

City Council  
Special Meeting  
January 29, 2004

The City Council of the City of Titusville, Florida met in special session in the Council Chamber of City Hall, 555 South Washington Avenue, on Tuesday, January 29, 2004.

xxx

Mayor Ron Swank called the meeting to order at 6:37 p.m. Present were Vice-Mayor Ken Ward and Council Members Conrad Eigenmann and Jeff Rainey. Also in attendance were City Attorney Dwight Severs, City Manager Tom Harmer, Community Development Director Roy Crawford, and Recording Secretary Judy Renaud. Council Member Chris Broome arrived at 7:14 p.m.

Facilitators Marilyn Crotty, Director of the Institute of Government at the University of Central Florida, and Rafael A. Montalvo, Associate Director of the Central Florida Office for Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium (FCRC), were also in attendance.

xxx

Mayor Swank asked for a moment of silence and the entire assembly recited the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

xxx

Mayor Swank suggested ground rules to include ending the meeting at 10:00 p.m. and hearing public comment from 10:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. He also asked for a suggestion on either a three or five minute time limit for individual public comments. It was the general consensus that the public have the opportunity to comment on the visioning process and Council's discussions.

Member Eigenmann moved to end the visioning process at 10:00 p.m. and to limit individual public comment to three minutes. Vice-Mayor Ward seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

xxx

City Manager Harmer stated that the purpose of this meeting was to conduct a visioning session on the future development of Titusville. This was an opportunity to discuss among the Council and facilitators growth-related issues. Staff would receive any Council direction and provide follow-up information.

Ms. Crotty stated this was an informal session to allow Council the ability to state individual ideas with guidance from the facilitators. It would provide an opportunity for the Council Members to use their knowledge, intuition, and dreams and reach some consensus for future growth. She introduced the following objectives 1. To provide an opportunity for Council Members to exchange and explore hopes and expectations for the future of Titusville. 2. Identify

and explore issues associated with riverfront development and annexation that the City will have to address as it grows. 3. Identify and discuss possible strategies to address those issues. 4. Identify areas of agreement and areas for continued discussion. 5. Provide a constructive point of departure for future discussions of riverfront development and annexation.

Mr. Montalvo stated the real value was to provide a starting point for subsequent discussion of these issues and allow Council to understand each other, to understand what was important to Council individually and collectively, and to look at the differences. He reviewed the following guidelines: 1. Expect and respect different opinions. 2. To be open to new ideas. 3. Listening to understand and to focus on the discussion. 4. The exploration of an idea did not imply a commitment.

Ms. Crotty began the visioning process with the analogy *“It was the year 2020, and the past 16 years had been wonderful for Titusville. What was the City like? What was it like to live here?”* She asked the Council Members to share individual ideas.

Mayor Swank commented that Titusville had a feel that citizens loved and he did not wish to lose that small hometown feel, but the City needed more amenities such as rooftops, curb appeal, and industry that provided living wages with jobs for the kids to come back to.

Vice-Mayor Ward mentioned that statistically Titusville has maintained a population of 41,000 people for about ten years. In 2020 he saw a population in the neighborhood of 60,000 people. In studies, a city with a population of 50,000 would sustain support for shopping, entertainment, restaurants, etc. At the present time, there were vacant grocery stores, restaurants and various other businesses that close on a daily basis due to the population base. He also believed that there was not a lot of land in Titusville to be developed. There would be a major effort by 2020 to implement redevelopment in the older subdivisions and older shopping centers by having incentive for the redevelopment.

Member Rainey stated he wanted to be proud of the community. He commented on complaints he received of streets not being paved, no entertainment or restaurants, etc. The Council had started paving projects, not saying no to development, there was an increase in growth, an education process for developers to understand the constraints of the *Land Development Code*, zoning, etc. He commented on the approval of low-income housing and the renovation of the Titusville Towers by the Titusville Housing Authority. By 2020 all available land would be developed and the focus would be on redevelopment of older communities and jobs for the young people.

Member Eigenmann felt that Titusville was a bedroom community and did not know if there would be enough jobs to make Titusville independent. He wanted to maintain a small town feel. It was acknowledged that the City had become more independent of the space center, he agreed with a population base of 60,000-65,000, and that redevelopment, infrastructure, and providing incentives for developers would be key elements in 2020. He encouraged Council to philosophically look at the kind of growth, define areas for heavy and light densities (downtown would have a higher density). He supported the awareness and protection of the natural resources

and riverfront. City growth was limited by its boundaries (Kings Highway to Parrish Road and Indian River to the St. Johns River).

