MINUTES
CITY OF COCOA
DIAMOND SQUARE CRA
REGULAR MEETING
August 17, 2020

The Regular Meeting of the Cocoa Community Redevelopment Agency was held on August 17, 2020 at City Hall, 65 Stone Street, Cocoa, FL, as publicly noted.

I. **Call to Order**

Chairperson Moore called the meeting to order at 6:06

ROLL CALL:

Tracy A. Moore	Chairperson
Sylvia Thomas	Agency Member
Ed Jones	Agency Member
Jackie Isom	Agency Member
Marilyn Ross-Smith	Agency Member
Larry Brown	Agency Member
Joseph Colombo	Agency Attorney
Lori Chabot	Recording Secretary

PRESENT:

Tracy A. Moore	Chairperson	
Ed Jones	Agency Member	*(arrived 6:08)*
Jackie Isom	Agency Member	
Sylvia Thomas	Agency Member	*(arrived 6:19)*
Larry Brown	Agency Member	
Joseph Colombo	Agency Attorney	
Lori Chabot	Recording Secretary	

ABESENT:

Marilyn Ross-Smith	Agency Member

STAFF PRESENT:
Charlene Neuterman, Deputy Community Services Director and **Alex Goins**, Deputy Mayor.

Vice Chairperson Martin provided the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

Agency Member Jones arrived

II. **Approval Of Agenda And Minutes:**

AGENDA: Regular Meeting of August 17, 2020.

* **MOTION by Agency Member Brown SECONDED by Vice Chairperson Martin to approve the agenda for the August 17, 2019 Regular Meeting noting the adjustment of combined action items 2 and 3 on Short Agenda, however the Full Agenda was correct.**

AYES: ALL

MOTION PASSED UNAMIOUSLY (5-0)

MINUTES: Regular Meeting of July 20, 2020.

* **MOTION by Agency Member Brown; SECONDED Agency Member Jones to approve the minutes for the July 20, 2020, Regular Meeting with the correction to add Vice Chairperson Martin to the Roll Call Section.**

AYES: ALL

MOTION PASSED UNAMIOUSLY (5-0)

III. **Delegations**

Purvette Bryant – Ms. Bryant and her family are owners of property on Stone Street in DS CRA. Ms. Bryant came to ask about the DS Façade program and how to get funds. She and her family have been working on the buildings and would like to know about procedures so they can finish what they started and get businesses operating.

Mrs. Neuterman responded and asked what business was currently there. Ms. Bryant stated, at this point there was not an active business. Mrs. Neuterman explained how the Facade program works, and recommended she call for an application and more information. She also stated an application could be submitted prior to the business opening, however, expenditures were not eligible and could not be received until the business was active. She also noted the property or business owner pays the funds up front and is reimbursed for 50% of what is spent and the maximum amount is $10,000. Mrs. Neuterman recommended holding off on future work, if possible, until an application could be submitted for approval. Ms. Bryant asked if there were any provisions for someone with undue financial burden to waive that rule. Mrs. Neuterman explained the council would make the decision to waive or change any program rules.Mrs. Neuterman also explained the difficulty in recouping funds when they have been given up front.

Agency Member Brown asked Ms. Bryant how long she owned the property and what she planned to do with it. She replied she had owned since 2009 and had some interest from renters possibly from NY and Miami. Agency Member Brown asked Agency Attorney Columbo if there was any flexibility with the grant as most people are not taking advantage of the program. Agency Attorney Columbo explained the program was mirrored after the downtown Cocoa RDA program and if money is given in advance and owners don't follow through, it puts the DS in a bit of a conundrum. He continued, Florida is historically the most difficult state to recoup funds. He added, it would be at the Board's discretion. Agency Chairperson Moore recommended Ms. Bryant review the application, what the requirements are and how it currently works and once she knew that and what her plans were for the property and what she needed the money for to come back to the board. Mrs. Bryant continued stating the money would be for infrastructure. Chairperson Moore replied the Façade funds were not for infrastructure. Mrs. Neuterman let Ms. Bryant know about the Small Business Assistance Program that could help her with her needs for infrastructure. This program would be starting October 1, 2020 and is designed to assist with start-up costs for small businesses. Mrs. Neuterman again recommended to Ms. Bryant to contact her the next morning to discuss in more detail. Discussion continued as to the value of the location and business possibilities.

