



CITY OF COCOA
Planning & Zoning Board /
Local Planning Agency
City Council Chambers

Cocoa City Hall
65 Stone Street
Cocoa, FL 32922

AGENDA
Special Meeting
September 10, 2018
6:00 p.m.

I. OPENING MATTERS:

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ROLL CALL
3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGEANCE

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND MINUTES:

1. AGENDA: Meeting of September 10, 2018
2. MINUTES: Meeting of July 17, 2018 and August 13, 2018

III. OLD BUSINESS: (Table discussion items to October meeting)

- A. Discussion of proposed changes to Art. XIII, Sec. 22 – Landscape Requirement
- B. Discussion of parking material standards

IV. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Review of the Cocoa CRA Plan Update for consistency with the Cocoa Comprehensive Plan

V. OTHER BUSINESS:

- A. Tree Board Update
- B. Recent Development Update

VI. NEXT MEETING DATE: (Select new monthly meeting date to begin in October)

VII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE TO PUBLIC:

This meeting may include the attendance of one (1) or more members of the Cocoa City Council who may or may not participate in the Board discussions held at this public hearing.

All persons and parties are hereby advised that if they should decide to appeal any decision made by this Board with respect to any matter considered at this hearing, they will need a record of the proceedings and that for such purpose, affected persons may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

The facility where this public hearing will be held is accessible to the physically handicapped. Interested parties are hereby advised that they may appear at said meeting and be heard with respect to the application. Written comment from the public with regard to the application will also be accepted.

Information pertaining to the above may be inspected at the Planning & Zoning Division at 65 Stone Street, Cocoa, Florida between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, beginning the Friday before the Board Meeting date, or by phoning (321) 433-8535.

CITY OF COCOA
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD MEETING
MEETING MINUTES
July 17, 2018

A Special meeting of the Planning & Zoning Board of the City of Cocoa was held on Tuesday, July 17, 2018 in the Council Chambers at 65 Stone Street, Cocoa, as publicly noticed.

OPENING MATTERS:

Chairman Mike Dobrin called the meeting to order at 6:01 P.M. The Board Secretary called the roll.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Dobrin	Chairman
Aleck Greenwood	Board Member
Jack Moore	Board Member
Jake Williams	Board Member
Lawrence Koss	Board Member (arrived at 6:03pm)
Sherry Ervin	Board Member
Russell Sengel	Board Member
Marilyn Green	Alternate Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Al Washington	Vice Chairman
Todd Anderson	Board Member

OTHERS PRESENT:

Dodie Selig	Planning & Zoning Manager
Robert Loring	Planner
Karen Hamilton	Community Services Director
Kristin Eick	Board Attorney
Jeri Blanco	Board Liaison
Monica Arsenault	Board Secretary

APPROVAL OF AGENDA & MINUTES:

1. Approval of Agenda: July 17, 2018.

Motion by Jake Williams, seconded by Jack Moore, to approve the agenda of July 17, 2018. The vote on the motion carried unanimously.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes: March 14, 2018.

Motion by Jack Moore, seconded by Sherry Ervin, to approve the minutes of March 14, 2018 as written. The vote on the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Selig introduced Mr. Robert Loring, the City's new Planner.

Chairman Dobrin announced that pending the approval of the City Council, City Council meeting nights will be changed from Tuesday nights to Wednesday nights. Ms. Arsenault polled the Board members to determine their availability in the event that meeting nights will need to be changed. Board members agreed that either Tuesday evenings or the first Wednesday of the month would be suitable.

OLD BUSINESS:

- A. Tree Board Discussion – Tabled to Next Meeting
- B. Parking on Gravel – Tabled to Next Meeting

Board member Greenwood inquired about a time certain to discuss these items. He stated a concern regarding trees that are pending removal and he reminded everyone about the tree ordinance.

Chairman Dobrin asked who makes the decision to remove the trees. In response, Ms. Selig explained that Public Works makes the decision. She noted that in these instances the cases are brought before Council for approval.

Board member Koss inquired if the City's arborist was involved. In response, Ms. Selig answered affirmatively.

Chairman Dobrin asked that these items not be tabled again.

Ms. Hamilton pointed out that there is a mention in the Ordinance that in certain instances trees may be removed if there is an emergency such as public health, safety and welfare. In such cases the Board would be notified following the removal.

Board member Greenwood agreed with Ms. Hamilton's statement but encouraged staff to do their best to honor the Ordinance and to notify the Board as soon as possible.

NEW BUSINESS:

- A. **PZ-18-02000001 – Zoning Text Amendment (Non-conforming lots of record)**

Ordinance No. 05-2018

An ordinance of the City Council of the City of Cocoa, Brevard County, Florida; amending Appendix A, Article X, Section 3 of the Code of the City of Cocoa to modify the requirements to allow the construction of single-family dwellings and customary accessory buildings on a nonconforming lot of record; providing for the repeal of prior inconsistent ordinances and resolutions, incorporation into the code, severability, and an effective date.

Ms. Selig pointed out that the City is the applicant and explained that the requested action is to approve Ordinance No. 05-2018 which would amend Appendix A, Zoning, Article X, Section 3 of the City Code, in order to modify the requirements to allow the construction of single-family dwellings and customary accessory buildings on a nonconforming lot of record.

She explained that when making amendments to the Code, staff considers the need and justification for the change as well as how the amendment relates to the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Selig reported that the City has identified an area of the City Code, specifically Appendix A, Zoning, Article X, Section 3, related to non-conforming lots of record which should be clarified. The intent of this section is to ensure that property owners maintain reasonable use of their lots if they become nonconforming lots due to a change in the Zoning Ordinance of the City. Furthermore, the City currently allows, in any district in which single-family dwellings are permitted, a single-family dwelling and customary accessory buildings to be erected on the nonconforming lot of record, provided that yard dimensions and requirements other than area and width are satisfied.

Ms. Selig noted that the key is that the language does not include any mention of depth in the Ordinance as it stands currently. Therefore, if a lot meets the width as well as the area but it does not meet the depth, a variance may be required.

She explained that after discussing this with Council, staff has brought this ordinance to the Board for the clarifications to be made. She pointed out that essentially there is no apparent reason to distinguish between legally nonconforming lots that are nonconforming due to width or area and those that are nonconforming due to depth, provided that all other requirements of the zoning code, including setbacks, are met.

Ms. Selig shared an example of a site plan. She referenced the Future Land Use Policy.

Board member Williams asked if this change would allow someone to build where they normally would not be allowed to. In response, Ms. Selig stated no, but if a situation such as this came about it would need to be brought to staff for a variance.

Board member Koss asked for clarification on setbacks and depth. Ms. Selig provided a brief background explaining how the depth issue came about. Board member Koss asked if there is a minimum depth. In response, Ms. Selig stated that technically there is a practical depth. Board member Koss inquired about setbacks for single family homes.

Board member Greenwood asked if this change came about due to a partnership the City has with a particular piece of property in the City or if it is just to clarify the ordinance as it was originally written. In response, Ms. Selig confirmed that this is just to address the language in the ordinance. She explained that this is an ordinance that would have a City-wide effect.

Board member Greenwood asked if the change in the ordinance will eliminate the variance process. In response, Ms. Selig replied affirmatively. Board member Greenwood inquired what would happen if a property had unique features that could not be addressed if the case did not go through the variance process. In response, it was clarified that the setbacks will still need to be met. Board member Greenwood asked if the setbacks are changing from what they currently are. It was confirmed that nothing is changing.

Chairman Dobrin opened the discussion to the audience.

Donna Kettner, 103 Derby St., stated that she's always wanted to have some sort of coverage in her driveway but was never able to due to certain restrictions. She mentioned that she is five feet short and asked if she would be able to now with the new setbacks. In response, it was clarified that setbacks will not changing.

Ms. Kettner offered to meet with Ms. Selig separately to review her property.

Lorraine Koss, 2115 N. Indian River Dr., mentioned that there are several homes on her street located precariously that drain into the river. She stated that as tax payers, they will be paying for their upgrades to sewer or septic. She asked if staff is referring to one of these properties. In response, Ms. Selig explained that this ordinance will affect all areas within City limits.

Ms. Eick clarified that it is not just the setbacks that need to be met but other zoning requirements as well.

Jennifer Riggs, 1629 N. Indian River Dr., asked if a smaller, irregular house would be allowed to be developed on a smaller lot anywhere in the City as long as it met the setback requirements. In response, Ms. Selig answered affirmatively. Ms. Eick clarified that this is only permitted in residentially zoned areas.

Ms. Eick added that, as a correction, it is only allowed in any district that permits single-family dwellings.

Robert Logsdon, 225 Broadview Dr., stated he has a non-conforming property along US1 in addition to his primary residence which is the adjacent property. He explained that since one of the properties lies within the US1 corridor he is unable to combine the properties as the County will not allow two different tax rates. Furthermore, he explained that his property located along the US1 corridor has been rezoned. He pointed out that his issues are that he would like to combine the two lots together and put a shed on the non-conforming lot.

Chairman Dobrin asked Mr. Logsdon if he has spoken with staff about these issues. Mr. Logsdon replied affirmatively and noted that he had brought this to the attention of another redevelopment board which resulted in a meeting with City staff, but nothing had happened.

