

**VERNON MYERS**  
MAYOR - COMMISSIONER

**MARY LAWSON BROWN**  
VICE MAYOR - COMMISSIONER

**ALLEGRA KITCHENS**  
COMMISSIONER

**PHIL LEARY**  
COMMISSIONER

**JAMES NORWOOD, JR.**  
COMMISSIONER



**ELWIN C. "WOODY" BOYNTON, JR.**  
CITY MANAGER

**BETSY JORDAN DRIGGERS**  
CITY CLERK

**MATTHEW D. REYNOLDS**  
FINANCE DIRECTOR

**GARY S. GETCHELL**  
CHIEF OF POLICE

**MICHAEL LAMBERT**  
CHIEF FIRE DEPT.

**DONALD E. HOLMES**  
CITY ATTORNEY

*Regular meeting 2nd and 4th Thursdays each month at 6:00 p.m.*

**MINUTES**  
**CITY OF PALATKA**  
April 5, 2011

Proceedings of a Workshop meeting of the City Commission of the City of Palatka, Florida, held on the 5<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2011.

**PRESENT:** Commissioner Mary Lawson Brown  
Commissioner Allegra Kitchens  
Commissioner James Norwood, Jr.

**ABSENT:** Mayor Vernon Myers  
Commissioner Phil Leary

Also Present: City Manager Elwin C. Boynton, Jr.; City Attorney Donald E. Holmes; City Clerk Betsy Jordan Driggers; Finance Director Matthew Reynolds; Police Chief Gary Getchell; Fire Marshal Mark Lynady; Planning Director Thad Crowe; Building & Zoning Administrator Debbie Banks; Parks & Cemeteries Supt. Jeff Norton

Also Present: Members of the Palatka Planning Board: Sue Roshkosh, Earl Wallace, Zack Landis, Ken Venables, Joseph Petrucci, and Anthony Harwell; and Pam Sprouse, Recording Secretary

**CALL TO ORDER** - Chairman Pro-Tem Sue Roshkosh stated Mr. Venables will be chairing the meeting for the Palatka Planning Board. Mr. Venables called the 4/5/11 meeting of the Palatka Planning Board to order at 4:00 p.m.

**CALL TO ORDER** – Vice Mayor Mary Lawson Brown, Mayor Pro-Tem, called the Palatka City Commission workshop to order at 4:01 p.m. and read the following call, dated March 18, 2011:

**TO MESSRS: MARY LAWSON BROWN, ALLEGRA KITCHENS, PHIL LEARY AND JAMES NORWOOD, JR.:**

You are hereby notified that a workshop meeting of the Palatka City Commission is called to be held on Tuesday, April 5, 2011, at the regular meeting place of the Palatka City Commission, Palatka City Hall, 201 N. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Palatka, Florida, to commence at 4:00 p.m.

The purpose of the meeting is to hold a joint workshop with the Palatka Planning Board to discuss the Draft Evaluation and Appraisal Report of the City of Palatka Comprehensive Plan.

/s/ Vernon Myers  
Vernon Myers, MAYOR

The following Commissioners acknowledged receipt of a copy of the foregoing notice of a special meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2011.

/s/ Mary Lawson Brown  
COMMISSIONER

/s/ Allegra Kitchens  
COMMISSIONER

/s/ Phil Leary  
COMMISSIONER

/s/ James Norwood, Jr.  
COMMISSIONER

**INTRODUCTION** – New Planning Director Thad Crowe was introduced by Debbie Banks.

**PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING** – Evaluation and Appraisal Report of the City of Palatka Comprehensive Plan – Thad Crowe, Planning Director, with Ameera Sayeed and Eric Anderson of Northeast Florida Regional Planning Council. The public hearing was opened.

Planning Director Crowe introduced consultants Eric Anderson and Ameera Sayeed. He said an Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) on the City of Palatka Comprehensive Plan has to be completed and submitted to DCA every five to seven years. It is a rolling document and has to be updated. The EAR contains specific recommendations for changes to the Comprehensive Plan and issues they are raising. This report follows a specific format set by DCA. As this is a workshop, they will take questions and input from the public.

