TREASURE COAST REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL

MEMORANDUM

To: Council Members

From: Staff

Date: November 21, 2014 Council Meeting

Subject: Local Government Comprehensive Plan Review
Draft Amendment to the City of Vero Beach Comprehensive Plan
Amendment No. 14-1ESR

Introduction

The Community Planning Act, Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, requires that the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council (TCRPC) review local government comprehensive plan amendments prior to their adoption. TCRPC comments are limited to adverse effects on regional resources and facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP) and extrajurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the comprehensive plan of any local government within the Region. TCRPC must provide any comments to the local government within 30 days of the receipt of the proposed amendments and must also send a copy of any comments to the State Land Planning Agency.

The amendment package from the City of Vero Beach amends the text of the Land Use Element and includes a new technical appendix to the comprehensive plan. This report includes a summary of the proposed amendment and TCRPC comments.

Summary of Proposed Amendment

The proposed amendment adds new Objective 12 and Policies 12.1 through 12.9 related to residential neighborhood strategies to the Land Use Element. The amendment also adds new Figure 1.6, which illustrates the original town neighborhood boundary in the City of Vero Beach. In addition, the amendment adds Appendix IV, a technical support document that presents background data and analysis related to the original town neighborhood. These items are included in the attached Exhibits.

The background information indicates that the previous pattern of approving new or expanded conditional uses has contributed to the erosion of the residential character and viability of the historic neighborhood and low home ownership rates. The new objective and policies encourage private development, redevelopment, and public infrastructure investment and services in the
historic original town center to stabilize and enhance the underlying physical fabric and character of the historic inner city neighborhood.

**Extrajurisdictional Impacts**

TCRPC requested comments from local governments and organizations expressing an interest in reviewing the proposed amendment on October 21, 2014. No extrajurisdictional impacts have been identified.

**Regional Impacts**

No adverse effects on significant regional resources and facilities have been identified.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendment is consistent with the SRPP.

**Recommendation**

Council should approve this report and authorize its transmittal to the City of Vero Beach and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.

**Attachments**
## List of Exhibits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Location Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Objective 12 and Policies 12.1 through 12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Figure 1.6 Original Town Neighborhood Boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Appendix IV Technical Support Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4.2.0 Residential Neighborhood Strategies

Objective 12:

The City, with the active support of Original Town property owners, residents, businesses, and civic/business associations, shall work to stabilize the underlying physical fabric of this historic inner city neighborhood and its remaining residential areas by encouraging quality residential infill and redevelopment along with appropriate public infrastructure investment, and regulatory programs that promote increased home ownership and housing opportunities and retain the historic residential character of the neighborhood, while limiting further intrusion of incompatible nonresidential uses.

Policies:

12.1 The City recognizes the boundaries of the Original Town neighborhood for planning purposes by adopting the map in Figure 1-6. The adopted map shall be used to describe the geographic limits for application of specific comprehensive plan policies and implementation activities related to the Original Town neighborhood under Objective 12.

12.2 The City recognizes the Original Town Neighborhood Association as a neighborhood contact organization for City staff. Other civic and business associations may request to be identified as a neighborhood contact organization upon written request to the City and approval by City Council. As a neighborhood contact organization, the organization shall be notified by the City prior to any public hearing for proposed future land use and zoning changes, amendments to comprehensive plan policies, major site plans and project architectural review, and conditional uses that may affect the neighborhood. Any neighborhood contact organization shall be willing to assist the City staff in coordinating any City planning, code enforcement, community policing, and other public programs in the neighborhood and act as the liaison between the neighborhood and City staff.

12.3 The City shall preserve the historic gridiron pattern and connectivity of existing streets and alleyways by denying property-owner initiated petitions for abandonment of public right-of-way or license applications for permanent private use of public right-of-way.

12.4 To protect the integrity and viability of remaining predominately residential areas of the Original Town neighborhood, any request for a change in the zoning map designation from residential to nonresidential for properties north of 22nd Street, shall be required to demonstrate that, in addition to meeting the criteria for a rezoning in the Land Development Regulations, such a change:

- Is warranted based on a substantial change in circumstances to the subject property or adjacent properties; and
• Will not adversely impact on the viability of existing residential uses and lead to further expansion of nonresidential uses along a predominately residential street.