Chairman Dobrin asked Ms. Selig if she had met with Mr. Logsdon. Ms. Selig replied affirmatively and noted she was aware of his predicament.

Barbara Kinsey, 1628 Manor Dr., asked if the City was doing away with the variance process. Ms. Selig replied negatively.

Ms. Kinsey asked what the advantages and disadvantages are of the new Ordinance. Ms. Selig explained that currently if the width and area requirements are met and the depth requirement is not, a variance would be needed. However, if the scenario was reversed, a variance would not be needed. This amendment will include depth in the language of the ordinance which will help avoid these types of issues.

Ms. Kinsey asked how often a variance is applied for. In response, Ms. Selig explained that they are very rare.

Ms. Kinsey inquired why staff would want to address an issue that hardly ever comes up. It was clarified that staff is only looking to simplify the process.

Additionally, Ms. Kinsey expressed concerns regarding the lack of review by City staff in some instances if this amendment is approved. In response, Ms. Selig assured her that if any individual wished to build on a property they would still need to go through the permit process which also includes an extensive review by City staff.

Board member Koss asked for further clarification. It was explained that currently a home could be built as long as it meets the criteria, but if the depth is not met a variance is still needed. By approving the ordinance it would allow builders to move forward as long as all criteria is met.

Motion by Lawrence Koss, seconded by Jake Williams, to recommend approval to City Council of Ordinance No. 05-2018 amending Appendix A, Zoning, Article X, Section 3 of the City Code, to modify the requirements to allow the construction of single-family dwellings and customary accessory buildings on a nonconforming lot of record.

The vote on the motion carried unanimously.

B. PZ-18-02000002 – Zoning Text Amendment (Cocoa Waterfront Overlay District)

Ordinance No. 06-2018

An ordinance of the City Council of the City of Cocoa, Brevard County, Florida; amending Appendix A, Article XI, Section 22 of the Code of the City of Cocoa to allow large scale commercial/mixed-use buildings on certain properties within the Cocoa Waterfront Overlay District, Cocoa Village Sub-district, as more particularly depicted on Exhibit "A" attached hereto; amending the Cocoa Waterfront Overlay Regulating Plan to allow for the same; providing for the repeal of prior inconsistent ordinances and resolutions, incorporation into the code, severability, and an effective date.

Ms. Selig pointed out that the City is the applicant and that the requested action is to consider an ordinance of the City Council of the City of Cocoa, amending Appendix A, Article XI, Section 22 of the City Code to allow large scale commercial/mixed-use buildings on certain properties within the Cocoa Waterfront Overlay District, Cocoa Village Sub-district.

She explained that the proposed amendment is to specifically allow "Commercial/Mixed Use - Large" buildings, as described in the Regulating Plan, to be developed on specific parcels within the Cocoa Village Sub-district. The "Commercial/Mixed-Use - Large" designation is described in the Regulating Plan as follows:

"A building lot located and designed to accommodate a multi-story building with commercial, office and/or multiple dwellings in any story that is designed for larger lot sizes."

Ms. Selig shared Exhibit A, depicting six parcels in Cocoa Village that lay south of Factory St. She stated that, as before, the board shall consider the need and justification for the change as well as the Comprehensive Plan when amending the code.

Ms. Selig provided a brief history and explained the need and justification for the change. She explained that, as previously mentioned, the Regulating Plan for the Cocoa Waterfront Overlay District and the Cocoa Village Sub-district currently only permits a maximum of five stories under the Commercial Mixed-Use - Medium building type, which is the largest presently allowed under the sub-district. Additionally, the regulating plan does not address height in terms of a maximum number of feet; however, the plan allows the first floor of a non-residential building to have a maximum of twenty feet and each floor thereafter a maximum of twelve feet.

Furthermore, a Commercial Mixed-Use - Medium building with non-residential use in this sub-district could currently be a maximum of five stories or sixty-eight feet. The potential maximum height allowed under the proposed amendment, i.e., designating certain properties in the Cocoa Village Sub-district to allow "Commercial/Mixed-Use - Large" buildings, will be eight stories or one hundred and four feet, but only on those certain properties included in the amendment. The amendment would not allow larger scale development throughout the Cocoa Village sub-district.

Ms. Selig explained the "step down" effect which has gradually reduced building heights. She pointed out that the maximum height of one hundred four feet is not extended throughout Cocoa Village, which will protect the downtown core of the Village and its quaint and historic character. This maximum height and "Commercial/Mixed-Use - Large" designation will be permitted only on these six parcels near the existing communications tower.

Board member Ervin asked the height of Oleander Point. A person in the audience stated that it is one hundred fifteen feet at the top of the roof line.

Ms. Selig explained that the increased height allowed under a Commercial/Mixed-Use – Large building type allows for the incorporation of needed public features into the building design. For example, increasing the maximum building height will allow developers to include a large parking garage with public parking spaces within their proposals that may not have otherwise been financially viable.

She pointed out that the Community Redevelopment Plan expressly states that a City Parking Garage, centrally located in the Historic Cocoa Village, is a high priority project for redevelopment. Furthermore, the Community Redevelopment Plan identifies the properties between Florida Avenue and Brevard Avenue as "ideal" for the future location of multi-story buildings because of their location on the top of the old dune formation along the river.

Ms. Selig mentioned the future land use element policies 1.1.4.1 and 1.2.1.8.

She explained that the site is designated Mixed-Use by the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Policy 1.1.2.6. The Mixed-Use category is intended to provide a mixture of residential, commercial, office, recreational and institutional uses.

Chairman Dobrin opened the discussion to the Board.

Board member Sengel noted that he would like to speak once everyone has had their chance to discuss the item.

Chairman Dobrin opened the discussion to the audience and called upon Ms. Riggs to speak.

Ms. Riggs pointed out that both her and husband had sent emails to staff regarding this ordinance.

Ms. Selig noted that she had provided the board members with the information she had received prior to the meeting.

Ms. Riggs explained that one of her concerns is about precedent. She mentioned that there have been other developments in the past that have not followed the transect concept and that concept has been instantiated in Cocoa's Comprehensive Plan. She expressed that she does not feel that the proposed height of the hotel will suit the village, and that something smaller would make more sense. Ms. Riggs noted that she feels there are other solutions to the parking situation. Additionally, she shared her concern that if the City allows a ten-story building in the village they will begin popping up all over. She stated that she does not feel this is a change that is positive and pointed out that the village is Cocoa's key asset and should be developed to enhance this quality. She expressed that she does not want to see the City turn into Daytona Beach or Miami.

Eleanor Riggs shared that when her and her family first came to Cocoa they fell in love with the village. She asked that the Board remember their responsibility and reconsider this ordinance.

Edward Green, 104 Riverside Dr., pointed out that, in all due respect, the plan is structured to be a maximum of seven or eight stories, and not ten as stated by Mrs. and Ms. Riggs. He explained that at seven stories the hotel would only be about seventy feet high and at eight stories it is only seventy-eight feet which would then only be eight feet higher than the current code allows. Furthermore, he explained that this change would allow the builders to construct a hotel that would offer specific benefits to the City and that this change would only affect a specific project on a specific lot. He also noted that even if one hundred and four feet were allowed it does not mean that it would be approved by the City and there are other restrictions in place that still offer protection. He stated that he understands that there are a lot of people that have concerns but feels that this project was crafted carefully. He asked that everyone keep in mind that realistically the City is only looking at a three to five-foot difference from what is currently allowed.

Walt Roslin, 1628 Manor Dr., asked if a study was conducted to show how the City will benefit from a hotel. He stated that we are not Savannah, Georgia and that this is a small town. He noted that he feels that this is more about money and not about the citizens. He asked everyone to remember that this area is unique. He commented on the "big white elephant" of City Hall and that he disagreed with the development of it back when it was built due to the fact that it does not architecturally fit the concept of the Village.

Chairman Dobrin asked Mr. Roslin how long he has lived in Cocoa. In response, Mr. Roslin stated since 1977.

Chairman Dobrin asked Mr. Roslin how he felt when Oleander Point was built. In response, Mr. Roslin stated that he felt the development of Oleander Point was absurd as well.

Mr. Roslin asked who will benefit from this hotel and how much money was spent conducting a study of the hotel.

Michael Harner, 31 Derby St., stated he is against the change. He expressed that he felt the original plan with the step-down approach was more appealing. He noted that he, along with some of his neighbors, are invested in this community and that he feels if the height is increased to one hundred and four feet then someone will want one hundred and five feet and it will never end.

Pat Chambers, 37 Derby St., explained that she bought her home here because it is a quaint place to live. She stated that she is in agreement with Mr. Harner.

Furthermore, Ms. Chambers asked if it is true that only thirty-three parking spaces would be added for village parking. In response, Mr. Lallo stated that two hundred and twelve parking spaces would be added.

Ms. Chambers reiterated that there will never be an end if this is approved.

Ms. Kettner stated that she has had a business here for thirty-five years and has always wanted more parking but feels that this is not the way to do it. She passionately explained her concerns and the fact that she is against this monstrosity. She stated that if this is approved she will put a for sale sign on her property and move. She noted that she feels this can be done but needs to be done thoughtfully and cannot be rushed.

Chairman Dobrin asked Ms. Kettner to clarify that it is not that she is against a unique boutique hotel in the Village, but that she is only against the hotel that is being proposed. In response, she answered affirmatively. She reiterated that she wants more parking and that she's been asking for years but this is not what she had in mind. She mentioned that she has spent many years building her clientele and that this hotel will ruin it.

