board Members Present: Chair Kemal Gasper, Vice Chair Russell Jackson, Tony Robbins and Vanessa Cullins Hopkins

KSC/CRA Advisory Board Member participation via Zoom: Leola Williams

KSC/CRA Advisory Board Members Absent: Dr. Mary Jackson

Staff Present: Kirk Wendland, Executive Director; Karen Nasrallah, Redevelopment Manager; Michelle Stephens, Recording Secretary

Representing the Office of General Counsel: Susan Grandin

Representing the Office of City Council via Zoom: CW Brenda Priestly Jackson, District 10 and Kristen Hodges, ECA District 10

Others Present: Robin Smith, Chief of Engineering Construction Management with Public Works

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gasper called the KingSoutel Crossing Advisory Board Meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. A quorum was not initially confirmed. The order of the agenda was revised to discuss the potential projects for FY 2021/2022 before approval of the meeting minutes. Advisory Board Member T. Robbins arrived at approximately 3:38 p.m. after which time a quorum was confirmed.

II. ACTION ITEMS

APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 24, 2022 KINGSOUTEL CROSSING ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES

A correction was noted to the March 24, 2022 KingSoutel Crossing Advisory Board Meeting Minutes on page 4, 6th paragraph - 4th line replace, Agency Board “than” with Agency Board “that”.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER CULLINS HOPKINS AND SECONDED BY CHAIR GASPER APPROVING THE MARCH 24, 2022 KINGSOUTEL CROSSING ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MINUTES, AS AMENDED. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 4-0-0.

III. GENERAL INFORMATION

GENERAL DISCUSSION ON POTENTIAL PROJECTS FOR FY 2021/2022

Mr. Wendland commented that they have been in discussion with Mr. Robin Smith since the last meeting who has had conversations with FDOT. Follow up from the March meeting, Mr. Wendland commented that working with FDOT is not a quick process, but is a possible option.

Mr. Smith provided an update on the turn lane construction project for New Kings and Soutel. The project will be under construction in a few weeks and will probably be complete in approximately six months.

Mr. Smith advised that a design consultant for Phase II of the Water Main Project is going through the Procurement process and work should start in about 90 days.

Mr. Wendland commented for clarification that Public Works would bring the consultant on board who will do the design work and from there the project will go to bid add it can take approximately one year before the bids are returned. With that, Mr. Wendland commented that as with recent bids they could very well come back in FY 2022/2023 and ask for additional funding for the project.

Mr. Smith advised that he had a positive conversation with Jim Knight and the landscaping staff at FDOT. They are looking at the corridor to see what improvements they can make. He commented that FDOT has a state-wide program for landscaping medians adding that if partnered with FDOT the landscaping would be their version and not an enhanced version. He noted that FDOT has a five year planning process like the City. He noted that the timeline could be moved up, if the CRA was able to fund some of the work. FDOT has agreed to provide a scope with approximate funding needed.

Mr. Smith mentioned an enhanced level of landscaping to FDOT and they were open to that adding that it would require a maintenance agreement which would tie up some future CRA funding. He noted that if you are planning nice stuff you want to keep it looking nice and there is a cost associated with that.

He advised that he reviewed the area with FDOT adding that if you look down the corridor at the medians there are some plantings and palm trees, but they are not in the middle of the road they are off to the side. He commented that they believe there is a big utility running down the middle of the road, but what exactly has not been identified yet adding that it will limit what can be put in the medians.

Mr. Smith commented that there is value in a consultant doing a corridor study not for the design but for possible landscaping in the subject medians. The study could be expanded to look at where sidewalk improvements are needed and are if there are other things along the corridor that maybe are not on FDOT's radar that the CRA could potentially fund as improvements. He suggested that if this is something the CRA is interested in doing, he suggests setting aside some funding in the current year budget for the study adding that \$100,000 would go a long way. If the money was set aside, they could have a consultant go down the entire corridor and point out all the things they think could be done in the subject median area.

Advisory Board Member Cullins Hopkins asked for clarification when Mr. Smith refers to the "whole" corridor because at the March meeting they did discuss Moncrief/Soutel, Norfolk/Soutel and also New Kings Road/Soutel. She asked if he is referring to the entire length of Soutel from Norfolk to Imeson and from Soutel all the way up to I-295.

Mr. Smith replied that he is talking about New Kings Road from Soutel the southern boundary to the northern boundary he believes is just south of I-295. He added that there are no medians down Soutel at this time so there is not much opportunity to do enhanced landscaping.

Ms. Nasrallah commented for clarity that the nodes will need to be broken down into individual corridors adding that the New Kings Road corridor stands alone because it is FDOT. She advised that the advised that the initial study is to find out what is possible and what can actually be done and at that point the Advisory Board will have to decide how much money they want to put into design and into an actual corridor project, if it will include sidewalks, lighting, etc.

Mr. Smith added that the consultant would not be designing anything. They will create a report with recommended improvements that they think will work in the subject area and if the Advisory Board were to design them a separate or same consultant possibly is hired to actually perform the design according to the desires of the Advisory Board with what works.