12.5 To limit the further encroachment of disruptive conditional uses into the neighborhood that adversely impact the neighborhood’s historic residential character and resources, any proposed new or expansion of an existing conditional use in the Original Town neighborhood shall be required to demonstrate that the proposed project will not adversely impact existing historic residential buildings in addition to meeting all conditional use criteria in the Land Development Regulations. For purposes of this policy the following definitions apply:

• Historic building – any building identified as, eligible for historic designation on the national or local historic registers.

• Adverse impact - The demolition or substantial alterations to the exterior of a historic building that negatively impact its historical authenticity.

12.6 The Planning and Development Department staff shall endeavor to investigate and prepare a draft report with recommendations for review by the Planning and Zoning Board by July 15, 2015, identifying specific regulatory changes that can be implemented through an overlay district and/or other amendments to other pertinent sections of the City’s Land Development Regulations to encourage and facilitate compatible residential infill development and redevelopment in the Original Town neighborhood. The report will serve as a guide in preparing and implementing desired changes in the Land Development Regulations. Any changes in the Land Development Regulations shall have, as appropriate, performance standards to ensure or promote compatibility with existing historic buildings and neighborhood characteristics.

Such investigation may cover, but not be necessarily limited to the following concepts:

• Overlay District Amending RM 10/12 district regulations – amendments to the RM 10/12 zoning district regulations through enactment of an overlay district to facilitate residential infill development by modifying underlying development standards and requirements.

• Residential group projects – on a project-by-project basis, projects to be approved through the conditional use process; modifies and/or allows for waivers from underlying development standards to facilitate residential infill development.
• Residential infill overlay district – applies to all residential lots meeting certain eligibility requirements; modifies underlying development standards to provide more flexibility for residential infill development.

• Conservation or neighborhood stabilization overlay district – applies to all properties in the neighborhood; establishes specific development standards for new and existing development intended to facilitate infill development and additions/renovation to existing development.

• TDRs (“transfer of development rights”) – provides for the transfer of density from one property to another within the RM 10/12 zoning district in the neighborhood as an incentive to attract investment in residential infill projects.

12.7 Any decision regarding the preparation and enactment of an overlay district regulations for the neighborhood should consider the following factors:

• Public interest to be served;

• Level of property owner support in relation to the impact of the regulations on property owners;

• Recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Board, Historic Preservation Commission, and City staff; and

• Sufficiency of available financial and staff resources to prepare and administer the overlay district regulations.

12.8 The City through its Historic Preservation Commission shall encourage and assist in the preservation of the historic character of the Original Town neighborhood and homes through the following actions:

1. Educate, encourage and assist property owners in applying for designation on the Vero Beach’s local historic register and in renovating and restoring designated historic structures and obtaining property tax abatement for eligible renovations.

2. Provide assistance to the neighborhood contact organization and property owners interested in pursuing neighborhood designation on the National Register of Historic Places for the area as recommended in the Historic Resource Survey Update of the Original Town and Osceola Park Area Neighborhoods.

3. Participate in coordination with the Planning and Zoning Board in advising the City Council on any overlay districts and regulations to be considered specifically for the neighborhood.
12.9 In conjunction with the neighborhood contact organization, property owners, residents, and businesses, the City shall promote the stabilization and enhancement of the neighborhood through the following actions consistent with the constraints on the City’s financial and staff resources:

1. Continue to provide Police Department support for Neighborhood Watch Program and increased community policing in the neighborhood in response to need of residents and businesses.

2. Support neighborhood efforts to improve traffic and pedestrian safety through the City’s traffic calming program.

3. Work to identify, prioritize and budget needed neighborhood public infrastructure improvements with input from the Original Town Neighborhood Association and other stakeholders as part of the City’s Five-Year Capital Program, such as additional street and alley lighting, drainage facilities, sidewalks, roadway improvements, and other public improvements.

4. Identify appropriate federal and state grants programs to secure financial assistance for construction of infrastructure improvements identified in the City’s Five-Year Capital Program.

5. Support efforts to establish neighborhood identification signs at gateway entrances and specialized neighborhood street signage with the historical street names to help better create a sense of place and neighborhood identification.

6. Support efforts to stabilize and improve the overall appearance of the neighborhood through comprehensive code enforcement of zoning, housing, and property maintenance regulations and through the active participation of property owners and residents with City code enforcement and solid waste personnel in comprehensive cleanup programs.