Ms. Hamilton mentioned the developers meeting that took place prior to this meeting that allowed citizens to share their concerns.

She shared information about the footprint of the hotel and stated that it is recognized that there is an appetite for a hotel in the City.

Mr. Lallo explained that the initial hotel brands that were looked at are Marriott and Comfort Suites.

Ms. Hamilton added that, in regards to the height concerns and the concerns regarding the views of the river, it is worth pointing out that some of those views have already been taken away from several different pre-existing buildings. She explained that this meeting is a reflection of the previous developers meeting and that if staff felt there wasn't enough positive feedback they wouldn't have brought it forward to the Board.

Chairman Dobrin inquired about the design.

Board member Williams mentioned the Bank of America building as an example.

Mr. Lallo explained that staff is currently in the process of creating a letter of intent to the developer. He pointed out that the CRA owns the property and they will need to be satisfied with the aesthetics of the hotel.

It was asked if the CRA will be donating the property to the developers. Mr. Lallo explained that this has not been determined and is still under negotiation.

Ms. Hamilton explained that there was a request for proposals that went out at the beginning of the year. It was clarified that the City is not handing the developer a blank check and everything is still being negotiated.

Board member Williams advised that currently the CRA has the say as to what kind of development will go there but if they were to give up the property than they would not.

Ms. Kettner stated that the City would still need to get permits. She raised concerns that the City is keeping secrets from the community and that the City can never seem to give solid answers.

Kathy Johnson, stated that she lives in the village and has owned a business here for ten years. She explained that at first she felt this was a good idea but then felt that the brand of hotel needs to be announced and that the height being considered is too high. She asked if her neighbors would have received a notice of this meeting as she did not see them in the audience. In response, Ms. Selig explained that notices were mailed to all property owners within three hundred feet of the property.

Ms. Johnson stated that she likes the idea of the step down plan as it seems more fitting for the historic village. She explained that she is for the growth of the village but that this needs to be done thoughtfully and slowly and there is no rush for development.

Danny Guy Day, 625 Brevard Avenue, noted that he is a tenant, and asked if their buildings will be demolished because they may be in the way of the developers. He stated that he agrees with some of the people that spoke before him and he is concerned with the future of his business.

Robert Kenaston, 107 Riverside Dr., stated that he has lived here all his life and is against the rush to approve this and that there is a lack of transparency. He noted that there is not any information on the City's website. He expressed that he feels there are no solid answers. He asked for more transparency and asked the Board to recommend slowing down on any decision making to Council.

Mr. Lallo explained that it is contingent on the CRA to approve the design of this hotel. He explained that this is the third time the City has tried to develop this property. He provided the history on the townhomes, which was an idea that a developer proposed the last time but the CRA was more hopeful for a more intense use. He explained that when there are visitors there is nowhere here for them to stay. He also reiterated that the City would not just give this property away without something in return. He pointed out that new jobs will be created with this hotel.

Ms. Hamilton stated that when the RFP was being considered at multiple levels it was brought to the CRA. The CRA encourages the input of the community and Ms. Hamilton encouraged all to attend the CRA meetings.

Chairman Dobrin asked Mr. Lallo if he had seen other projects the developers have completed. In response, Mr. Lallo stated that he has seen photos of various projects but each one is different.

Board member Greenwood asked Mr. Lallo if he felt there was a majority vote at the previous developers meetings. In response, Mr. Lallo stated that in his opinion he felt about ninety percent voted in favor of the hotel.

Board member Greenwood asked Mr. Lallo if Chase Bank is considered part of historic Cocoa Village. In response, Mr. Lallo stated that his opinion is subjective but he would say no.

Board member Greenwood explained that as being the owner of Murdocks, he feels this is a positive change for the village and that it will bring at least one hundred additional people to the village daily.

Mr. Lallo stated that staff is hopeful that the hotel will offer additional parking to help address concerns.

Board member Greenwood pointed out that City Hall is almost as tall as the proposed hotel.

A question was raised in regards to a conflict of interest, as Board member Greenwood is a property owner close to the hotel. It was asked if he needed to abstain from voting. Ms. Eick asked for a moment to look into the issue.

Board member Koss explained that he has done some research on other hotels built in historic districts in Florida and explained that he found the majority of them have a fifty foot height limit on commercial buildings. He noted that he feels sixty-eight feet is enough to keep the balance between the growth of the village and the historic qualities of the village.

Board member Ervin stated she is concerned that if the board approves one hundred and four feet and the current developer backs out then another developer may come along wanting to utilize the maximum height because it has already been approved. She agreed that a hotel and additional parking would be beneficial but the current code should be kept.

Board member Williams agreed and reiterated that he has seen contingencies happen before and so the current code should be kept. He feels the developer should work with the City and what we have.

Board member Sengel asked Ms. Selig if this item should be brought to a Board of Adjustment meeting as a variance rather than changing the entire plan. In response, Ms. Selig stated no, that this is really the only way to address the change.

Board member Sengel explained that at this point there are still a lot of uncertainties and feels that the City should stick with the current code.

Board member Greenwood asked why staff chose this height when it is not needed. In response, Ms. Selig explained that the City did not “choose” a height, it was included in the regulation as the City would be changing from Commercial-Medium to Commercial-Large.

Ms. Hamilton stated that this height increase is based on these six parcels. She pointed out that staff took into account the heights of various pre-existing buildings along the river and decided that the hotel would not be higher than what already exists.

Board member Greenwood asked for clarification on what the motion should include, whether it be limiting the hotel to a certain height, or holding off altogether.

Alternate member Green noted that the hotel would need to have the eighth floor in order to meet the requirement for parking. She mentioned that she had spoken with business owners in the downtown area and it seems that this would be a positive benefit as it will bring more customers to the village. She mentioned that this is a specific zoning for a specific location and that this is not a spot zoning where someone can come along and say “they did it there we can do it here”. She explained that the difference in one story can really impact the village and its parking situation.

Chairman Dobrin asked if anyone from the audience wished to speak in favor of the hotel.

Ms. Eick pointed out that everyone in the audience should be given the opportunity to speak.

Ms. Riggs asked if two lane traffic will support the traffic that will come with the hotel. In response, it was noted that a traffic analysis would need to be reviewed.

Ms. Kinsey asked if this is a growing economy why other suggestions haven't been brought forward from other developers for the City to consider. She feels that there is not enough of a majority vote to support this decision. She encouraged the Board to vote against changing the code.

Ms. Eick referenced the code regarding Board member Greenwood's vote on this motion. She stated that her opinion is that there would not be a conflict of interest due to speculation of what gains Mr. Greenwood has at this point.

Deputy Mayor Blanco, Board Liaison, stated that one hundred and four feet is already permitted in the Cocoa Waterfront Overlay district and the vote this evening is specifically for six parcels that are not part of the historic Cocoa Village designation. She asked that the Board keep this in mind when making their vote.

Motion by Aleck Greenwood, seconded by Marilyn Green, to recommend approval to the City Council of Ordinance No. 06-2018 as presented.

The vote on the motion was 2-6. The motion was denied.

Discussion was held regarding whether this item could be brought back to the Board.

Ms. Selig suggested several dates and polled the Board members to establish the next meeting date. It was established that the next meeting date will be August 13, 2018.

Ms. Arsenault pointed out that a roll call would need to be done for the vote on Ordinance No. 06-2018.

Ms. Arsenault called the roll.

AYES: Greenwood, Green.

NAYS: Williams, Sengel, Dobrin, Koss, Ervin, Moore.

Discussion was held regarding the ordinances being brought before the Board at the next meeting.

V. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Tree Board Update: Two trees have been removed in City Right of Way (13 Oleander St. and 215 Brevard Ave.). Both will be replaced with Crepe Myrtle trees.

B. Recent Development Update

OTHER BUSINESS:

None.

NEXT MEETING:

The Board members established that the next meeting would be held on Monday, August 13, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion to adjourn by Sherry Ervin, seconded by Larry Koss.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:15 P.M.

Approved on this _____ day of _____, 2018.

Michael Dobrin, Chairman

Monica Arsenault, Board Secretary

CITY OF COCOA
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD MEETING
MEETING MINUTES
August 13, 2018

A meeting of the Planning & Zoning Board of the City of Cocoa was held on Monday, August 13, 2018 in the Council Chambers at 65 Stone Street, Cocoa, as publicly noticed.

OPENING MATTERS:

Chairman Mike Dobrin called the meeting to order at 6:03 P.M. The Board Secretary called the roll.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Dobrin	Chairman
Al Washington	Vice Chairman
Aleck Greenwood	Board Member
Jake Williams	Board Member
Russell Sengel	Board Member
Todd Anderson	Board Member
Lawrence Koss	Board Member
Marilyn Green	Alternate Member

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Jack Moore	Board Member
Sherry Ervin	Board Member

OTHERS PRESENT:

Dodie Selig	Planning & Zoning Manager
Robert Loring	Planner
Karen Hamilton	Community Services Director
Kristin Eick	Board Attorney
Monica Arsenault	Board Secretary

APPROVAL OF AGENDA & MINUTES:

1. Approval of Agenda: August 13, 2018.

Motion by Lawrence Koss, seconded by Al Washington, to approve the agenda of August 13, 2018. The vote on the motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS:

A. Discussion of Proposed Changes to Art. XIII, Sec.22 – Landscape Requirement

Ms. Selig provided a presentation¹ and explained the ten parts that make up the ordinance and pointed out that staff would like to bring four of those parts before the Board for consideration.

