

ROSELAND NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN TASK FORCE

There was a meeting of the Roseland Neighborhood Plan Task Force held on Tuesday, December 11, 2001, at 4:00 p.m. in the Commission Chambers of the County Administration Building, 1840 25th Street, Vero Beach, Florida.

Present were Barbara Banfield, Cy Carlson, Arthur Deschane, Jackie James, Joann McGrath, Robert Musante, Blakeman Smith, and Holly Dill.

Kathy Coley and Joanie Reed were absent.

Also present were Bob Keating, Planning Director; Sasan Rohani, Chief, Long-Range Planning; Randy Deshazo, Planner, Long Range/Economic Development; Kimtilal Sharma, Planner, Kashi Ashram; Durgadas Hutner, Land Planning Coordinator, Kashi Ashram; and Peggy Ball, Staff Assistant IV.

1. Call to Order

Ms. Carlson called the meeting to order and opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Approval of Minutes of November 6, 2001 Meeting

ON MOTION by Ms. Carlson, SECONDED by Ms. Banfield, the members voted unanimously (8-0) to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 6, 2001, as submitted.

3. Presentation of Kimtilal Sharma, Planner for Kashi Foundation

Mr. Hutner explained Kashi Ashram had a small academic school for Pre-Kindergarten through 12th Grade students. He stated they also did healthcare work and had a small repose for terminally ill people. He commented Kashi Ashram held workshops that taught yoga and meditation and had retreats for rest and relaxation. He added there were about 80 to 100 members on the Kashi Ashram property and in the local community.

Mr. Sharma indicated Kashi Ashram was in the very preliminary planning stage of additional land development. He showed a chart of their property including the boundaries, wetlands, and vegetation. He remarked Kashi Ashram had approximately 80 acres of land, and the challenge was how to develop this site and enhance the natural setting that was there. He noted the County had advised them the best approach to develop this land would be to follow a Planned Development (PD). He commented they did not plan on building anything higher than two stories. He concluded Kashi Ashram was not a typical commercial developer who would try to squeeze out the maximum amount of land utilization. He invited the group to visit the Kashi Ashram community.

Mr. Musante stated there were about 80 to 100 people living in homes in the Kashi Ashram community, and the County did not receive any tax relief for any County infrastructure that was being used by them. He inquired if all of the additional properties would be tax-free properties within the County. Mr. Sharmi advised he had not addressed that area in his position as the planner, and he could not answer that question.

Ms. McGrath pointed out the residents of Roseland did not want their taxes increased because of the development of Kashi Ashram, which was an exclusive community.

Mr. Sharmi stated Kashi Ashram would pay impact fees to the County for such things as water and sewer. He added the River School was open to everyone, and the community was not exclusive to Kashi Ashram members. He felt Kashi Ashram had a positive community impact.

Mr. Smith asked what type of care facility would be on the premises, and Mr. Sharmi replied it would be similar to an assistant living facility.

Ms. Carlson wanted to know if the care facility would be federally subsidized, and Mr. Sharmi did not believe they would have any subsidy.

Ms. Dill questioned how many patients were expected, and Mr. Sharmi replied it was anticipated the maximum number of residents in the care facility would be 29.

Ms. Dill inquired about the increased size of the school. Mr. Sharmi advised there were currently about 120 students, and they would be asking the County to approve a school for about 300 to 400 students.

Ms. Dill asked if Kashi Ashram would be required to put in a turn lane or a street light on Roseland Road. Mr. Sharmi explained they were in the preliminary planning stage, but if the traffic study demonstrated that any such improvements were required, they would do them.

Ms. Dill wanted to know the time frame of the development. Mr. Sharmi remarked the PD process took about six to seven months and the plan would be done in three phases. He guessed the minimal completion time of the project would be in about five to ten years.

Mr. Keating commented Kashi Ashram had only gone through a pre-application process and had not submitted an application yet.

Ms. James mentioned the Collier Club development, the airport development, Kashi Ashram, and the condo on the other end of Roseland Road, and she felt Roseland was losing its character. She wanted to know what controls the County had to control development. Mr. Keating explained Roseland was not unique, and everyone was building according to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP).

Ms. James wanted to know how to change the CLUP to lower the density in Roseland. Mr. Rohani advised the only way the County could change the zoning of a property would be if the property owner asked for a rezoning.