IV. **<u>Presentations</u>**

None

V. **<u>Action Items</u>**

Agency Thomas arrived at 6:19

1.Approve the final Proposed Budget for FY 2021.

Staff respectfully requests approval of the Fiscal Year 2021 Diamond Square CRA Proposed Budget.

At the DS CRA meeting of July 20, 2020 Agency Members discussed the upcoming Fiscal Year's budget and priority projects. Exact amounts are not known for each of these projects and therefore, funds will be transferred to the Contingency account within the CRA and will be used as the projects come online. Once the final Tax

Increment Financing (TIF) numbers are received from the County, the revenue and expenditures will be updated in the final budget to be adopted in September by City Council.

Priorities placed by the Agency included the following projects:
- RFP for redevelopment of DS CRA lots on Rosa L. Jones and Peachtree Street
- Relocating the Community Garden on Peachtree Street and re-purposing the lot for affordable housing.
- Residential Façade Improvement Program
- Benches and trash receptacles at bus stops (where none are located).
- Homebuyers assistance program.

Mrs. Neuterman explained the line items and details of the budget and stated the budget is a fair increase and DS is growing about 10-15% from prior year. This could be related to the improvements and increased homeownership in DS.

Mrs. Neuterman pointed out that 3 members (instead of 2) were budgeted to attend the conference as well as a few programs previously discussed such as, the Residential Grant, DS Initiative Service Provider to bring in adult service providers, Beautification Grant which is a landscaping incentive type program, a Pilot Paint Program (residential) as well as the Small Business Program.

Agency Member Brown asked about the Cocoa PD Athletic League and the budgeted amount of $4,500 and asked if they normally used that amount and what was it used for? Mrs. Neuterman replied they normally did, until this year and it was used primarily for food and activity supplies for different camp programs. Agency Member Brown asked about the kids and were they DS kids? He also asked for a breakdown of expenses. Chairperson Moore stated that in the past it was specifically asked that the kids be from DS. Discussion continued as to previous expenses related PAL. Mrs. Neuterman stated she will bring 2018 and 2019 expenses for the board's review.

Agency Member Thomas asked about the Beautification Program and what the cap was. Ms. Neuterman responded that the total program budget was $10,000, with each award being $1,000 - $2,000 and awards would be up to the board.

Chairperson Moore added how valuable of these types of programs are to help residents who come to DS with a community project and DS can help landscaping. She continued, this along with what Habitat for Humanity is doing DS can reach more people. Chairperson Moore asked about the Paint Program. Mrs. Neuterman explained how the Paint Program and the Beautification Program were similar in that the CRA would purchase the supplies (i.e., paint or landscaping) and the homeowners, along with neighbors, youth, church, PAL etc would provide the manpower. Service a purpose for those that cannot pay for supplies up front. Chairperson Moore added it is a great opportunity to combine that with the Façade grants and can create a domino effect throughout the neighborhood. She asked about the application and Mrs. Neuterman said there will be an application and it will be brought to the next meeting.

Chairperson Moore stated she believed everything was included in the budget that had been discussed. Chairperson Moore mentioned the Small Business Program and Mrs. Neuterman explained that conversations are ongoing with the Director of EDC and Deputy Mayor Goins. She continued as to how it worked and that it could motivate new business in DS. Chairperson Moore would like to see classes along with this. Mrs. Neuterman replied that they are partnering with a couple of organizations. One, We Venture and another, Career Source Brevard have free programs for new business. Discussion continued about new business ideas, lessons learned and how they can be shared to assist new business.

* ***MOTION by Agency Member Brown; SECONDED by Agency Member Thomas to accept proposed budget.**

AYES: ALL

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY (6-0)

Chairperson Moore thanked Ms. Neuterman stating "Good Job" with 2021 budget.

2. Budget Adjustment cleanup for FY 2020 Budget.

Staff is requesting approval of a Resolution Amending the Fiscal Year 2020 Budget BAF# 20-094-T, from within the Community Redevelopment Agency's Line Item Accounts for Operating, which may have become negative at mid-year, due to Unforeseen Expenses.

During the fiscal year budgeting process, future expenses are sometimes calculated using historical information and forecasting, for the CRA's future needs. As such, throughout the year, Finance reviews the previous year's budget, for any changes which may have placed any of the accounts into a negative balance. Once this analysis is complete, a "shore up" of the line item budgets within the CRA occurs and is presented to the Agency.