¹ Exhibit A: Planning & Zoning presentation

Ms. Hamilton reminded everyone that this is a working draft only.

Ms. Selig mentioned several definitions to consider, including:

- **Hazardous:** A tree existing on a developed parcel of land or within the right-of-way, that due to its shape, location or growth pattern, which cannot be corrected by pruning or other reasonable preservation and/or preventative procedures, may cause or reasonably be expected to cause damage to persons or property and/or presents a potential threat to the health, safety, and welfare of the general public, as determined by the city arborist.
- **Specimen Tree:** Any hardwood tree not included on the list of exempt trees in subsection (E)(6) herein having a trunk diameter eighteen (18") inches or greater as measured diameter at breast height (d.b.h) or four and one-half (4 ½') feet above actual grade. Specimen trees shall not include dead, hazardous or diseased trees.
- **Tree:** A woody or fibrous perennial plant with an upright trunk which normally grows, or is capable of growing, to an overall height of a minimum height of fifteen (15') feet in the central coastal area of Florida, and having a trunk diameter of not less than eight (8") inches four (4") inches or greater as measured diameter at breast height (d.b.h.) or four and one-half (4½') feet above actual grade.

Ms. Eick explained that hazardous trees will set a hierarchy and it will help to differentiate between what is hazardous and what is an emergency.

She explained that the intent of addressing specimen trees is to consider the language of the definition to require a person owning a single-family residence to acquire a permit in order to remove a specimen tree.

Board member Sengel asked if a permit is currently required to remove a tree that has a trunk diameter of four inches or greater. In response, Ms. Selig explained that there is a "loophole" meaning that currently, a permit is only required depending on when an individual's house was built. She noted that the ordinance was established in 1983-1984. She explained that if your home was built prior than the establishment of the ordinance a permit is not required.

Board member Koss inquired if the new language will clarify the confusion. In response, Ms. Eick explained that the intention of including "specimen trees" in the language of the ordinance is to require property owners to obtain a permit to remove these particular types of trees.

Board member Sengel noted that he has a concern with infringing on private property and asked staff to consider this moving forward.

Board member Greenwood mentioned several of his concerns regarding the removal of oak trees. He pointed out a section of the ordinance from 1985.

He stated that a representative of the City's Public Works Department has been taking these cases to the City Council and presenting them as trees that need emergency removal and asking for Council's approval. He explained that based on the information that is provided to them, they approve the removals and the Planning and Zoning Board is kept in the dark. He asked that the Board no longer be ignored and that special meetings be called if needed in order to review the removal of trees on a case by case basis. He pointed out that the City has

removed five oak trees using the “emergency” position that did not necessarily need to be removed.

Chairman Dobrin asked if the City has control over trees on public property. In response, Ms. Selig stated yes, and that Code Enforcement has received several complaints, usually regarding a neighbor’s overgrown tree.

Board member Greenwood noted that he received an email regarding 1054 Broadmoor Avenue about a tree that was pruned poorly.

Ms. Hamilton stated that for purposes of the meeting that the Board consider the language under proposed Section I. She shared a draft of the amended language for the Board’s consideration.

Members of the Board agreed that the proposed word “may” under Section I, 1a, be kept as “shall”.

Ms. Eick suggested keeping “updated biannually and administer a plan...” as it will not require a plan to be updated annually but it will preserve the Board’s authority to develop and advise regarding policies and standards.

Board member Washington stated that there is a City tree that overhangs his property and has caused a rotten spot on his roof. He asked if he is allowed to prune it himself. In response, it was clarified that if the tree crosses over onto someone’s property than they are allowed to prune it as long as it doesn’t cause detrimental damage to the tree.

Board member Washington asked if the word “pruning” could be left in the ordinance.

Board member Greenwood asked if the Board could provide a notice to Council, through staff, to notify them that the Board has full intentions to reinstate the Tree Board and that the ordinance has not been followed and the Board will be enforcing the ordinance to honor it.

Board member Koss asked for more time to review the draft before making a motion.

Ms. Hamilton asked for clarification as to whether the Board will be reviewing the ordinance in its entirety or if they will only be focusing on the tree board section. Board member Koss explained that the Board will be doing both.

Motion by Aleck Greenwood, Seconded by Al Washington, to activate the existing tree ordinance as designed, to include that no trees are to be removed by Public Works until it is brought before the Tree Board so recommendations can be made and then presented to Council. The vote on the motion carried unanimously.

Board member Koss stated that the Board needs time to review staff’s recommendations for modifications and asked that the board be given the time between now and the next meeting to do so.

Ms. Eick pointed out that as it stands, there is still an exception to the ordinance where Public Works can deem a situation an emergency in order to remove a tree.

Ms. Eick explained that this is an attempt to say that only trees that are an imminent danger to the public can be immediately removed. She explained that that was the purpose of adding the definition of “hazardous” to the ordinance which would help to distinguish the difference between a hazardous tree and a tree that is considered an emergency.

Alternate member Green suggested that Public Works report to the Board quarterly to report a list of trees that pose to be in hazardous condition.

Ms. Hamilton stated that she can pass the suggestion along to Public Works but due to staffing and monetary problems that would be a decision Public Works will need to make.

Board member Koss provided a handout to the Board members and shared information regarding the value of trees², a website providing information, and noted that he would be bringing more information to the Board in the future.

B. Discussion of Parking Material Standards

Ms. Selig provided information generated by the Board at the last meeting.

Board member Greenwood noted that he had done some research on surrounding cities pertaining to their codes on brick pavers and white gravel. He noted that a permit is not required to have these in the City. He pointed out that with newly constructed homes that have a garage, concrete must be poured leading up to the garage. He stated that the code is vague and the language makes references that sound “commercial” to the extent that the code mentions parking lines. He requested that the ordinance be clarified.

Ms. Hamilton asked the Board to focus less on the Code case that transpired between Code Enforcement and Mr. Greenwood and more on the language of the code.

Ms. Eick explained that the off-street parking article, as a whole, was looked at by the attorneys and the legal opinion is that the code is applied to all off-street parking, residential and commercial. She pointed out that it is up to the Board to decide whether or not the code is vague and if it needs to be modified.

Board member Sengel pointed out a section in the code and asked for clarification. He asked if the code applies to both residential and commercial than how can it be enforced that residential off-street parking be required to have curbing in addition to meeting various other regulations.

The Board agreed that the code is vague.

Ms. Hamilton clarified that the Board is asking staff to differentiate, in the code, the difference between commercial and residential and specify the regulations.

Board member Koss stated that he feels gravel should be permitted as it serves as a drainage tool.

² Exhibit B: Value of Trees handout

Board member Williams pointed out that during a hurricane gravel can become dangerous as they may become “little projectiles”.

Discussion ensued regarding the different materials and methods used for driveways.

Ms. Eick pointed out that in 2001 a change was made to the ordinance to require all parking be paved³.

Ms. Hamilton noted that Public Works will need to provide input regarding the percolation issues. She also pointed out that existing gravel is allowed if the homeowner is renovating. She stated that staff will begin sorting it out and will reach out to Public Works for their input.

Discussion ensued regarding the clarification in the code.

Board member Sengel asked if a simple amendment could be made noting that residential parking be an exemption.

Ms. Selig listed reasons as to why a permit is required for driveways.

Ms. Hamilton stated that she cannot guarantee that gravel will be approved and that Public Works will have to weigh in.

NEW BUSINESS:

None.

OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Tree Board Update

B. Recent Development Update

Ms. Selig noted that the City recently approved Guard Space Storage on Peachtree St. They will be adding two more buildings for storage. Walmart is also approaching the approval of their C.O. She also noted that she will be visiting the Mike Erdman site. There is also a warehouse expansion going in on Cox Rd. Dunkin Donuts came in on 515 W. King St. Lakeside Palms subdivision is moving forward. She noted that she would be emailing the Board members a list of developments going on in the City.

Vice Chairman Washington asked about the old Winn Dixie site. In response, Ms. Selig noted that no one is currently interested in developing it.

Chairman Dobrin asked about the Bank of America building. In response, Ms. Selig stated that she does not believe anyone is currently interested.

Board member Greenwood asked about the old Sun Trust building. Ms. Selig stated that the property owner wanted to develop it into a retail site, however, FDOT has plans that will severely impact that property.

³ Board member Williams left at 7:30pm and returned at 7:33pm.

Chairman Dobrin noted that there is a Council meeting tomorrow night if anyone is interested in attending.

Ms. Selig also mentioned that Council will also be addressing whether or not their meeting nights will be changing.

NEXT MEETING:

The Board members established that the next meeting would be held on September 10, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion to adjourn by Lawrence Koss, seconded by Mike Dobrin.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 7:52 PM.

Approved on this _____ day of _____, 2018.