Eric Anderson, NEFRC, said this is essentially an audit of the current Comprehensive Plan and determines how the City will proceed in the future on what the community wants. This will be updated over the next 18 months. This EAR was developed by NEFLC. The recommendations they are making today are not set in stone but are purely for consideration.

The EAR contains the following sections:

- Section A: Introduction
- Section B: Community-wide Assessment
- Section C: Evaluation of Local Major Issues
- Section D: Special Topics
- Section E: Recommended Plan Amendments

Mr. Anderson said today they will look at Section B(7), Assessment of Comp Plan Elements and Section C, Evaluation of Local Major Issues. These sections provide the basis to update Comprehensive Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies (GOPs).

Mr. Anderson said the Assessment of Elements is broken into two sides. The left hand side of the page shows recommended Goals, Objectives and Policies. The right-hand side makes recommendations as to how to proceed with the specific recommendations made.

A synopsis of the power point presentation follows:

Policy B-18 -- B-19, Policy A.1.3.2 replaced language describing specific LDR-level buffers with more general language.

Page B-21, Policy A-1.4.3, adds “erection of silt fences” to erosion control measures. Policy A.1.4.10 is a new policy requiring property owners to maintain required drainage facilities to approved standard of construction.

Policy A.9.9.3.B.2 was added to Page B-37 referencing the Planned Industrial Development (PID) zoning district.

Page B-43, Policy B.1.1.1, B.1.1.1(a) and other policies make reference to the required mobility plan. The first sentence under recommendations will be deleted as the city is NOT required to adopt a Mobility Plan at this time. The City can choose between retaining Transportation Concurrency and adopting a Mobility Plan, and will make this decision prior to adoption of EAR-based amendments. This occurs in various places in the Elements Assessment. Through discussions with DCA this agency has agreed to the City making a study to determine whether or not to incorporate one or the other of these.

Policy B.1.1.5, page B-45, adds the Transportation System Management (TSM) option of vehicular and pedestrian/bicycle connections between existing and proposed developments.

Policy D.2.1.1 on Page B-78 restores deleted language and moves D.2.1.2 to the end. This affirms the waiver of required sewer hook-up for existing single-family homes when a lift station is required due to topography. Mr. Boynton said homes still need a sewer hook-up, even if hook-up is waived. Mr. Anderson said he will adjust that. Per the question, Mr. Boynton said this will only apply if a property is annexing into the City or planning to annex. This is a hardship provision for when a s/f home is within 250 feet of the City Limits so they don't have to put in a lift station. Commissioners Kitchens and Brown noted water customers can't get sewer unless they are inside the city limits. Some people already have this, but they aren't doing any more at this time. Mrs. Banks said there are some places outside the City Limits where a sewer line runs in front of a property. Currently, if you are in the city limits, the City can't make you hook into it unless you can do so by a gravity line. The City can't force you to put in a lift station. Mr. Boynton said the City doesn't want septic systems throughout the City as they move forward. That's not progressive. The City should do whatever it takes to hook people up, even if they have to spread the cost out over a few years. Mr. Holmes said what they have makes reference to existing sewer lines. There's no criteria that triggers this if a sewer line runs adjacent to a property. Mr. Boynton confirmed that they don't want septic tanks in the City. Per the question, Mr. Boynton said there are a few places with septic tanks that are grandfathered in, but they don't want to accept septic tanks coming in. Mr. Crowe said properties that are grandfathered in won't be forced, but anything newly coming in or built will need to hook into City sewer. Mr. Holmes said building permits, which refer to future construction, contemplate the addition of septic tanks in the future, so they need to delete the entire reference. They should put a period after “phased out of service” and delete the rest of the passage.

Mr. Holmes said as to D.2.1.2, the City isn't contemplating installing any new septic tanks. There was consensus to strike this passage and to revise D.2.1.1 to read "The City shall maintain Land Development Regulations which ensure that remaining septic tanks are phased out of service, and that no new septic tanks shall be installed within the city limits"

Mr. Anderson continued, noting Policy E.1.2.8, on Pages B-86 thru B-87 consolidates wetland/river/lake upland buffer policies from the FLUE and Conservation Element into one policy, which allows certain limited activities within the buffer.