The BAF shows mostly accrual payout and would clear out negative balances. This also includes Approval of a Change Order and Resolution to cover legal expenses within the DS CRA budget to cover remaining Diamond Square CRA meetings (August and September). Chairperson Moore asked if a Resolution was needed as well? Mrs. Neuterman replied, yes.

The Budget Transfer schedule shows the accounts and amounts that were required to be adjusted to cleanup account overages. Chairperson Moore asked about negative items and attorney fees and where they were coming from. Mrs. Neuterman replied, funds were from the Contingency and Salary line item.

* ***MOTION by Agency Member Thomas; SECONDED by Agency Member Brown to approve to amend the CRA budget adjustments for FY 2020 Budget.**

AYES: ALL

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY (6-0)

4. Approve the scope of work for the RFP for the redevelopment of DS CRA lots on Rosa L. Jones Blvd. and Peachtree Street and redevelopment recommendations for the Peachtree lot

- Charlene Neuterman addressed the board stating staff is requesting agency approval on the scope of work for the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the redevelopment of two (2) lots within the 800 block of Rosa L. Jones Drive, currently owned by the Diamond Square CRA and redevelopment recommendations for the 1112 Peachtree Street property.

  To finalize the Diamond Square CRA Fiscal Year 2021 Budget, the CRA is prioritizing redevelopment projects for the upcoming budget year. Since 2014, the Diamond Square CRA has been active in completing many of the redevelopment projects listed in the Plan Update. Pursuant to F.S. 163, Part II (the Community Redevelopment Act of 1969), a Redevelopment Plan is necessary to undertake and carry out community redevelopment activities within the CRA to improve a blight community.

  One such project is the redevelopment of property within the 800 block of Rosa L. Jones Blvd. This was acquired by the Diamond Square CRA in 2004 by Resolution 2004-17 for the amount of $50,000, which was the cost of the demolition of the buildings on the property. That property totaled just over 2.8 acres is zoned RU 1-7, which allows for low density residential, primarily single-family homes.

  A representative from the Rose Garden Apartments attended to speak on behalf of the property owner regarding their interest in purchasing part of one of the lots. The Rose Garden Apartments located at 826 Rosa L. Jones, is directly adjacent (east) to parcel 24-36-32-00-773.0. The apartments would like to purchase approximately (70 feet) of the parcel to construct a parking lot for their complex. This option should be considered by the Agency as it is a recommendation of staff. The apartment complex, built in 1963, currently does not have adequate parking for their residents and is using a portion of one lot for resident parking. If the board developed both parcels in its entirety, it would cause significant issues with Rose Garden residents locating parking spaces as their site has only 8 marked parking spaces, which is insufficient for the 40 units. If directed to, Staff will communicate with the owners of that property to negotiate an agreement that would be beneficial to both parties. All communications will be brought back to the Agency for final approval before entering into an agreement for sale. Staff recommends looking into this option prior to establishing an RFP for the remaining parcels as the lot would need to be split. One option in the agreement would be that the owner of the apartment complex design and construct a vinyl fence and landscape buffer that would effectively separate their property from the DSCRA owned parcels to the west, thus creating more privacy separating the residential homes from the multiple family apartments. Staff attached a conceptual plan of the parking area the owners of Rose Garden would like to construct.

In the 2004 agreement, it states if Diamond Square sells that property for more than $50,000, the dollar amount above that would have to be returned to the city. She contends the staff believes the best solution is to enter into an agreement with the apts to make improvements in lieu of selling and work on splitting the property and moving over to new owner and do RFP for building.

- Robin Magnelli, Property Manager of Rose Garden Apartments addressed the agency and submitted a small conceptual plan. She stated the current apartment owners bought the apartments in 2013. At that time, it had an undesirable nick name. She went on to say although the area has been known as a dangerous area, the owner has been committed to improving the apartments inside and out. Renovations include bathrooms and kitchens, as well as painting, water heaters and tile. Ms. Magnelli described the varies types of working-class people who live there. The building has 40 units and is mostly 100% occupied. With the current residents, there are approximately 50 cars and 2 motorcycles, however only 28 spots for parking, emphasizing the need for additional parking. She also said due to not having enough spots, residents already park on the vacant lot. She also explained that with residents parking all over it could be an issue if emergency vehicles needed to get in and out.