Michael Dobrin, Chairman

Monica Arsenault, Board Secretary



City of Cocoa Planning & Zoning Board

STAFF REPORT

Date:	September 6, 2018
Project Name:	Cocoa CRA Redevelopment Plan Update
Project No:	N/A
Meeting Date:	September 10, 2018
Project Planner:	Dodie Selig, AICP – Planning & Zoning Manager
Applicant/Owner:	City of Cocoa
Requested Action:	Recommendation on whether the draft of the updated Cocoa Redevelopment Agency Redevelopment Plan is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the requirements of law.

I. Background

The Cocoa City Council adopted Ordinance No. 10-81 in 1981 creating the Cocoa Redevelopment Agency. The Cocoa Redevelopment Plan prepared by Glatting, Sellen, Lopez, Anglin was approved in 1982 through adoption of Ordinance No. 28-82. The Plan was updated by Design West Studios in 1997 and adopted by the Cocoa City Council via Ordinance No. 27-97. Glatting, Jackson prepared the Cocoa Waterfront Master Plan in 2008. The Five-Year Cocoa Waterfront Master Plan Update was completed in 2018 and approved at the June Cocoa CRA meeting.

The Cocoa CRA has accomplished several goals and objectives in the past 37 years, including Riverfront Park, the dredged basin, renovated boat launch platforms, the purchase of land for redevelopment, the US 1 and Florida Avenue Streetscape Projects, and the Riverfront Pedestrian Connector. While progress has been made over the years regarding the CRA's core mission of combatting and eliminating slum and blight by implementing redevelopment activities, many more redevelopment opportunities have been identified that need the CRA's attention, particularly following the destruction of public infrastructure and assets in the riverfront area due to Hurricane Irma.

Furthermore, it has been twenty-one years since the Plan has been amended. Consistent with Comp Plan policy 1.1.4.9 the city shall review and update as necessary the redevelopment area plans. Given the extensive level of new, exciting projects identified in the recent 2018 Cocoa Waterfront Master Plan Update, it is necessary to review, update and amend the 1997 Cocoa Redevelopment Plan to reflect current conditions, challenges, future projects and opportunities to implement the Agency Mission and the 2018 Waterfront Master Plan Update. Additionally, since the last plan update, the City acquired Lee Wenner Park and entered into an Interlocal Agreement on July 25, 2017, which recognized that the Park was located within the redevelopment area of the Cocoa CRA and would be subject to the strategic vision for the Cocoa waterfront, as envisioned by the Master Plan.

CRA Plan Update Approval Process

Under the Community Redevelopment Act of 1969 ("Act"), the procedural requirements governing the modification of redevelopment plans are governed by Section 163.361, Florida Statutes.

Prior to the CRA's consideration of an update to the Redevelopment Plan, the City's Land Planning Agency ("LPA"), must review the proposed Plan modifications for conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan. The Act requires that the Plan be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. See §163.360(2)(a), Fla. Stat. Importantly, the LPA's role in the Redevelopment Plan update process is solely to consider whether the proposed amendments are consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Upon receipt of comments and a recommendation from the Cocoa Planning and Zoning Board (LPA), the CRA will make whatever adjustments are necessary to the draft Plan modifications and conduct a hearing to formally recommend the final draft of the Plan modifications to the City Council.

The City Council will then consider adopting an ordinance with the Plan modifications and shall be required to provide notice of the modifications, prior to adoption, to each taxing authority which levies ad valorem taxes on taxable real property contained within the geographical boundaries of the Agency's redevelopment area.

Need for Modification of the Plan

As stated above, it is necessary to update the 1997 Cocoa Redevelopment Plan to reflect current conditions, challenges and opportunities. In accordance with F.S. §163, Chapter III, staff has prepared the attached 2018 Cocoa CRA Redevelopment Plan Update Draft for the LPA, CRA, and City Council's consideration.

It is necessary that the contents of the redevelopment plan reflect the objectives of the CRA. Florida Statutes governing the powers of community redevelopment agencies provide that expenditures and projects of such agencies shall be made "in accordance with the community

redevelopment plan” and, further, that general government operating expenses unrelated to the planning and carrying out of a community redevelopment plan may not be paid for or financed by tax increment revenues. Therefore, the Cocoa CRA Redevelopment Plan must be updated to reflect the projects that are anticipated in accordance with the 2018 Waterfront Master Plan and to generally update those projects listed in the Redevelopment Plan that may no longer be desired after 21 years has elapsed since the previous update.

Section 163.360, Florida Statutes, provides that a redevelopment plan shall:

- (a) Conform to the comprehensive plan for the county or municipality as prepared by the local planning agency under the Community Planning Act.
- (b) Be sufficiently complete to indicate such land acquisition, demolition and removal of structures, redevelopment, improvements, and rehabilitation as may be proposed to be carried out in the community redevelopment area; zoning and planning changes, if any; land uses; maximum densities; and building requirements.
- (c) Provide for the development of affordable housing in the area, or state the reasons for not addressing in the plan the development of affordable housing in the area. The county, municipality, or community redevelopment agency shall coordinate with each housing authority or other affordable housing entities functioning within the geographic boundaries of the redevelopment area, concerning the development of affordable housing in the area.

In addition, the community redevelopment plan may provide for the development and implementation of community policing innovations. Section 163.360(3).

The 2018 Cocoa CRA Redevelopment Plan Update is a culmination of the 1997 Cocoa Redevelopment Plan, the 2008 Cocoa Waterfront Master Plan and the Five-Year Cocoa Waterfront Master Plan Update, as well as the recommendations in the 2017 Cocoa CRA Parking Study. The Plan contains the following four (4) sections:

- I. Background and History of the Cocoa Redevelopment Agency
- II. Existing Conditions Analysis
- III. Community Goals, Objectives, and Policy
- IV. The Long-Range Master Plan

Staff eliminated Part V (The Implementation Work Program) of the original Plan and incorporated implementation strategies in Section IV (Long-Range Master Plan).

Part I was updated to reflect 2018 changes to F.S. §163, Chapter III and to show current conditions with maps.

The following revisions were made to **Part II**. Updated text to the Land Use section for consistency with the 2010 City of Cocoa Comprehensive Plan, a summary of the 2017 Parking Study Update, demographics, socio-economic data, and maps that illustrate current conditions and the inclusion of overlay districts. CRA districts were established in the 2008 Cocoa CRA Waterfront Master Plan.

- Cocoa Village
- Heart of Cocoa
- King Street and Willard Street Corridor
- Uptown District
- South of the Village
- US 1 Corridor
- Waterfront

Part III includes an updated Community Workshops Overview, which lists all meetings and workshops held in the development of both the 2008 Cocoa Waterfront Plan and the 2018 Five-Year Cocoa Waterfront Master Plan Update. Redevelopment Goals and Objectives have been updated by retaining the relevant goals and objectives from the original Plan and incorporating goals and objectives from the 2008 Cocoa Waterfront Plan and the 2018 Five-Year Cocoa Waterfront Master Plan Update.

Part IV retains the relevant projects from the original Plan and includes projects from the 2008 Cocoa Waterfront Plan and the 2018 Five-Year Cocoa Waterfront Master Plan Update, an updated Capital Improvements Plan, Cost Projections, and Sources of Funding.

Plan Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

Redevelopment Goals and Objectives

In pursuit of accomplishing substantial improvements in the CRA, the following goals and objectives were established based on community input and approval. They provide the framework and general guidelines needed to direct decision making that will enable rational development activities that are consistent with the primary intentions of the community.

Staff evaluated the goals, objectives, policies, strategies and projects of the CRA Plan to ensure consistency with the City of Cocoa's Comprehensive Plan.

Although some wordsmithing has taken place, many of the goals, policies and objectives identified in the prior CRA Redevelopment Plan have not been changed. The substantive changes are as follows:

FUTURE LAND USE

CRA Goals & Objectives

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Objective: The CRA will promote mixed-use development patterns in new projects to provide greater diversity of use in close proximity of one another to promote reduced dependence on automobiles, and increased use of pedestrian and bicycle travel.	Policy 1.1.2.6: The Mixed-Use land use category is intended to provide a mixture of residential, commercial, office, recreational and institutional uses along the major transportation corridors (such as SR 520 and US 1). The mixed-use could be developed as single uses on separate parcels or as a
---	---

	mixture of uses within a single development. The following criteria shall be used for determining appropriate locations for mixed-use land use areas. A. Areas within a quarter mile walking distances of public transit stations, transitional areas between high and low intensity uses, and areas adjacent to major corridors within the City are appropriate for Mixed-Use category. B. The land development regulations implementing this category shall encourage a compact and walkable environment to reduce vehicle miles of travel and encourage use of public transit. C. Development within mixed-use shall be encouraged to follow Transit Oriented Design (TOD) principles.
Objective: Utilize Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles in order to increase the safety of housing developments through the planning process and incorporate them in the land development regulations. CPTED principles and strategies shall include natural access control, natural surveillance, territorial reinforcement, and target hardening.	Objective 3.2.3: Housing Safety. The City of Cocoa shall utilize Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles in order to increase the safety of housing developments through the planning process and incorporate them in the land development regulations. CPTED principles and strategies shall include natural access control, natural surveillance, territorial reinforcement, and target hardening.
Goal Provide aesthetic improvements and way-finding measures to increase the sense of community identity.	Policy 1.2.2.2: The City shall examine the feasibility of establishing form-based design guidelines for City-wide as well as for specific areas in the City including CRAs, major corridors and waterfront. The standards could include streetscape standards, building signage, architectural styles and gateway designs to highlight the entrances to the City.
Goal Make the protection of the historic character of the CRA a priority in all development activities.	Policy 1.1.3.3: The City shall redevelop the Central Business District as a viable business district while preserving the historic character of Cocoa Village and of adjacent historic resources, housing and residential neighborhoods, and with protecting natural resources.
Objective:	Policy 1.1.6.2: The City shall consider creating design