Page B-109, Policy G.1.6.5 in Page B-109 is a new policy as required by the Water Management District that commits the city to adopting a water supply plan if required by the District. Mr. Holmes asked if they have the power to mandate that. Mr. Crowe said if the City doesn't add it, they will object to it. They will have to put it in one way or the other. Commissioner Kitchens said they need to change "will" to "may". Mr. Anderson said this language is recommended by the Water Management District. Mr. Holmes said the first half of the paragraph is required. The 2<sup>nd</sup> half says "if required." He asked required by whom. After discussion, there was consensus to add "if required by statute" as suggested by Mr. Crowe. It was noted there is no funding for this.

Mr. Crowe said Commissioner Leary was unable to attend, but one of the things he wanted to pass along was to avoid unfunded mandates.

Commissioner Brown said they need to add a requirement for buffers, as they've annexed in the past and been promised buffers, but there was no follow through on those promises after they came in. They need to require this. Per discussion, Mr. Crowe said if they came in under an enforceable development agreement, the City can enforce it, but if not, there's nothing the City can enforce. Mr. Crowe said they have added something about retention ponds to require people to keep them up to the standard under which they were approved. They can add something similar to this.

## **SECTION C – LOCAL MAJOR ISSUES**

**Issue 1: Historic Preservation** – Mr. Anderson said they've made the recommendation to add a historic element as this provides potential for grant funding and allows the City to put policies for historic preservation into the comp plan. Other recommendations are:

- To apply for a certified local government (CLG) designation which promotes historic preservation through grass roots level. Commissioner Norwood said he understands the recommendations, but wants to be sure that whatever policy they put in place doesn't make it more intrusive.
- Add a policy calling for historic survey of older areas of the City, as it's been many years since a survey was done and other properties or areas may now qualify
- Adopt policies to enable historic tax exemptions.
- Adjust current CRA boundaries to match historic district boundaries
- Consider infrastructure improvements in historic districts
- Consider programs that leverage private investment with City of TIF or other funds

- Preserve, renovate and market the city's historic resources
- Continue to seek public and private funding sources
- Coordinate with Putnam County Historical Society, the Chamber and others to update historic documentation, including a walking tour. Commissioner Brown said they need to do more than just walking tours. They need to do something to promote bringing people into the City to spend money. They need kiosks that tell people what stood in a certain area at one time.
- Consider historic designation and design standards for downtown. One example would be use of canopies.

Mr. Holmes said when the City adopts specific policies it will have to live with those. Conceptual things like recommendations are just that, but as in Section C.2, when they are suggesting modification of specific policies, he wants to be sure everyone is on board with those. Mr. Boynton said if this gets approved, these policies get amended. Mr. Anderson said these are just recommendations; when they amend the Plan they will make these changes. Commissioner Brown said when they first laid out the historic districts there were some who wanted the designation, and others who fought this, because they didn't want this intrusion into their property rights. Everyone who has an old house didn't necessarily buy it to have a historic home, and some inherited them. Some complain that they didn't know the house was located in a historic district before they purchased it. They need a notice procedure.

Mr. Holmes said he's thought about some sort of notice being put in the public record, so that if a person has a title search done on a property in a historic district, you'd have some form of notice to make people aware that people are buying property in the historic district. They'd know prior to closing they will have a burden placed on them that's not placed on other property owners. Mr. Crowe said he's heard of doing something similar in the case of airport noise zones. He supposes if they can do that in other cities, they can do it here. Mr. Holmes said that would eliminate the objections of people who come in and say they didn't know they had to get permission to do certain things. It puts the onus on the property owner. Commissioner Kitchens said if they put it on the legal description, it would come up in a title search. The realtors that sell the property are bound by law to advise people they are purchasing property in a historic district. The new owner has legal recourse against a realtor that didn't advise him/her. Commissioner Brown said she had a friend that wanted to enclose a porch to make extra living quarters and was stopped from doing so because the home was in a historic district. They need to reach those folks who have owned these properties for many years. Commissioner Kitchens said people can always plead ignorance. You can't inform everyone of everything all the time.