Ms. Crotty asked for additional comments and reactions to the above statements.

The Council Members made the following comments: 1. That the City be financial stable. 2. The City cannot be compared to Orlando, Ormond Beach, etc. 3. Service areas would be a factor in where to put density. 5. Maintain a small town feel with a larger population base. 6. To assure there were sufficient transportation corridors to handle the increase in population.

Mr. Montalvo reiterated a number of common themes for the year 2020: 1. Population base of 60,000-65,000. 2. The importance of redevelopment. 3. To retain a home town feel.

A couple points of difference were a desire for a greater development of jobs and the uncertainty that due to the limitation of developable land the additional jobs were not attainable. Overall, it was observed that Council enjoyed a high degree of consensus regarding their hopes for the future of Titusville.

Member Chris Broome arrived at 7:14 p.m. He was briefed and asked his vision for Titusville in the year 2020. His view was a great place for families and retirees to live, where streets were paved and infrastructure was great and water was not an issue, easy to drive to different areas taking in the traffic corridors, a safe city with police, code enforcement, restaurants, shopping, etc.

xxx

The next discussion item was riverfront development. Mr. Montalvo outlined three parts to this exercise. 1. The Council would discuss the vision they had just developed and the identifying issues related to riverfront development that would have to be addressed in order for the City to move in the direction of that vision. 2. They would then focus on strategies for addressing those issues. 3. They would summarize points of agreement and direction to staff.

Member Rainey suggested that the discussion be divided between riverfront commercial and riverfront residential. It was agreed to indicate on the chart commercial/residential. The Council Members offered the following comments.

Mayor Swank commented it was an important part of the community but really had not been under that much demand until the last couple of years. For example, citizens wanted to protect the riverfront and stop development. But, citizens opposed a funding mechanism that would have allowed the City to purchase riverfront land. Consideration of property rights-developers want high rises, citizens want single-family residences.

Other comments were made regarding the maintenance of parks, protection of the marina, protection of boaters access to the water and public access to the parks, densities/heights, vacant undevelopable land, the riverfront was an asset, availability of public access points to the river (parks from Marina Park to State Road 50), preservation of vacant land, history of mixed-use along the riverfront, redevelopment of old properties, incentives for developers to maintain

undeveloped/undevelopable properties, protection of areas that should remain residential, submerged lands, and Riveredge Drive.

Mr. Montalvo summarized and Council refined a list of issues (in no particular order): 1. Funding/resources. 2. What can go on the riverfront? 3. Where on the riverfront can it go? 4. Densities and heights/visibility (breezeway). 5. Access-visual, physical; public-pedestrian, boats. 6. Redevelopment. 7. Submerged lands.

Council Members began discussing strategies by addressing the following issues: What development can go on the riverfront, and where on the riverfront should it go?

Vice-Mayor Ward commented that a lot of the shoreline was already dictated as to what type of development. The downtown historic area was already mixed use. Council needed to determine what was the best return as far as following smart growth techniques such as density, etc.

Other comments included lack of political and financial power to renovate the Max Brewer Causeway bridge, the former Boeing property would be mixed use, to look at incentives for development of mall properties, growth on the west side of U. S. 1 to protect visibility, Sand Point Plaza for a high rise development. In a perfect world, the City would leave the east side of U. S. 1 north of State Road 50 undeveloped, balance between high rise development and public access, and increase breezeways, to better define breezeways, to protect the quality of life for citizens by providing incentives to secure vacant properties by trading/dealing with incentives.

Council Members discussed Riveredge Drive. Member Broome reviewed the situation of the area being in the County (enclave), use of our roads, single-family residences, developers want to build high rises to maximize the view of the water and return on investment. Citizens wish to protect single-family homes. How do we work incentives to enable developer to build in harmony within the neighborhood?

Member Eigenmann stated that the developers needed to work with homeowners and obtain their endorsement and buy-in by respecting the homeowners' privacy.

Member Broome suggested that if a developer met with homeowners and obtained endorsement, the developer could receive a fast track permitting process (expedited permit review).