Encourage the retention and preservation of landmarks and historically significant structures.	regulations to protect the locally designated historic sites and districts. Policy 1.1.6.5: The City shall facilitate the education of the public regarding the significance and historic values associated with the City's architectural, historical, geological, and archaeological resources, and the costs associated with the loss of such resources. Policy 1.1.6.6: The City shall give consideration to the establishment of an historic zoning district.
Objective: Encourage the continued identification, analysis, and preservation of the CRA's historical resources.	Policy 3.2.2.2: The City shall pursue available grants and alternative funding, where appropriate, to expand the local knowledge and awareness of existing historic and archaeological sites and structures. Policy 3.2.2.4: The City shall encourage the continued identification, analysis, and preservation of the City's historical resources. Such efforts shall include determination of their significance and vulnerability, as well as implementation of preservation management policies. Environmental reviews of units assisted with governmental resources shall be conducted as required.
Objective: Make property owners and investors aware of the tax inducements available as an incentive for restoring historical buildings for practical use.	Policy 3.2.2.3: The City shall assist owners of designated historically significant housing to apply for and utilize state and federal assistance programs.

TRANSPORTATION

CRA Goals & Objectives

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Objective: Support the redevelopment of the former FEC Railway passenger station site at US 1 and Rosa Jones Blvd. to a possible All Aboard Florida Brightline Tier 2 Station.	Policy 2.1.14.1: The City shall continue to conduct coordination meetings with the Florida East Coast (FEC) Railroad and Amtrak to establish a future passenger transportation terminal within the City limits.
Goal The CRA shall support the development of parking	Policy 1.1.3.8: The City shall continue to monitor and, as

strategies to support the transportation goals.	appropriate, conduct parking studies to examine the demand and availability of parking in the Cocoa (Downtown) Redevelopment Area. Objective 2.1.15: The City shall develop parking strategies to support the transportation goals.
Objective: The CRA shall encourage the City to seek a public-private partnership to help establish a multi-use, multi-level parking facility, if needed, to reduce traffic congestion and increase pedestrian safety, reduce the amount of surface parking lots and increase green space within the Central Business District.	Policy 2.1.15.1: The City shall seek a public-private partnership to help establish a multi-use, multi-level parking facility to reduce traffic congestion and increase pedestrian safety, reduce the amount of surface parking lots and increase green space within the Central Business District.

HOUSING

CRA Goals & Objectives

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Goal Encourage and promote the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary housing to meet the needs of the present and future population of the CRA.	GOAL 3.1: The City shall encourage and promote the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary housing to meet the needs of the present and future population of the City. Objective 3.3.1: The City shall maintain land development regulations and procedures which assist the private and non-profit sector in providing identified housing needs of various types, sizes and costs. GOAL 3.7: The City shall promote opportunities for the creation of housing and infill development within the City. Objective 3.7.5: The City shall continue to support the revitalization of its Florida Enterprise Zone, its designated Florida Brownfield Area, the Diamond Square Redevelopment Area and the Heart of Cocoa Area concentrating on issues such as crime, economic development, and affordable housing.
Objective: The CRA shall continue to utilize local government partnerships with the private sector in order to	Policy 3.1.1.3: The City shall continue to utilize local government partnerships with the private

improve the efficiency and expand the capacity of the housing delivery system.	sector in order to improve the efficiency and expand the capacity of the housing delivery system.
Objective: The CRA shall promote mixed-use developments that include provisions for a wide variety of housing types and price ranges.	Policy 3.1.1.6: The City shall promote mixed-use developments that include provisions for a wide variety of housing types and prices.
Objective: Housing designated as historically significant by virtue of architecture, social significance, or ethnic heritage will continue to be identified and continue to be preserved and protected, and if possible, maintained for residential uses.	Objective 3.2.2: Housing designated as historically significant by virtue of architecture, social significance, or ethnic heritage will continue to be identified and continue to be preserved and protected, and if possible, maintained for residential uses.

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

CRA Goals & Objectives

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Objective: Encourage the stabilization of neighborhoods within the CRA and maintain the quality of existing neighborhoods, by upgrading the supporting infrastructure and facilities, including paved public road access; stormwater management facilities and flood protection; wastewater disposal facilities; potable water facilities; solid waste collection service; electric utility service; and by protecting natural and historic resources.	Policy 6.1.1.3: The City will continue to reduce the quantity and improve the quality of stormwater discharge into receiving water bodies and wetlands by continuing to maintain and operate the following stormwater storage/treatment systems: A. The Rockpond Project treats stormwater runoff from 170+ acres of developed land in Cocoa that discharges into the St. Johns River. This project is a cooperative effort with the City of Rockledge and Brevard County. C. The Riverfront Park Project stormwater treatment system treats urban stormwater runoff from 20+ acres and will continue to be monitored for its performance in accordance with its St. Johns River Water Management District permit. E. Continue to seek additional projects for retrofitting stormwater systems utilizing best management practices and seeking grants as available.
--	--

COASTAL

CRA Goals & Objectives

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Goal The natural resources of the CRA coastal planning area shall be preserved, protected or enhanced to provide the highest possible water quality, habitat for fish and wildlife and use for public recreation.	GOAL 9.1: The natural resources of the City's coastal planning area shall be preserved, protected or enhanced to provide the highest possible water quality, habitat for fish and wildlife and use for public recreation.
Objective: The CRA shall preserve and protect the environmental quality of estuarine environments by limiting specific impacts and cumulative impacts of development or redevelopment.	Objective 9.1.2: Estuarine Environmental Quality. The City shall preserve and protect the environmental quality of estuarine environments by limiting specific impacts and cumulative impacts of development or redevelopment.
Objective: The CRA shall continue to promote appropriate land uses along the Lagoon consistent with the public need, while protecting natural resources.	Objective 9.1.3: Priority of Lagoon Shoreline Land Uses. The City shall continue to promote appropriate land uses along the Lagoon consistent with the public need, while protecting natural resources.
Objective: The use of public funds for infrastructure improvements which subsidize increased development in the Coastal High-Hazard Area (CHHA) will be restricted to those projects which restore or enhance natural resources and/or part of the Cocoa CRA Plan.	Objective 9.1.4: Public Expenditures in Coastal High Hazard Area. The use of public funds for infrastructure improvements which subsidize increased development in the Coastal High-Hazard Area (CHHA) will be restricted to those projects which restore or enhance natural resources and/or part of the City's Redevelopment Plan.
Objective: The CRA shall continue to coordinate with other coastal cities and Brevard County to investigate and implement equitable measures to promote the provision or funding of public access ways to the Indian River Lagoon by new development.	Policy 9.1.5.7: The City shall continue to coordinate with other coastal cities and Brevard County to investigate and implement equitable measures to promote the provision or funding of public access ways to the Indian River Lagoon by new development.
Objective: The CRA shall cooperate with and assist St. John's River Water Management District (SJRWMD) and the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to continue to protect or restore the aquatic vegetation including, but not limited to, aquatic weed control, restoration or creation of aquatic grass beds or shoreline restoration. In addition, the CRA will protect the diversity of submerged and emergent aquatic	Objective 12.1.7: The city shall cooperate with and assist St. John's River Water Management District (SJRWMD) and the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to continue to protect or restore the aquatic vegetation including, but not limited to, aquatic weed control, restoration or creation of aquatic grass beds or shoreline restoration. In

vegetation and fish species as well as the quality of fresh water (estuarine), found in the Indian River within the zone between the Cocoa shoreline and the Intracoastal Waterway.	addition, the City will protect the diversity of submerged and emergent aquatic vegetation and fish species as well as the quality of fresh water (estuarine), found in the City's lakes and tributaries associated with St. John's River, and in the Indian River within the zone between the Cocoa shoreline and the Intracoastal Waterway. The protection shall be as great, or greater, than they were in 1988, as determined by SJRWMD and the DEP, using DEP established standards.
Objective: The CRA shall not encourage or promote shoreline development activities that would destroy or degrade the function of estuarine shoreline or deep water habitat.	Policy 12.1.7.4: The City shall not permit shoreline development activities that would destroy or degrade the function of estuarine shoreline or deep water habitat. The applicant shall demonstrate how any potential adverse impact shall be reduced or avoided.