Mr. Petrucci asked why C.1.5.2. is being added to the Historic Preservation Element. Mr. Crowe said they added it because there may be historical sites that may not be inventoried at this time. There could be archaeological sites that need to be designated and preserved.

## **Issue 2 – Economic Development**

**Downtown Revitalization** - Mr. Anderson said the first part is the addition of elements specific to downtown revitalizations. In addition, they recommend:

- Continue to institute downtown design improvements
- Continue façade and building improvement grant program

Mr. Petrucci said on page C-9, where it talks about the buildings in downtown Palatka, many of these were constructed prior to building code adoption and renovation may be cost prohibitive. They are talking about doing improvements to streets and infrastructure without doing renovations to buildings. There are 34 storefronts between 1<sup>st</sup> Street and 9<sup>th</sup> Street that are vacant. They need to fill those stores before they do street lighting. Street lights are luxuries. The need is to fill those spaces. Mr. Anderson agreed, saying however, this goes hand in hand with renovation of properties. Commissioner Norwood asked if they are compromising the safety of buildings when they don't require people to bring their buildings up to code. He wants to be sure they aren't compromising the safety of individuals based upon preserving these buildings. Mr. Crowe said the existing building code does allow flexibility in certain instances, but doesn't allow flexibility in terms of life and safety. Mr. Petrucci said it sounds as though they are not focusing on getting buildings occupied. He sees no focus on bringing people already in the community back into Downtown. Mr. Crowe said the more reasons people have to come to Downtown, the more people will come and the better businesses will do; this is what will happen when the Florida School for the Arts is brought into Downtown. It will create a more hospitable environment for business, and will bring in businesses to support it. They provide incentives with Façade and BIG grants. This is a package deal. They have to use a number of strategies. Commissioner Kitchens said she had the same reaction, because it seemed to discourage people from preserving old buildings, but other Sections do encourage preservation. Mr. Crowe said they don't mean this in a boiler plate way, but need to provide some incentives. Commissioner Brown said they don't want to run people off from Downtown; if they tell her she needs to put certain things in she can't afford to do, she'll have to leave her building and walk away. Mr. Petrucci said these improvements cost a lot of money. They need to make money available through grants, so people will want to put businesses in these buildings. Once you fill storefronts, you have taxes coming in, and then you can take that money and do other things with it. Commissioners Brown and Kitchens said they are doing that through BIG grants. Mr. Petrucci said they need to concentrate on filling buildings before they start putting in benches and landscaping. Mr. Crowe said if you want to put all your resources into private investment, and then follow up with public investment, that's something the City will have to decide.

Regarding tax abatements, Commissioner Kitchens said the City exists on ad valorem tax. If they abate taxes, they can't pay for services. Mr. Crowe said they have those provisions with sunset provisions wherein they can reexamine tax abatement. You can limit it to the tax revenues realized from renovations. For example, if an owner puts \$100,000 into restoring the building, he/she won't be taxed on the increase, but will be taxed on what was there before the improvements were made. Ms. Sayeed suggested they strike the paragraph on C-9 that begins with "Many of the buildings in Downtown Palatka. . ." Mr. Venables asked it be moved it to Page C-3, Bullet #4 under Historic Districts. Commissioner Kitchens said Downtown Palatka is not in a designated historic district. Mr. Crowe said this is part of the narrative. There was

consensus to strike the 3rd paragraph under the heading “Downtown Palatka” on page C-9. Commissioner Kitchens said the last paragraph contains an error; the City revised the CRA plan in 2008, not created it. Mr. Anderson said he’ll correct that passage.