  Ms. Magnelli stated the owner wants to put in a side walk adjacent to the building that would provide a safer location for cars to park. She explains it can be a safety hazard, especially for kids opening car doors there. The owner wants to create enough parking for about 65 cars, add grass, an additional dumpster and more landscaping. She thanked the members for having her and requested the board consider their request for the land for safety and beautification.

  Agency Member Brown asked about age of property and if there was central air/heat. The apartments were built in 1963 said Ms. Magnelli, and they did not have central air, however there is 2 window units for each (750 sq ft) unit. He then asked about the improvements. Ms. Magnelli replied painting, kitchen cabinets, bathroom, tile etc. Agency Member Brown explained he didn't like the word "fence" and continued, your dividing people and your dividing neighborhoods. He added he would prefer to use landscaping instead of fencing. Mrs. Neuterman explained the fence would be at the back of the backyard and would also help to keep apartment residents from parking in the homeowners' yards. She added that homeowners would likely be putting up their own fencing, which could all be different, so it may be in the board's interest to up a fence to create consistency. Agency Member Brown urged using landscaping rather than fencing and Mrs. Neuterman replied it would be up to the board.

Chairperson Moore asked about the owner's timing. Ms. Magnelli stated she believed he was close to being ready if he got the green light.

Chairperson Moore expressed her concern about the exterior and as to whether it would be possible to change the perception of the area, adding this was a good start to improve the image and the parking area would help. Chairperson Moore asked about the amount of area that would be available to build upon if they gave part to the apartments. Mrs. Neuterman replied there would be about 2 acres and is enough room to develop upon and not impact the development of those lots and the RFP. Mrs. Neuterman went on to say it was a win, win for both and an agreement would be developed between the DSCRA and the Apartments to include expectations and requirements. She continued, cleanup of the apartment area is a priority. Agency Member Thomas asked about updating the parking on the east side. Ms. Magnelli said they added new asphalt but still not a lot of room and, there is an old building there. Agency Member Thomas asked if they would be removing that or updating? Mrs. Neuterman responded the building was not owned by the apartment owner. Ms. Magnelli added, it is in bad shape and turns people off when they are considering whether or not to rent there. She continued, there is a fence in between that is currently broken however, they are going to fix it as it is seen as a safety issue.

Chairperson Moore asked about the agreement and timelines. Mrs. Neuterman stated there would be timelines noted within the RFP. Agency Attorney Columbo confirmed and stated now was not time to vote emphasizing that the board should see the proposals on the entire 2 lots prior to piecing it out.

Chairperson Moore emphasized "being good neighbors" and would like to see the possibilities with the property as per the builders' response to the RFP. Discussion began regarding if the property was sold for more than $50,000 that money (over $50,000) would have to be returned to City's GF and Agency Attorney Columbo discussed other historical challenges in acquiring the property.

Agency Member Jones asked questions about lot size and expressed his concerns over the DS over-gifting. Mrs. Neuterman responded it was just over 150 feet in length.

Agency Member Brown stated he has pause with investing in the 57 year-old building and does not have central air/heat. We are trying to improve the living standards in the area, even housing authority has moved from window units. He continued, the building was not adequate for the citizens and doesn't want to waste money of a building that might break down in a few years. He added, it would be band aid and the building is past its usefulness adding, the building and the neighboring building needs to be demolished. Chairperson Moore asked, if there had been any conversations with the owner of the abandoned building. Mrs. Neuterman replied code enforcement had been in contact.

Agency Member Thomas asked about the integrity of the plumbing and discussion ensued about that and the structure of the apartment complex. Ms. Magnelli responded, other than situational maintenance, there wasn't any systemic issues with the plumbing as far as she knew.

Agency Member Brown asked to table the matter. Vice Chairperson Martin and Chairperson Moore discussed the importance of the conversation and what to do with the land and how to enhance the area that is affordable. Mrs. Neuterman explained to the board the process of the RFB and that decisions involving the bids, builders, or written agreements would be theirs. Chairperson Moore agrees with Agency Member Jones about alot of gifting over the years and the importance of looking closely at the pros and cons of this issue.

Staff requests Agency direction on the type of development they wish to see on the properties. The Scope of Work will be created based on the current zoning regulations for single family homes and wishes of the Agency. RU1-7 zoning requires the following:

BULK REGULATIONS

- Minimum lot area: Seven thousand five hundred (7,500) sq. ft.
- Minimum lot width: Seventy-five (75) ft.
- Minimum lot depth: One hundred (100) ft.
- Minimum lot coverage: Thirty percent (30%)
- Minimum living area: One thousand two hundred (1,200) sq. ft.
- Maximum height: Thirty-five (35) feet.