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

CRA Goals & Objectives

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Objective: The CRA shall provide inter-connectivity between recreational facilities and the surrounding community.	Objective 10.1.3: The City shall provide interconnectivity between recreational facilities and the surrounding community. Policy 10.1.3.5: The City will work to incorporate connectivity wherever feasible between recreational facilities in the City and the existing Brevard County Greenways and Trails Master Plan system.
---	--

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

CRA Goals & Objectives

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Goal The CRA shall evaluate the impacts of any development on and from adjacent jurisdictions.	Objective 13.1.1: Coordinate Comprehensive Plan. The City shall continue to coordinate comprehensive planning and intergovernmental issues with Brevard County, adjacent municipalities and the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC).
---	---

Objective: The CRA shall coordinate with the City of Rockledge to institute joint planning activities in areas of joint concern and influence. The activities shall include land use, landscaping, urban design and urban form of new development in the area.	Policy 13.1.2.3: The City shall coordinate with the City of Rockledge to institute joint planning activities in areas of joint concern and influence. The activities shall include land use, landscaping, urban design and urban form of new development in the area.
---	--

COCOA CRA CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN

CRA Projects - Waterfront	Consistency with Comprehensive Plan
Living Breakwater	Policy 14.1.3.5: Capital improvements planning will include evaluations of the costs and benefits of upgrading, expanding or modifying regionally significant public facilities versus the cost of constructing new facilities.

North Mooring Facility + Pump Out vessel & facilities Submerged Land Lease Query T Dock with mix of fixed and floating piers + 100' extension. Include floating piers +concrete construction Dinghy Dock Day Slips Shoreline Stabilization	Policy 9.1.3.4: The City shall require that new marinas, mooring fields and substantial improvements or additions to existing marinas demonstrate compliance with the following criteria: A. Economic need and feasibility; B. Land use compatibility with surrounding land uses; C. Availability of upland support services; D. Availability for public use; E. A plan to ensure that water quality will not be degraded below existing FDEP water classification standards. The plan shall address the maintenance and containment of stormwater runoff and wash-down water for dry storage areas and sanitary sewer disposal; F. Hurricane contingency planning; G. A plan for mitigation activities in the event that the environment is adversely affected; and H. An educational plan for users regarding impacts on the Lagoon is in place. The above criteria were demonstrated to be satisfied during the planning process for the 2018 Waterfront Master Plan, adopted in June 2018. Policy 9.1.5.1: The City shall, where appropriate, maintain and preserve all public access and water-related recreational facilities and shall inventory existing public access to the lagoon and water-related recreational facilities to identify deficiencies. Policy 9.1.5.2: The City shall encourage the preservation of recreational and commercial working waterfronts as defined in section 342.07, F.S.Policy Policy 10.1.1.5: The City shall ensure the provision of a range of different types of facilities for passive outdoor recreational activities including nature trails or boardwalks, waterway trails, interpretive displays, educational programs, and/or wildlife observation areas.
--	---

CRA Projects – Lee Wenner Park

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

New Civic Center	Policy 14.1.3.5: Capital improvements planning will include evaluations of the costs and benefits of upgrading, expanding or modifying regionally significant public facilities versus the cost of constructing new facilities. The benefits of constructing a new Civic Center were weighed against the costs during the planning process for the 2018 Waterfront Master Plan, adopted in June 2018, which included better support of community needs and better utilization of the waterfront views for the Cocoa Village and Delannoy Avenue.
Harbor Master Building	Policy 9.1.5.1: The City shall, where appropriate, maintain and preserve all public access and water-related recreational facilities and shall inventory existing public access to the lagoon and water-related recreational facilities to identify deficiencies. Policy 9.1.5.2: The City shall encourage the preservation of recreational and commercial working waterfronts as defined in section 342.07, F.S. Policy
Lee Wenner Park Renovation	Policy 9.1.5.1: The City shall, where appropriate, maintain and preserve all public access and water-related recreational facilities and shall inventory existing public access to the lagoon and water-related recreational facilities to identify deficiencies. Policy 9.1.5.2: The City shall encourage the preservation of recreational and commercial working waterfronts as defined in section 342.07, F.S. Policy Policy 10.1.1.5: The City shall ensure the provision of a range of different types of facilities for passive outdoor recreational activities including nature trails or boardwalks, waterway trails, interpretive displays, educational programs, and/or wildlife observation areas.
Large Vessel Docking Pier	Policy 9.1.5.1: The City shall, where appropriate, maintain and preserve all public access and water-related

	recreational facilities and shall inventory existing public access to the lagoon and water-related recreational facilities to identify deficiencies. Policy 9.1.5.2: The City shall encourage the preservation of recreational and commercial working waterfronts as defined in section 342.07, F.S. Policy Policy 9.1.3.4: The City shall require that new marinas, mooring fields and substantial improvements or additions to existing marinas demonstrate compliance with the following criteria: A. Economic need and feasibility; B. Land use compatibility with surrounding land uses; C. Availability of upland support services; D. Availability for public use; E. A plan to ensure that water quality will not be degraded below existing FDEP water classification standards. The plan shall address the maintenance and containment of stormwater runoff and wash-down water for dry storage areas and sanitary sewer disposal; F. Hurricane contingency planning; G. A plan for mitigation activities in the event that the environment is adversely affected; and H. An educational plan for users regarding impacts on the Lagoon is in place. *If the project becomes feasible, further evaluation of the criteria will be finalized.
--	---

CRA Projects – Downtown Park

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Taylor Park Renovation	Policy 10.1.1.8: The City will ensure that all recreational facilities are well maintained and redeveloped as needed.
Promenade Reconstruction	Policy 9.1.5.1: The City shall, where appropriate, maintain and preserve all public access and water-related recreational facilities and shall inventory existing public access to the lagoon and water-related recreational facilities to identify deficiencies.

	Policy 9.1.5.2: The City shall encourage the preservation of recreational and commercial working waterfronts as defined in section 342.07, F.S.Policy 10.1.1.5: The City shall ensure the provision of a range of different types of facilities for passive outdoor recreational activities including nature trails or boardwalks, waterway trails, interpretive displays, educational programs, and/or wildlife observation areas.
Promenade Overlooks	Policy 10.1.1.5: The City shall ensure the provision of a range of different types of facilities for passive outdoor recreational activities including nature trails or boardwalks, waterway trails, interpretive displays, educational programs, and/or wildlife observation areas.
Porcher House Lawn & Garden	Policy 10.1.1.8: The City will ensure that all recreational facilities are well maintained and redeveloped as needed.
Support Building for Amphitheatre	Policy 10.1.1.8: The City will ensure that all recreational facilities are well maintained and redeveloped as needed.
Harrison Street Streetscape	Policy 2.1.7.5: The City shall include landscaping and streetscaping as roadway design components in order to enhance the aesthetic and safety of roadways for all users. Policy 2.1.7.6: The City shall pursue grant opportunities for median landscaping and road beautification.

CRA Projects – Overall Cocoa CRA

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Evaluate Site Design Standards	Policy 1.1.5.2: The City shall consider developing neighborhood plans, as needed, to either strengthen preservation of established neighborhoods or encourage redevelopment of transitional neighborhoods. Objective 1.2.1: New development in the City shall incorporate “Smart Growth” principles that will lead to compact development standards as opposed to conventional development standards that encourage urban sprawl.
--------------------------------	---

	Policy 1.2.2.2: The City shall examine the feasibility of establishing form-based design guidelines for City-wide as well as for specific areas in the City including CRAs, major corridors and waterfront. The standards could include streetscape standards, building signage, architectural styles and gateway designs to highlight the entrances to the City.
--	---

CRA Projects – US Highway One Corridor

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Evaluate Site Design Standards	Policy 1.1.5.2: The City shall consider developing neighborhood plans, as needed, to either strengthen preservation of established neighborhoods or encourage redevelopment of transitional neighborhoods. Objective 1.2.1: New development in the City shall incorporate “Smart Growth” principles that will lead to compact development standards as opposed to conventional development standards that encourage urban sprawl. Policy 1.2.2.2: The City shall examine the feasibility of establishing form-based design guidelines for City-wide as well as for specific areas in the City including CRAs, major corridors and waterfront. The standards could include streetscape standards, building signage, architectural styles and gateway designs to highlight the entrances to the City.
--------------------------------	---

CRA Projects – Uptown District

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Street and Sidewalk Improvement Program	Objective 2.1.6: Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities. The City shall ensure safe and adequate movement of pedestrians and bicyclists. Policy 2.1.6.1: The City shall conduct pedestrian movement and safety studies to determine high travel patterns and accident areas, and remedial actions shall be taken by the City where feasible and practical to mitigate safety problems where conditions have
---	--

	been determined to be unacceptable. Policy 2.1.7.5: The City shall include landscaping and streetscaping as roadway design components in order to enhance the aesthetic and safety of roadways for all users. Policy 2.1.7.6: The City shall pursue grant opportunities for median landscaping and road beautification.
Landscape Standards	Objective 1.1.4: The City shall encourage redevelopment of areas that are exhibiting evidence of decline (i.e., disproportionate number of vacant, dilapidated and/or substandard structures) through redevelopment programs and through maintaining land development regulations that contain standards and procedures to encourage redevelopment where desirable. Policy 1.1.5.1: More intense development such as commercial, mixed-use and industrial uses shall be designed to minimize the negative impacts on lower intensity land uses through such means as, for example, landscaping and appropriate transitional uses including low-scale professional offices or medium density residential development. In the absence of transitional land uses, potential adverse impacts to surrounding residential should be mitigated through the use of: A. Buffer areas that will provide a separation between commercial and single-family residential structures; B. Landscaping and/or trees separating the commercial and residential land use; and C. Walls and/or opaque vegetative screens separating the commercial and single-family residential land use.
Signage Regulations	(enforced through the Land Development Regulations)
Land Use Plan Provisions	Policy 1.1.2.6: Mixed-Use (MU) E. Mixed use buildings within a single development will be highly encouraged in this category.