**Downtown Marketing** - The following recommendations were noted:

- Partner with private entities to leverage public resources
- Encourage and consider providing incentives for establishment of live-work artist district
- Continue using grant and other funding to transform the Price-Martin Center into a mid-size performing arts center

**Arts/Cultural Strategies** - The following recommendations were noted:

- Nurture cultural and arts programs
- Support the Mural Program
- Support art events that attract artists to the City
- Inventory art facilities and programs
- Assess Cultural Needs of the Community - Commissioner Norwood asked who will complete the cultural arts assessment? He doesn’t want to get into unfunded mandates. Mr. Boynton said most of these recommendations will incur a cost. Commissioner Kitchens suggested the UF Arts Dept would perform a cultural needs assessment.
- Continue allowing established 50(C)(3) non- profit art organizations to lease unoccupied city buildings for a nominal fee
- Interface with state and regional tourism agencies to develop and clearer identity for the City

**Tree City Strategies** - The following recommendations were noted:

- Develop inventory of street trees
- Develop street tree planting program
- Identify additional funding sources for tree planting

**Industrial Park** - The following recommendations were noted:

- Work with the Economic Development Council and Chamber in marketing the industrial park
- Investigate availability of shovel-ready sites.

**Airport** – The following recommendations were noted:

- Continue to pursue state and federal grants for airport improvements and new business attraction & retention
- Improve appearance of airport through use of strategic landscaping
- Implement marketing proposed by Airport Master Plan

**Infrastructure Improvements** – the following recommendations were noted:

- Pursue reuse improvements

**Downtown SJRSC Presence** - the following recommendations were noted:

- Work with SJRSC/FLOARTS to establish a downtown branch /continuing education facility.
- Work with SJRSC and appropriate agencies to establish downtown business incubator.

**Public Private Partnerships** – the following recommendations were noted:

- Coordinate with public, quasi-public and non-profit groups on economic development issues
- Pursue state, federal and other grant and loan opportunities, possibly utilizing a city-funded grants staffer
- Create a committee of those who deliver cultural programs to greater Palatka

Mr. Petrucci asked what they would offer to people in the community that aren't into the arts. He doesn't see recommendations for anything that isn't arts-related. Mr. Anderson said this is a very general, large, encompassing statement. Commissioner Kitchens said Putnam County has a large amount of artists and talented people. Mr. Anderson said there is a large amount of data that shows that arts education promotes economic development. Mr. Crowe said many places have been successful in revitalizing their downtown area through arts development like antique stores, etc. Commissioner Brown suggested adding going after money from foundations that support the Arts. Mr. Anderson said they can add that in.

Commissioner Brown said black churches have what's called "Praise" dances, which is a form of art. When they start thinking about arts, they need to look at churches.

**Rails and Water Transportation** – the following recommendations were noted:

- Work with regional commuter rail systems to "sync" operations with Amtrak service
- Work with Amtrak in converting train station to "manned" status
- Support water taxis for eco tourism and potential transit purposes

**Eco-tourism** – The following recommendations were noted:

- Support and promote fishing tournaments
- Plan for bicycle routes or trails to link terminus of Lake Butler-Palatka Rail Trail to Downtown
- Support public and/or private water taxis that connect the riverfront park with Murphy Island for hikers and/or campers
- Recommend to Florida Div of Parks and Recreation the prohibition of automobile travel in Ravine Gardens State Park during peak pedestrian/bicycle periods.

Commissioner Brown said fishing guide service is a viable business. Mr. Landis asked if the water taxi service is a given. Commissioner Brown said the grant money has been secured and they have one more contract in the pipeline to get executed.

**Economic Development** – The following recommendations were made:

- Consider city economic development staff position
- Institute brownfield or enterprise zone tax exemptions for property improvements.

Mr. Venables said he was told by a woman from Salt Springs that she does all her shopping in Palatka as everything she needs is on Hwy 19. They have an “influence zone” in a large area surrounding Palatka/Putnam County. He’s not sure they are marketing out that far. Commissioner Kitchens said Downtown Palatka received marketing money to put up billboards along I-95, do advertising on television and in publications, and promote a website. Commissioner Brown said they need a more strenuous marketing strategy. They have many boating opportunities on the River now with the Blueways. They need to find a way to promote water sport opportunities. Mr. Anderson said they can prioritize those types of projects.