MINIMUM YARD REQUIREMENTS.

- Front setback—Twenty-five (25) feet.
- Side interior lot setback—Eight (8) feet.
- Side corner lot setback—Fifteen (15) feet.
- Rear setback—Fifteen (15) feet.

Other items the Agency may want to consider whether you want the RFP to specify:

- Type of construction: (wood frame, steel, concrete, etc.)
- Number of bedrooms (two, three, or four bedroom or a mix)

- Carport, single car or double car garage door requirements
- Homeownership only or a mix of homeownership/rental
- Energy efficiency requirements and/or solar panels
- Impact Windows or aluminum panels

Mrs. Neuterman added that the RFP can be as specific as the board wishes. She added, Staff's recommendation would include concrete or steel type construction, energy saver or solar, as well as impact windows or aluminum panels. The RFP will be for the 2.8 acres with approximately each lot being ¼ are. The board discussed their preferences to include concrete/steel, 3 bedroom, garage (1), energy efficient and homeownership v. rentals.

Staff will use the recommendations of the Agency to develop the Request for Proposal for the site. An appraisal of the property will be conducted to determine the actual value of the parcels. Once proposals are received, the Agency will take part in the selection process and will assist in the drafting of a redevelopment agreement. The homes will be affordable homes. Agency Member Isom asked about the homes and whether they will be eligible for homebuyer assistance. Mrs. Neuterman responded they would. Discussion continued about the size of the lots and how many homes could built. Mrs. Neuterman stated up to 8 homes could be built on the lot, of course dependent on home size, etc and builder must meet zoning and setback requirements. Agency Brown asked about the difference between these homes and the ones on Stone Street. Mrs. Neuterman replied the zoning is for single family homes. If the builder wanted to do anything different, they would have to request zoning change.

- The Community Garden parcel on 1112 Peachtree is another parcel the Agency directed Staff to begin the redevelopment process on, in further research staff has found that the parcel is actually owned by the City of Cocoa and the City entered into an agreement with the Agency. Staff is recommending the Agency outline the future redevelopment of the property and have staff bring those recommendations back to City Council for their consideration, along with the parcels discussed above.

  The parcel size is .33 acres and could hold two smaller homes or one duplex-style unit. The parcel located at 1112 Peachtree Street is zoned C-N (Neighborhood Commercial), multiple-family and single-family residences within C-N are regulated in accordance with the RU-2-15 District.

  BULK REGULATIONS.
  - Minimum lot area —Seven thousand five hundred (7,500) square feet.
  - Minimum lot width —Seventy-five (75) feet.
  - Minimum lot depth —One hundred (100) feet.
  - Maximum lot coverage —Forty percent (40%).
  - Maximum height —Thirty-five (35) feet.

  MINIMUM LIVING AREA.
  - Duplex —Seven hundred fifty (750) square feet each unit.
  - Efficiency apartments —Five hundred (500) square feet.

- One-bedroom apartments —Eight hundred (800) square feet.
- Two-bedroom apartments —Nine hundred (900) square feet, plus one hundred (100) square feet for each additional bedroom.

MINIMUM YARD REQUIREMENTS.
- Front setback —Twenty-five (25) feet.
- Side interior lot setback —Ten (10) feet.
- Side corner lot setback —Fifteen (15) feet.
- Rear setback —Twenty (20) feet.

* [OPEN AIR SPACE] Multiple-family buildings (more than two (2) units) located on the same lot shall have an open air space of not less than fifteen (15) feet between exterior walls of buildings.

The board will need to decide whether they would prefer two (2) single-family homes or a duplex. Preferences the board may want to consider:

- Type of construction: (wood frame, steel, concrete, etc.)
- Number of bedrooms (two, three, or four bedroom or a mix)
- Carport, single car or double car garage door requirements
- Homeownership only or a mix of homeownership/rental
- Energy efficiency requirements and/or solar panels
- Impact Windows or aluminum panels

Staff recommends a duplex-style construction, with a one-car garage and three bedrooms. The units could be a minimum 750 sf or larger. This will allow for additional affordable housing in the Peachtree corridor for families who have children attending nearby Endeavor Elementary School. Staff does not recommend a triplex due to the open-air space requirement.