The Council Members agreed with a fast track permitting process as it would provide incentives to the developer to meet with the citizens and to resolve rumors/fears and obtain a citizen buy-in to the proposed plan.

Mayor Swank asked Attorney Severs the legality of providing incentives. Attorney Severs advised that a criteria could be set in the *Code* as part of the process. City Manager Harmer commented on the development of a criteria to address various projects (small and large). Also, Staff would review the internal site review process to incorporate an incentive plan. The Council Members agreed that this was a doable idea.

Mr. Montalvo clarified there were several ideas presented. 1. There was an idea to provide incentives to preserve access to adjacent land. 2. To provide incentives for development on the west side of U. S. 1. 3. To provide incentives for preserving the land. 4. To provide incentives for neighborhood meetings. 4. Allow greater density/height in return for access or the purchase of land to be preserved.

Mr. Montalvo mentioned that he had heard Council referring not only to incentives but also as a condition of development. He asked if Council was comfortable with Staff exploring both of these ideas. Attorney Severs advised that these ideas could be built in as a conditional use process.

xxx

The meeting recessed at 8:02 p.m. and reconvened at 8:12 p.m.

xxx

Council Members agreed that they wished to explore the following ideas: 1. Compatibility with neighborhood. 2. Expedited permit review. 3. Meeting with homeowners. 4. Incentives for public access to the river. 5. Harmony with neighborhood.

There was discussion regarding the drawing of a line between a county enclave and the property below which was applicable not only to Riveredge Drive but also to several other areas. Further discussion ensued regarding not only offering incentives but also the endorsement of the homeowners being known as a Development Agreement.

Council discussed the meaning of “access.” It was determined that the definition of breezeway needed to be reviewed and it might include a revision to the Ordinance to clarify the meaning as a view (visualway). Also discussed was the overgrowth of government-owned vacant land and to work with North Brevard Parks and Recreation to clear/maintain such property.

xxx

The Council Members briefly discussed submerged lands issues: 1. Private property rights were an issue. 2. The right-of-way severs contiguity for purposes of calculating allowable densities. 3. Address this by creating incentives and initiatives for the right kind of development density calculations based on the aesthetics desired. It was agreed to defer further discussion to the February 3, 2004 special Council meeting.

In conclusion, the strategies identified during the Riveredge Drive discussion could be applied to the riverfront and throughout the City. Staff was directed to bring back the following ideas in a more developed form for formal consideration:

Providing incentives, including expedited development review, for developers to: 1. Hold neighborhood meetings to obtain endorsement/buy-in. 2. Develop in compatibility with the neighborhood (harmony). 3. To provide access (physical or visual). 4. Look at areas west of U. S. 1 where it would be appropriate to provide incentives to redevelop.

xxx

Council Members began discussion on annexation by reviewing the vision they had developed earlier and identifying issues related to annexation that would have to be addressed in order for the City to move in the direction of that vision. They then focused on strategies for addressing some of those issues and identified agreement or direction to staff for each issue they discussed.

Council Members discussed the following: 1. The ultimate boundaries of the City should be those in our current policy-Kings Highway to Parrish Road, from the Indian River to the St. John's River. 2. What were the County's views? 3. Most of the areas had services already (90%). 4. Costs of providing services (i.e., the value annexed property needs to have for the City to break-even on the cost of services) differs by location. 5. Need to define our mechanism for providing the same level of services that we have now as the City grows. 6. Model expected growth and costs of services based on full build-out of the annexation area. This could be done section by section within the annexation area. 7. Establish probable zoning of annexation areas in advance. 8. Start the modeling with vacant properties. 9. Model future land use? 10. Staff to meet with residents, stakeholders, property owners in enclaves to come up with a zoning. Explore what it would take for them to want to annex. This would assist in Council knowing the issues in advance and sort the needs from the wants.

It was agreed by Council that the annexation area boundaries in current policy were appropriate and staff was asked to bring back ideas and estimates of the effort that would be required to conduct the kind of modeling of service costs to different parts of the annexation area suggested during the discussion.