Mr. Keating explained the CLUP became effective in 1990, and noted everyone wanted growth and development to go someplace else. He remarked from a planner's standpoint, they advocated development that was not sprawled, and he explained the Planning Department's job was to make sure the development occurred in the best way possible.

Mr. Deschane wanted to know who designed the CLUP, and his concern was the impact on the environment. He wanted to see larger lots and less density. Mr. Keating indicated the BCC approved the CLUP, and he explained urban sprawl and density. He stated the bottom line was

there would be growth. He noted if the task force expected the result of this process to reduce density and stop growth, it would not happen.

Ms. McGrath felt the County had some severe problems in the past, and they were now trying to deal with the impact of those problems. She thought the County could have an impact on rezoning, such as the multi-family zoning project east of US-1. She said nobody had told them about the condominium project and now there would be a 45' structure on US-1. She explained the task force members were concerned about that project, and wanted the owner to change the multi-family units to single family homes.

Mr. Keating asked the members where they thought apartments and condominiums should be, and remarked building only single-family units would be discriminatory as fewer people could afford them.

Ms. James wanted to know if the County would provide suitable recreation, fire services, ambulance services, etc. for the increased population. Mr. Keating said there were standards for all of these things, and new residents would be added to the tax rolls and would pay any traffic, water or sewer impact fees.

Mr. Musante asked if new school construction had to have building inspectors. Mr. Keating advised a new building code would go into effect March 1, 2002, but right now public school facilities were subject to a State building code, and the State provided the building inspectors, not local government. He noted private school systems must meet all local requirements.

4. Review of the Roseland Neighborhood Quality of Life Survey

Mr. Deshazo asked the task force members if they wanted the survey sent to the property owners or to the renters on properties that were leased. After some discussion, the task force members decided to send the survey to both the property owners and the renters. They determined the survey should be mailed to the property owners and hand-delivered to the renters after the holidays with a mid-January return date.

Ms. Carlson thought the reason they were doing the survey was because it was part of the County process, and Mr. Rohani clarified that the

task force requested the survey, and the County offered to assist them but did not require the survey.

Ms. Carlson read all the questions on the survey, and the following items were discussed:

- * On Question #2, Ms. Dill suggested changing the order of the answers so that nature trails would be first. The task force members agreed to eliminate tennis courts, basketball courts, and shuffleboard courts from the answer.
- * On Question #4, the task force members wanted to omit "in residential areas" from the question.
- * After a lengthy discussion, the task force members decided to revise Question #5 to, "Are you unable either physically or financially to maintain your property? If so, which of the following kinds of help would be most useful?"
- * Ms. Dill was concerned there were no questions regarding the historical preservation of Roseland. The task force members decided to add historic preservation as an answer in Question #6 and take the word "environment" out of the question.
- * On Question #7, Ms. Dill wanted the word "additional" omitted from the question.
- * Mr. Musante suggested the words "you" be changed to "I" in the answers to Question #8.
- * Mr. Deshazo said staff thought the questions about annexation to the City of Sebastian were important, but staff had dropped them at the request of the task force members. Ms. James wanted to know why staff wanted those questions put on the survey. Mr. Rohani replied everything the City of Sebastian did directly impacted Roseland, and some people might want to be annexed to the City of Sebastian so they had a voice on the issues. A discussion ensued, and the majority of task force members agreed to add the two questions regarding annexation to the survey. Ms.

James and Ms. Banfield were against having the question on the survey.

- * On Question #11, Mr. Musante requested the staff double-check the figures before sending the survey.
- * Ms. Dill thought the print on the survey should be changed to a larger font.
- * Mr. Musante suggested numbering the surveys in order to identify the area the returned surveys came from.

5. Discussion and Comments

Ms. Carlson announced they would schedule a workshop meeting for the second week of January 2002.

Mr. Musante wanted to know how the task force could pressure the BCC to do things differently than they were doing. He wanted code enforcement to be more pro-active. Mr. Keating responded in certain cases it was hard to get results in code enforcement. He noted if it was a homestead property, the lien could not be enforced, and if it was a non-homestead property, there could be prior liens or encumbrances that took precedence. Mr. Musante felt there were things the County could do which they did not, such as put someone in jail or foreclose on the property. Mr. Keating stated the County would not do anything without their attorney's involvement and advisement.

6. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.