The Agency, at the July Diamond Square CRA meeting, directed staff to move the Community Garden to the area behind the Harry T. Moore Center, 307 Blake Avenue, which is close to a 22-home development currently anticipated to be constructed in the next two to three years. The Community Garden will serve a more heavily populated area and potentially could benefit more residents. Since this parcel is owned by the City of Cocoa, staff will need to present an agenda item to seek City Council's approval. Agency Member Brown asked if they moved the garden, would DS still get to keep it in DS area. Mrs. Neuterman and Deputy Mayor Goins stated yes.

Agency Member Jones asked about a single-family home on this lot and Mrs. Neuterman said zoning for the lot states the home would be either a duplex or single home. Mrs. Neuterman explained due to the size, preference would be to build a duplex. Discussed ensued as to the kinds of buildings that are around and near this location.

Mrs. Neuterman explained how the RFP process worked. She continued to say that the RFP would include the agency's preferences or requests for type of structure, number of rooms, baths, garage or no garage. Once the bids come back, the board again would choose which bid they wanted and would also have the opportunity to add their requests in the agreement with the builder.

Mrs. Neuterman reminded the board about the monthly expense budgeted that could return to DS for use on other projects.

Chairperson Moore also brought up the DS seniors and what DS could do about affordable housing for them. Agency Member Brown added he would want senior housing, but in a an area with less traffic than the Peachtree location.

Staff is requesting approval to move forward the potential scope of work for the RFP process for the two (2) parcels on Rosa L. Jones Drive and redevelopment recommendations for the 1112 Peachtree Street property.

* ***MOTION by Vice Chairperson Martin; SECONDED by Agency Member Thomas to approve Staff moving forward with the potential scope of work for an RFP.**

AYES: ALL

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY (6-0)

VI. **Attorney's Report**

None

VII. **Staff Reports**

Mrs. Neuterman let the board know they each had a copy of the budget update in their packets and asked if there were questions.

Mrs. Neuterman also reminded the board about the Habitat for Humanity Dedication for the two Female Veterans on Thursday at 9:30 am and asked who is planning on attending. She continued explaining the events of the morning and the mobile parade route.

Mrs. Neuterman shared with the board good news about being awarded the Grant for Harry T. Moore Historical museum to create and design the museum which, hopefully would happen next year. Florida Historical Society will design the museum and Mrs. Neuterman will work with members towards their goals to bring the history of DS to that building. There is one more grant on the table to complete the historic windows and doors for the Moore Center.

Mrs. Neuterman also asked the agency members if they would prefer to pick up their Agenda Packets on Wednesday afternoon, Thursday or Friday at City Hall since some members have not been receiving them timely. The board agreed to this option. Chairperson Moore asked if staff could send a notice/reminder when the packet was ready. Mrs. Neuterman said staff would send an email.

Agency Member Brown asked about the Historical sign. Mrs. Neuterman replied that she will submit another grant for that when the cycle comes around early next year.

Agency Member Brown asked how many neighborhood watch programs did DS have. Deputy Mayor respond there was one however, not active. He stated that many residents are too afraid to call police. He also stated they call him. Agency Member Brown would like to look at more programs. Discussion continued about various types of Crime Watch, Save our Neighborhood or Neighborhood Ambassador programs. Chairperson Moore added the RDA conference would be a good opportunity to talk with others about this and continued, saying now is a good time to start fresh and create a new program and a new name. Deputy Mayor Goins discussed the value of community participation and relationships. Mrs. Neuterman said she would look into these programs and bring information back to the next meeting.

Agency Member Isom asked about the tour. Mrs. Neuterman said she will arrange that once there is a CO issued on the building.

VIII. **Next Meeting Date**

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Diamond Square Community Redevelopment Agency will be on Monday, September 21, 2020 at 6 pm at the Cocoa City Hall, 65 Stone Street, Cocoa, Florida, unless a business need arises earlier.

IX. **Adjournment**

* * **MOTION by Agency Member Brown; SECONDED by Agency Member Isom to adjourn the meeting.**

AYES: ALL

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY (6-0)

MEETING WAS ADJOURNED at 8:26 pm

Tracy Moore

Tracy Moore, Chairperson

Respectfully Submitted by:

Lori Chabot, Recording Secretary