The Beachside Redevelopment Committee (BRC) approved the use of a subcommittee to refine the issues and draft recommendations presented to the BRC at the October and November meetings. The following is a summary of the critical issues, assumptions and general recommendations prepared by the county staff. The BRC subcommittee reviewed the list at its December 4, 2017 meeting. The BRC subcommittee comments and recommendations are shown in red. This will serve as the basis to finalize the recommendations of the BRC.

There was a concern regarding how the background and level of analysis will be clarified in the final recommendations. At the October meeting, staff provided the BRC with a draft cover letter from the BRC and a document that showed how the recommendations will include background information and the overall format. These will be provided to the BRC again. This is not for final approval, but to make sure that there is sufficient background information and the format is acceptable.

1. The successful redevelopment of the beachside area involves regulatory, operational and physical aspects. A single focus project could serve as a catalyst for redevelopment if the other elements are in place, but it will not resurrect the beachside on its own.
   • The BRC subcommittee acknowledged that the redevelopment effort applies to all four local governments, but the initial focus has to be on Daytona Beach. Daytona Beach is the core of the beachside, and its health impacts the other governments. This has to be clarified in the preamble, or introductory letter, for the BRC’s recommendations.

2. The pursuit of state or federal funds for any redevelopment project/program will require a coordinated effort among the cities and county. The Volusia County Legislative Delegation helps to serve in that role.
   • There needs to be unanimity in the efforts of the local governments in the pursuit of state and federal funds.
   • Public lands owned by Daytona Beach and the county within the core area offer a great opportunity for a private-public project that can serve as the catalyst for positive growth.
   • The cities and the county need to clarify and identify what are the top priorities so that there is unity in all lobbying efforts.

3. The cities and county need to identify the project and the program in order to search for funding. It is not recommended to go after the money and then trying to fit a project to the funding source.
   • No more studies. The beachside area has been studied enough, and there are viable plans already approved. Work on implementing those adopted plans before there is additional cost and delay for a new study.
   • Identify what is needed by F.S. 255.065 Public Private Partnerships (3-P) to solicit redevelopment projects for the targeted areas/projects.
• Determine what can be done to expedite redevelopment of public lands that are candidates for a 3-P project.

4. There are multiple plans and projects in place that identify many different options. The cities and county are poised to participate in redevelopment projects. Examples include the Daytona Beach Convention Hotel, Brown & Brown corporate HQ, Hard Rock (both sites). There is a cost to all of these projects and it is harder for local governments to fund all of the needed infrastructure upgrades to make “shovel ready” projects.

• The top priority needs to be the East International Speedway Boulevard project since that is in the funding process and has the most traction at this time.

• The next priority needs to focus on opportunities around the Ocean Center since there are publicly-owned lands that can be used for a variety of developments that can capitalize on the 3-P process.

• There is also an identified need to look at the Seabreeze Boulevard and Oakridge Boulevard area for a major upgrade in code enforcement and incentives for redevelopment.

5. Neighborhood stabilization has a different meaning to many people. The following are three common strategies. What strategy should be used where?

a. Protect and improve existing housing stock via strict code enforcement and grants to “urban pioneers” who invest in the area.

b. Change the market and attract investors who want to renovate the area for tourist-based residency.

c. Tear down Purchase and rebuild redevelop to attract higher income area residential investment.

• Improve information and marketing programs so that neighborhood groups and investors are aware of grants and programs available from local, state and regional.

• Involve and listen to the neighborhood groups. They are the “eyes on the street” and can provide the best reconnaissance.

• Investigate incentive programs for developers (reduced impact fees, expedited review, tax abatement) and potential residents (neighborhood heroes program)

6. The stabilization and improvement of the commercial uses along west A1A, Seabreeze/Oakridge, Main street and ISB continues to be discussed and there does not appear to be a consensus what should be done; when should it be done and how will it done. There are differing perspectives that need to be reconciled, specifically:

a. Incentives for “mom and pop” businesses and art districts.

b. Developing intensive mixed-use commercial, residential and entertainment districts.

c. Facilitating the “Special Event” commercial activities (itinerant vendors) without jeopardizing the “365 businesses”.

• Make sure that all property taxes, fees, fines and other obligations are up to date and a business is properly operating before any grants and assistance is provided-do not reward bad behavior.
• The issue of managing special event and itinerant vendors is a major issue. The general feel is that special events need to be better managed, and there needs to be a disincentive to itinerant vendors being the primary retail activity.

7. Code enforcement is a top priority to those from Daytona Beach and creates the greatest amount of frustration. There are relatively limited options, but the BRC consistently calls for:
   a. Increased code enforcement presence in the city of Daytona Beach core area;
   b. Coordinated efforts to ensure that homestead exemptions are properly awarded and strictly enforced; and
   c. Improved processing to reduce time and lag for improvements.
• The message is simple “set the bar high” and “stick to your guns”.
• It is perceived that there are periods during special events that code enforcement is suspended. If this is the case, then it needs to stop.
• Send a signal: “The cities are serious about code enforcement, and they are committed to following through.”

8. Public safety continues to be an identified concern of the BRC for the core area of Daytona Beach. The individual cities are the ultimate responsible group for this issue.
   • The homeless issues will continue to impact redevelopment of the beachside. The efforts to create facilities is one of many components that are needed. Is there a need to revisit the Pottinger Settlement Agreement, and its impact on how the cities and county address homeless persons?

9. Does the BRC believe that there is a need for non-utility infrastructure consisting of:
   a. Upgrades to sidewalks and bike facilities.
   b. Undergrounding electricity lines.
   c. Façade site development grants or assistance.
• There has to be a better definition of infrastructure that includes all of the elements listed above and expanded to include parking facilities, park and open space components, transit and information technologies.
• It is also important to emphasize how the improvements to infrastructure will address and improve resiliency efforts.

10. Implementation and monitoring-who, when and how.
   • There needs to be a single-point of contact among the cities and county that ensures a coordinated effort.
   • There needs to be improvement with the marketing and identifying funding opportunities and incentives within the core area of the beachside area.
   • No need to “reinvent the wheel”. Need to capitalize on existing organizations.