CRA Projects – Heart of Cocoa**Consistency with Comprehensive Plan**

Comprehensive Investment Strategy	Policy 1.1.4.12: The City shall coordinate redevelopment issues with the private sector to promote mobilization of public and private resources necessary to effectively carry out redevelopment efforts.
Catalyst Park Site	Policy 10.1.1.5: The City shall ensure the provision of a range of different types of facilities for passive outdoor recreational activities including nature trails or boardwalks, waterway trails, interpretive displays, educational programs, and/or wildlife observation areas.

CRA Projects – Waterfront Neighborhood Infill Development Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Single Family Infill	Policy 1.1.4.10: The City will encourage infill development and redevelopment in blighted areas or areas in transition, and encourage new housing development in appropriate areas where community services exist or are programmed to occur. Policy 3.2.2.6: The City will adopt incentives to retain historically significant residential structures in the City through a variety of strategies and procedures including zoning, land development regulations, public and private land acquisition programs, and other techniques. Policy 3.7.5.4: The City shall continue to pursue environmentally-related grants, such as Brownfields Assessment and Cleanup Grants, to advance the cleanup, restoration and redevelopment of City designated Brownfields areas and sites.
Multi-Family Infill	Policy 1.1.4.10: The City will encourage infill development and redevelopment in blighted areas or areas in transition, and encourage new housing development in appropriate areas where community services exist or are programmed to occur.

	Policy 3.2.2.6: The City will adopt incentives to retain historically significant residential structures in the City through a variety of strategies and procedures including zoning, land development regulations, public and private land acquisition programs, and other techniques. Policy 3.7.5.4: The City shall continue to pursue environmentally-related grants, such as Brownfields Assessment and Cleanup Grants, to advance the cleanup, restoration and redevelopment of City designated Brownfields areas and sites.
--	--

CRA Projects – South of Cocoa Village

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Residential Infill Node	Policy 1.1.4.10: The City will encourage infill development and redevelopment in blighted areas or areas in transition, and encourage new housing development in appropriate areas where community services exist or are programmed to occur. Policy 1.1.4.12: The City shall coordinate redevelopment issues with the private sector to promote mobilization of public and private resources necessary to effectively carry out redevelopment efforts.
Major Mixed Use Node (Rockledge/Cocoa City Line)	Policy 13.1.2.3: The City shall coordinate with the City of Rockledge to institute joint planning activities in areas of joint concern and influence. The activities shall include land use, landscaping, urban design and urban form of new development in the area.

CRA Projects – State Road 520 Corridor

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

King Street and Willard Street Improvements Option A	Policy 2.1.7.5: The City shall include landscaping and streetscaping as roadway design components in order to enhance the aesthetic and safety of roadways for all users. Policy 2.1.7.6: The City shall pursue grant opportunities for
--	---

	median landscaping and road beautification.
King Street and Willard Street Improvements Option B	Policy 2.1.7.5: The City shall include landscaping and streetscaping as roadway design components in order to enhance the aesthetic and safety of roadways for all users. Policy 2.1.7.6: The City shall pursue grant opportunities for median landscaping and road beautification. Objective 2.1.6: Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities. The City shall ensure safe and adequate movement of pedestrians and bicyclists. Policy 2.1.6.1: The City shall conduct pedestrian movement and safety studies to determine high travel patterns and accident areas, and remedial actions shall be taken by the City where feasible and practical to mitigate safety problems where conditions have been determined to be unacceptable.
Improve Intersections at King/Brevard & Willard/Brevard Streets	Objective 2.1.6: Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities. The City shall ensure safe and adequate movement of pedestrians and bicyclists. Policy 2.1.6.1: The City shall conduct pedestrian movement and safety studies to determine high travel patterns and accident areas, and remedial actions shall be taken by the City where feasible and practical to mitigate safety problems where conditions have been determined to be unacceptable.
Promote Vehicular Cross Access from King or Willard Streets	Policy 2.1.11.6: Access points to parcels with frontage along two or more roadways being located on the roadway of lower functional classification.

CRA Projects – Cocoa Village Gateways and Signage Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Identify Gateway Locations and Develop Wayfinding Package	Policy 1.2.2.2: The City shall examine the feasibility of establishing form-based design guidelines for City-wide as well as for specific areas in the City including CRAs, major corridors and waterfront. The standards could include streetscape standards, building signage, architectural styles
---	---

	and gateway designs to highlight the entrances to the City.
6 Forrest Avenue Entrance Feature	Policy 1.2.2.2: The City shall examine the feasibility of establishing form-based design guidelines for City-wide as well as for specific areas in the City including CRAs, major corridors and waterfront. The standards could include streetscape standards, building signage, architectural styles and gateway designs to highlight the entrances to the City.
Gateways and Signage	Policy 1.2.2.2: The City shall examine the feasibility of establishing form-based design guidelines for City-wide as well as for specific areas in the City including CRAs, major corridors and waterfront. The standards could include streetscape standards, building signage, architectural styles and gateway designs to highlight the entrances to the City.

CRA Projects – Streets

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Rosa L. Jones Traffic Circle	Policy 1.2.2.2: The City shall examine the feasibility of establishing form-based design guidelines for City-wide as well as for specific areas in the City including CRAs, major corridors and waterfront. The standards could include streetscape standards, building signage, architectural styles and gateway designs to highlight the entrances to the City. Policy 2.1.5.5: The City shall seek alternative funding sources for roadway improvements, including but not limited to, tax increment financing. Policy 2.1.7.5: The City shall include landscaping and streetscaping as roadway design components in order to enhance the aesthetic and safety of roadways for all users. Policy 2.1.7.6: The City shall pursue grant opportunities for median landscaping and road beautification.
Two Way Street Conversion	Objective 2.1.5:

	Right-of-Way Preservation. The City shall formally identify right-of-way needs and a priority schedule for acquisition or reservation shall be maintained. Protection of existing right-of-way from building encroachment shall be assured. Objective 10.1.3: The City shall provide interconnectivity between recreational facilities and the surrounding community.
Underpass beneath SR 520	Objective 10.1.3: The City shall provide interconnectivity between recreational facilities and the surrounding community.
Municipal Parking/Shared Parking Facilities/ On Street Parking	Policy 2.1.5.5: The City shall seek alternative funding sources for roadway improvements, including but not limited to, tax increment financing. Objective 2.1.15: The City shall develop parking strategies to support the transportation goals.
Street Tree Program	Policy 2.1.7.5: The City shall include landscaping and streetscaping as roadway design components in order to enhance the aesthetic and safety of roadways for all users. Policy 2.1.7.6: The City shall pursue grant opportunities for median landscaping and road beautification.
Streetscape Reconstruction	Policy 2.1.7.5: The City shall include landscaping and streetscaping as roadway design components in order to enhance the aesthetic and safety of roadways for all users. Policy 2.1.7.6: The City shall pursue grant opportunities for median landscaping and road beautification.

CRA Projects – Catalyst Mixed Use Redevelopment Sites

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Former City Hall Site	Policy 1.2.1.1: The City should encourage public-private partnership to develop mixed-use projects at key-locations in the Central Business District, and
-----------------------	---

	entice others to do the same. Policy 1.1.4.12: The City shall coordinate redevelopment issues with the private sector to promote mobilization of public and private resources necessary to effectively carry out redevelopment efforts.
Bank of America Site	Policy 1.2.1.1: The City should encourage public-private partnership to develop mixed-use projects at key-locations in the Central Business District, and entice others to do the same. Policy 1.1.4.12: The City shall coordinate redevelopment issues with the private sector to promote mobilization of public and private resources necessary to effectively carry out redevelopment efforts.
SunTrust Bank Site	Policy 1.1.4.12: The City shall coordinate redevelopment issues with the private sector to promote mobilization of public and private resources necessary to effectively carry out redevelopment efforts. Policy 2.1.15.1: The City shall seek a public-private partnership to help establish a multi-use, multi-level parking facility to reduce traffic congestion and increase pedestrian safety, reduce the amount of surface parking lots and increase green space within the Central Business District.

Approval Timeline

Staff developed the below schedule to amend the Plan in accordance with applicable noticing and meeting requirements.

A public workshop was held last month to present the Draft Plan and illicit comments. The LPA's recommendation and the updated Redevelopment Plan shall be submitted to the Agency for final consideration and approval at the Cocoa CRA Special Meeting on September 18, 2018. Notice of Council Meeting dates to review the Plan will be sent by registered mail to pertinent taxing authorities, at least 15 days prior to first reading. The Final Plan will go to the City Council for first and second reading next month.

August 29	Public Community Input Meeting
September 4	Special Cocoa CRA meeting to approve draft plan
September 10	Special PZ Meeting for consistency review.

September 18	Special Cocoa CRA meeting to approve the plan
September 20	Notice of Plan review dates via certified mail to BOCC
October 10	City Council first reading
October 24	City Council second reading

II. Budgetary Impact

No budgetary impact.

III. Previous Action

The Cocoa Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) approved the Cocoa Waterfront Master Plan on November 5, 2008.

The Cocoa CRA approved the Five-Year Cocoa Waterfront Master Plan Update on June 12, 2018

IV. Recommended Motion

Recommendation on whether the draft of the updated Cocoa Redevelopment Agency Redevelopment Plan is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the requirements of law.