Mr. Wendland advised that budgetarily, the Advisory Board can designate funds to a defined project and take what is needed for the initial study and down the road pay for the design work, enhancements, construction, etc. The point is to designate funds to a project for the current fiscal year so they do not roll over into the General Fund.

Advisory Board Member R. Jackson commented that if the Advisory Board can come up with a project name, dollar amount to allocate, etc. he would prefer they review and approve it at the May meeting and not put it off until the June meeting. Staff agreed if we can get it done in May that is optimal and not wait until June and risk not having a quorum for the meeting adding that we will need to ensure there is a quorum present for the May 26, 2022 meeting.

The Advisory Board agreed to allow Mr. Smith to gather additional information and return at the May 26, 2022 with more specifics that will allow for the Advisory Board to make an informed decision regarding a specific project and funding needed.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

No new business was discussed.

V. OLD BUSINESS

Chair Gasper advised regarding the new RaceTrac Gas Station that they have the cover over the pumps installed. The area needed more gas stations. He commented that the gas station and the new hotel will be positive activity in the area.

Ms. Nasrallah advised that the Mayor is in the process of signing the contract for the Cultural Council and it should be executed any day. The Cultural Council plans to hold the first community meeting as outlined in their contract.

Advisory Board Cullins Hopkins made a comment for the record that refers to Application WLD-22-13 Waiver of Minimum Distance Requirements for a Liquor License Location that the Advisory Board reviewed at the March 24, 2022 meeting. She commented that the information that they were given with regard to the subject waiver located at 5522 Soutel Drive advised that what has since been learned is that the various exceptions that could be used as an approval of a waiver at the discretion of the Planning Commission as opposed to being a required decision by the Planning Commission and the change in the wording from what we received was from "shall" to "may". She noted for the record that the waivers are up to the discretion of the Planning Commission and is not a foregone conclusion as it was presented to us at the March meeting.

Ms. Grandin clarified that a waiver of a liquor distance limitation is a decision by the Planning Commission adding that it does not go to City Council for approval and it is never a foregone conclusion, which is why an application is submitted and goes before the Planning Commission. She noted that the Planning Commission takes the Planning Departments recommendation into consideration, but the decision stops at the Planning Commission unless someone appeals it. An appeal goes before City Council. She commented that she was not sure where the "shall" and "may" come into the picture.

Mr. Wendland clarified that he thinks Advisory Board Member Cullins Hopkins is referring to what was presented by the client's representative (Mr. Harden) to the Advisory Board indicated that it was a "shall" situation where it should have been indicted as a "may".

Ms. Nasrallah commented that this one was a lesson learned adding that she is not a planner, Mr. Wendland is not a planner, the Advisory Board are not planners, and the administrative deviations, exceptions, waivers, etc. come before the Advisory Board but we are not experts. She asked for clarification on the role of the Advisory Board. Should they be getting in the weeds of the may, shalls and cans. Do they look at the plan and long term calls and ask if it fits within the plan and that is the only decision that the Advisory Board should be making. We should not be looking at the legalism of it but maybe more geared to what the Advisory Board should be looking at is if this is something we want in our community redevelopment area and does our plan allow for it.

Mr. Wendland added that when the Planning Commission sees it, they have a staff report and when it comes before the Advisory Board the staff report is not prepared yet nor provided.

The legalese said to the Board they are going to get this regardless because that is the way the law is stacked up, but is that the message you want to send to the Planning Commission because we have these six criteria that they can meet and get their waiver, is it still what we want in the CRA. For us it is more of a yes, we know that it is the right of the property owner, etc. but do we as an Advisory Board of this area agree that this is what is wanted in the CRA.

Ms. Grandin replied that a good point is made because the Advisory Board is not a mini Planning Commission. It is not the Advisory Board's responsibility to look at it from the Planning Commission criteria that they look at in terms of waiver of liquor distance. If it gets appealed to City Council, they also can turn over the Planning Commission's approval and they look at the same criteria that the Planning Commission looks at. It is not set in stone, it is not black and white, it is all discretionary. Ms. Grandin agreed that the Advisory Board should look at it as is this in keeping with what we want to see in the CRA because they don't have the Planning Departments Report that is supposed to take into consideration what the Advisory Board says about whether it fits in the CRA or not.

Mr. Wendland commented that the Ordinance Code is such that establishes that those deviations come to the Advisory Board while it is not clear and very broad as to what the Advisory Board's role is in the process. Mr. Wendland suggested that longer term that is something that should be looked at to clarify the language or have an operating agreement something that institutes what the role and responsibility of the Advisory Board is. Ms. Grandin agreed at least a written policy.

Mr. Wendland suggested after we get through the budget in May, the Advisory Board could further discuss the issue at the June meeting. The Advisory Board and the Office of General Counsel agreed.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments from the public.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Gasper adjourned the KingSoutel Crossing Advisory Board meeting at 4:48 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.