Regarding Water-Service Annexation Agreements, Council agreed that it was appropriate to continue the current policy. Regarding the idea of requiring binding development plans with annexation requests, it would be easier to ask for conceptual plans, not detailed site plans (bullet points list). Maybe "binding" was not the right word. Important to make it clear the City needed a commitment, but make it possible to change with justification. The City wished to have a level of comfort that what the Council thought it was getting was built that way. Council asked Staff to bring back ideas on how to implement this discussion.

xxx

City Council considered the next steps. 1. To quantify the ideas agreed upon, and to bring those ideas back in a more finished form. 2. To compare the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations to ascertain what changes would need to be made to make them compatible with Council's vision. 3. To sponsor neighborhood meetings to address the stakeholder's concerns. 4. To take action to deal with pending projects, annexations, etc.

xxx

The visioning segment of the meeting ended at 10:09 p.m. Council heard from the following public present.

Gloria Heiden congratulated Council Members on the visioning process and encouraged them to continue with the process. She commented on her meeting with developers, and the need for a new zoning category to allow clustering due to wetlands and open spaces.

Mayor Swank asked Staff to get with homeowners and developers. City Manager Harmer advised that Staff was looking at how to address clustering.

Laura Ward was happy with the process. She asked the Council to look at the big picture so developers know what to look for (including Riveredge Drive). The visioning process showed that Council had some other ideas besides condominiums and patio homes.

Member Eigenmann commented that Council did not address looking at the City in a global aspect. The City Manager was asked to include in next visioning meeting.

Bob Snider enjoyed the comments and thought the visioning process was a great start. He expressed concerns with the riverfront properties at the south end of the City. He was opposed to a condominium project and had several meetings with the developer. It was his opinion that the City was setting a dangerous precedent if condominiums were built on that land. He indicated there was 98% opposition to the project.

It was clarified that the project Mr. Snider discussed was at the corner of Coquina Road and U. S. Highway One.

Kathleen Burson thanked Council for sharing its ideas with the public. The ideas regarding the maintenance of visual and public access to the waterfront was very positive for the community. In future workshops, she encouraged Council to consider the development of property between U. S. Highway One and Hopkins Avenue. She commented on the limited size of the shoreline properties.

Danny Treder thanked Council for a productive meeting. He was happy with the present development, and commented on the riverfront/shoreline.

Bonnie Fuller thanked Council for a wonderful meeting and asked that Council consider in future developments the appropriation of land for schools.

Michael Myjak commented that there were so many good points and suggested the facilitator report and minutes be placed on the website and provide a sign up list and email people to let them know of future meetings. He commented that one item not discussed was a planned community development from Kings Highway to Parrish Road and river to river (fire/police, infrastructure, schools, density). It was his opinion that the Comprehensive Plan did not address low level density and suggested amending the Plan and updating the map. He commented on binding development agreements, submerged lands, rivers/lakes, consensus (rough consensus being 2/3 majority) in meeting with homeowners and developers, and to consider conservation planned development.

Don Page appreciated Council's efforts. He encouraged more visioning workshops. He commented on items not discussed: commercial corridors, where and how to plan for high and low density, global aspects. He suggested that staff and citizens work on different aspects and then bring a recommendation to another group and then a package of information would be presented to Council. He suggested setting workshops within local areas of the City to receive public input.

Keith Norman congratulated Council on the process. He commented that this process re-established trust, and communication with the public. He was a developer interested in the Fox Lake area and indicated he had started exchanging draft documents with residents and wished to meet with staff for a formal review. He commented on a binding site agreement and the degree of detail required at this development stage. The initial agreement needed to have a time table when more details needed to be supplied and reviewed.

Brad Downs was concerned with the South Carpenter/Fox Lake areas. He commented on the city's current phraseology to specify density. He suggested the City consider using lot size language instead of gross acreage. He stated that there was a large area of wetlands in the Falls Road area that drains to Silver Lake.

Charles Moehle thought the meeting was productive and made the following comments: Submerged lands should be addressed separately because there were differences. The requirement of a binding site development versus a conceptual plan. There was a misconception about allowable densities in the Future Land Use Map.

Veronica Clifford complemented Council on the visioning process and made the following comments. To look at the City in a global aspect. To maintain a good quality of life. To allow economic growth in the airport/industrial area. To look at adequate park/open spaces and land for schools with future growth.

xxx

The meeting adjourned at 10:51 p.m.

---

Ronald G. Swank, Mayor

ATTEST:

---

Karan J. Rounsavall, City Clerk