**Issue 3: Transportation LOS** – The following recommendations were made:

- Study/choose whether or not to do a mobility plan or retain transportation concurrency. Mr. Crowe said this is a more comprehensive way of looking at transportation. The legislature is looking at not mandating transportation concurrency, but it will have to be replaced with something. Ms. Sayeed said even if mobility plan requirements go away, the City will still need to look at transportation concurrency or a mobility plan or a hybrid of some type. It’s not necessarily a negative or positive, but the City should consider a hybrid in order to ensure land use changes will be allowed.
- Encourage alternative modes of travel through multi-modal corridors
- Propose multi-modal transportation strategies
- Establish “complete streets” to include bicycle and pedestrian paths.
- Encourage new bus stops and transit routes
- Coordinate with County in developing a list of priority projects for bus stops and transit routes
- Ensure that future financial commitments to transit will increase ridership levels and reduce traffic congestion.

**Issue 4: Trails and Parks** – the following recommendations were made:

- Create a long range parks and trails plan, utilizing the work of County Greenprinting and Trails Master Plan. Mr. Anderson said this gives the City more points in certain grant applications. Commissioner Norwood asked who determines rail trails. Mr. Boynton said at this time FDOT, but it would be good to plan a loop system that will encompass the entire city. Commissioner Brown said the City put a plan together at one time. Mr. Boynton said the City doesn’t have a recent, decent plan; it hasn’t been updated in some time, like the County has been updating theirs.
- Plan for parks and trails in Coastal High Hazard Areas (CHHA). Mr. Anderson said a new study came out in Dec. 2010 that defines a coastal high hazard area, or an area with a potential to flood in a Category 1 storm. The State has said development can take place here with mitigation, but there are no specific guidelines as to what mitigation is acceptable. He referred to a map on display (copy filed), saying the red areas on the map show these CHHA areas and the Plan seeks to limit development in those areas. They can look at trails and parks in this area. Per discussion, it was noted the City doesn’t own these areas.

- Identify and establish linkages to other regional trail systems and park facilities – Mr. Anderson said the Putnam County Master Trail Plan does this and the City can piggyback off that.
- Evaluate opportunities for trail development through the National Rails-to-Trails Conservancy Program

**Issue 5: Annexation & Municipal Boundary** – the following recommendations were made:

- Diminish and eventually eliminate enclaves. Commissioner Norwood said they've been talking about enclaves for many years, but there is no plan. The City's tax base is shrinking. If they are going back to urban services boundaries, they have to provide incentives to annex if they want to grow. This will have to do with water and sewer. They can only grow west, north or south. They have to put measures in place for water & sewer incentives and may need to revisit policies, and how far they want to annex and what the city will look like 20 years from now. Mr. Crowe said they frame this within the next few slides. Commissioner Kitchens said they cannot annex a property into the City unless it's adjacent. Per conversation, it was noted Palatka has recently grown by 736 acres in area.
- Develop criteria for annexation requests addressing:
  - Impacts on tax revenue
  - Impacts on city services
  - Alleviation of negative environmental impacts
  - More efficient provision of services; and
  - Elimination
- Develop or promote annexation incentives such as:
  - Tax breaks
  - Traffic/road/sidewalk/parks improvements
  - Provision for reimbursement of drainage improvements
  - Improved urban services and quality of life
  - City sewer
  - Professional fire/rescue and lower fire insurance rates - Mr. Homes and Commissioner Kitchens said water and sewer service are the biggest "carrots."
- Enforce voluntary annexation agreements once a property owner's land becomes contiguous to the City to include time limits to apply for annexation
- ~~Work with County to define long-term geographical extent of city-provided urban services~~
- Assess funding sources for urban service provision
- Promote the use of a Joint Planning Area with Putnam County
- Three possible EAR approaches to annexation and provision of urban services:
  1. Continue "piecemeal" voluntary annexation
  2. Work with County to develop urban service and planning district in unincorporated area under City's sphere of influence
  3. Pursue annexation referendum for "Greater Palatka"

Mr. Crowe referenced maps that follow, entitled Potential Urban Service Area/Future Annexation Area and Annexation Area – “Greenbelt.” He said if Palatka were to grow to “build-out” there are natural barriers to the east and south. They’ve tried to piece together the natural boundaries of the City, which creates a more clear identity. This is very conceptual. They need to establish a long-range vision and decide how they want to take this property in, through annexation, through working with the County to control development, provide water & sewer, etc. They may want to look at an overall referendum for annexation. They may choose not to do any of this.

Mr. Crowe said at this time they are looking for a recommendation from the Planning Board to send this to the City Commission. They need policy direction in the EAR. At this time they have none. Discussion ensued regarding recommendations. Mr. Crowe noted there were consensus recommendations made during this workshop. He stated this draft has to be transmitted to DCA by May 1; they need to bring this to City Commission on April 14 so they’ll have an extra meeting to make other changes.

**What’s next:**

- Planning Board as local planning agency recommends transmittal of the EAR to the City Commission (targeted for presentation at the April 14 City Commission meeting)
- Adoption of EAR by resolution and transmittal to DCA (April 14<sup>th</sup>)
- Agency and DCA review within 60 days
- DCA issues Final sufficiency determination within 90 days
- Adopt EAR based amendments within 90 days of receipt of sufficiency letter from DCA

Mr. Crowe stated this concludes the presentation portion.

Mr. Venables said annexation policies should be developed by the City Commission, which is the policy-making body, and not the Planning Board. Discussion ensued. Mr. Crowe said they are not proposing the procedure for annexation be changed. This is a long-range vision. They need to decide if they want to keep on with voluntary annexation, or hammer out a working arrangement with the County on municipal boundaries, or pursue an annexation referendum for “Greater Palatka.” This is a way to frame long-term growth. The City has been on “auto pilot” for a long time. This is a way to make a decision to grow. There was consensus that if they try to force people to come into the City, they will encounter hard resistance. Mr. Crowe said all plans have to be marketed to the public. Mr. Wallace said he favors continuing as they’ve been doing and recommended Option #1, which received the consensus of the Planning Board, to continue piecemeal voluntary annexation. Commissioner Kitchens said she doesn’t believe in forcing citizens to come in. People come in as they need water & sewer and they do it voluntarily. Commissioner Norwood said what they are currently doing is providing a service. The City can provide the same level of service to a broader sector of the Community. He likes Option #2, to work with the County to develop urban service and planning districts in unincorporated areas under City’s “sphere of influence.” This will give the City an opportunity to create revenue to run the City and keep employees. They need to look at alternative ways of generating revenue. They can’t continue to piecemeal. Commissioner Kitchens said they can’t garner as much in taxes with all the forced cuts coming from Tallahassee. These new individuals will want more

services than the City can provide. Commissioner Brown said in some areas people on one side of the Street are getting city services, but people who may not be in the City on the other side of the Street are getting the same services. They need to tell people about the insurance breaks people will get by annexing into the City. Before the Commission decides which way they want to go, they need to outline incentives. Mr. Holmes asked if they can give a tax break to people who annex for a period of time to get them to come in. Mr. Crowe said other cities do this; they write up development agreements with developers who are developing properties. There is nothing to prevent the City from doing this across the board. Mr. Wallace said they can try to sell people in the enclaves on the benefits of coming into the City, but not a referendum. Residential property doesn't pay for itself. Commissioner Kitchens said if they can't tax them, there is no benefit to the City. Growth on its own is not always good. They don't need more people, they need more money. More people don't equate to more money. She doesn't want to force someone to annex against their will. Mr. Crowe said from a planning perspective they want efficient delivery of services. Mr. Boynton said they won't know what the recommendation will be until they go through workshops and disseminate the information. That's what the recommendation is today. No one here wants to commit to piecemeal, or referendum, or anything in between. They aren't ready to commit. They can start moving forward with workshops once they adopt this EAR. They can have a series of workshops on this over the next year before deciding. Nothing's ever been put together on this. Much of this data is there and incentives are there, but to say what they are going to chose tonight is going too far. Mr. Crowe said this is just a way of framing the information; these are strategies they can use.

Discussion followed concerning voting tonight to move this forward to the City Commission with changes adopted by consensus. Mr. Wallace said they do not want to recommend forced annexation. Mr. Wallace moved to pass along the draft EAR to the City commission with revisions and concerns as discussed and noted. Mr. Howell seconded the motion. Mr. Holmes said they need a motion to approve the Draft and transmit it to the commission, or not to recommend it's transmittal to the Commission. Mr. Wallace said they've only been considering this for two hours. There is no recommendation from the Planning Board to transmit to DCA. Mr. Boynton said they need a recommendation to transmit this to DCA. Ms. Sayeed said the local planning agency has to recommend to the City Commission to transmit this to DCA. The City Commission is the agency that will vote to actually transmit it to DCA. Mr. Holmes said this will go to the City Commission regardless. They can recommend to transmit it as is, with changes, or not to transmit it.

Mr. Wallace said they've been thrown a lot of information too fast to make a recommendation. They need more time to understand what they are recommending. Commissioner Kitchens asked if the City can ask for an extension past May 1. Ms. Sayeed said with the current legislative priorities, she can't make that recommendation. Commissioner Norwood asked about having another workshop between now and the 28<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Crowe said they can move to hold another workshop. Mr. Wallace moved to hold another workshop in order to have more time to make a recommendation. Mr. Landis seconded the motion. Discussion ensued around a workshop on April 14<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Sayeed said if they don't present this to DCA by May 1<sup>st</sup> they won't be able to make any Comp Plan amendments until they do. This local planning agency transmittal is a statutory requirement. After discussion, all prior motions and seconds were withdrawn by their respective makers. Mr. Wallace moved to continue the Planning Board Public Hearing to

Monday, April 11<sup>th</sup> at 4 pm. Mr. Landis seconded the motion. Mr. Boynton said there are three major sections to the EAR. The Community-wide assessment contains the policies; they are the only thing being changed. The next section is the recommendations to consider in the future; they are not concrete, hard and fast issues. They can add or subtract from them. That's not a big deal. Part 1 is statutory changes and other inconsistencies. That needs to be done. The major issues section contains five areas/issues that were determined through past workshops, and that's where they came up with those issues. None of this is concrete; they are just proposing they look at these issues in the future. This is just a recommendation for consideration; it's a "kitchen sink" recommendation. They don't want to miss the deadline at any cost. Next there could be a very important Comp Plan change that needs to be submitted ASAP. At this time, CDP can't do their project. They need to get this submitted by May 1. Then they need to amend the Comp Plan. They don't want to further complicate the issue, but there are things out there that will be coming in May to the Planning Board. The CDP plan is not outside the zoning ordinance; the zoning ordinance has been changed to allow his development, but the changes made to the zoning ordinance weren't carried over to the Comp Plan.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Normand Jutras, 412 Mulholland Park, Palatka, said as to historic preservation and adopting policies to enable historic tax exemptions, this should also fall into economic development for improvements and new structures, especially infill lots, that already have infrastructure. They should give tax abatements for accelerated additions over a 10 year period on any improvements made on an infill lot. In 10 years you triple or quadruple taxes on a vacant lot. It shouldn't apply to just historic buildings.

As to adjusting current CRA boundaries to match historic district boundaries, Mr. Jutras said they should adjust current Historic District boundaries to match CRA districts. He has a piece of property in the historic district that is not in the CRA district. He doesn't want it in the CRA district, but he'd like his property to be adjusted into the historic district. He contacted the National Registry himself, and their response is the local community can set or adjust boundaries. The City can shrink boundaries they've already set. The current historic boundaries were described; they come down Crill to Morris, then to Emmett Street, goes behind to a few houses on Morris Street, then it should come back to Morris Street and to the River, but it just says it goes "to the River." There is no description of the property it goes around. It is inaccurate in that corner.

---

There being No further discussion on the motion to continue the workshop to a time certain, a vote was taken and the motion passed unopposed.

**ADJOURN PLANNING BOARD MEETING** – The Planning Board Meeting was adjourned at 6:19 p.m. to be continued at time certain of April 13, 2011 at 4:00 p.m.

**ADJOURN CITY COMMISSION WORKSHOP** – the workshop was adjourned at 6:20 p.m. upon a motion by Commissioner Norwood.