7. Provide outreach support by the City’s professional staff to property owners, residents, and businesses, if requested by the neighborhood contact organization in addressing planning, historic preservation, code enforcement, police, and public service issues that affect the neighborhood.

8. Work with the Indian River County MPO, the GoLine transit service and neighborhood contact organization to coordinate the location of bus stops and routes in the neighborhood.
Exhibit 3
Figure 1.6 Original Town Neighborhood Boundary
APPENDIX IV
TECHNICAL SUPPORT DOCUMENT
ORIGINAL TOWN NEIGHBORHOOD
OBJECTIVE AND POLICIES OF THE
LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

OVERVIEW

This document presents the background data and analysis to support the amendment to the Land Use Element of the City of Vero Beach Comprehensive Plan specifically tailored to the Original Town neighborhood. This amendment establishes an objective and supporting policies for encouraging private development/redevelopment and public infrastructure investment and service decisions in the historic Original Town neighborhood to stabilize and enhance the underlying physical fabric and character of this historic inner city neighborhood.

BACKGROUND

In its adoption of the Original Town Neighborhood Enhancement Strategies in 2009, the City Council directed staff to thoroughly review, refine, modify and/or expand strategies contained in that document designated as a City responsibility. Subsequently, the Vero Beach Evaluation and Appraisal Report for the City of Vero Beach Comprehensive Plan adopted by the City Council on September 21, 2010, recommended that the Land Use Element be amended to include an objective and set of supporting policies for the Original Town neighborhood based on the adopted neighborhood enhancement strategies.

Using the Original Town Neighborhood Enhancement Strategies as the starting basis for this effort, the staff prepared an objective and set of supporting policies for the Original Town neighborhood. The initial draft objective and set of policies went through numerous reiterations based on input at several Planning and Zoning Board public workshops including a Planning and Zoning Board evening workshop held in the Original Town neighborhood in March of 2014.

Neighborhood Profile

The Original Town neighborhood is the oldest residential neighborhood in the City. It was part of the first subdivision established by the Indian River Land Company in 1913 that eventually became the Town of Vero.

The neighborhood has an estimated population of less than 380. The 2010 U.S. Census shows a total of 221 housing units of which 185 units were occupied for a vacancy rate of 16% compared to a City-wide vacancy rate of 27%. [Vacancy rate includes seasonal housing.] Approximately 26% of the occupied units are owner occupied compared to a City-wide figure of around 65%.

Of the total of 221 housing units, it is estimated that 71 are in single-family structures and 150 units in structures or on lots with 2 or more units. A survey of the condition of housing structures in the neighborhood conducted by staff in 2009 found that the overall condition of
housing to be good. Except for a few isolated cases, the condition of housing has not materially changed since that survey.

Based on the 2009 survey, single-family uses account for 22.4 percent (14.1 acres), multi-family uses 14.9% (9.4 acres), commercial/office 7.5% (4.8 acres), public/institutional 54.3% (34.3 acres), and vacant 0.9% (.6 acres) of the total 63.2 acres comprising the neighborhood (excluding rights-of-way). The majority of the neighborhood (72.2%) is zoned RM-10//12 Multi-family residential at 10 units per acre. The remainder of the neighborhood is designated under one of three different nonresidential districts.

Specific socio-economic data for the neighborhood is unavailable as much of this data is only available by census tract or group block data which are larger in area than the neighborhood. Furthermore, the boundaries of the 2000 and 2010 Census Tract and block group data that contain the neighborhood differ.

However, based on extrapolated 2010 U.S. Census data the population of the neighborhood is considerably younger than the City’s population. The percentage of the neighborhood’s population age 65 and older is approximately half of that for the City (28.4%) as a whole. The percentage of the population under age 18 is slightly less than that for the City (18.9%).

Census data on education and household income at the block group level is unavailable as of this writing. However, the 2000 U.S. Census showed that the neighborhood’s population was less educated than the city’s population as a whole. Based on the 2009 American Community Survey prepared by the U.S. Census the median household income was 10 percent less than that for the City.

DATA AND ANALYSIS

The following is the background data and analysis that provided the policy basis and rationale for the amendment to the Land Use Element:

1.4.2.0 Residential Neighborhood Strategies

A new category is added to the Land Use Element to establish a placeholder in the text for the incorporation of residential objectives and policies for individual residential neighborhoods to be added later.

Objective 12 – Original Town Objective

The grid pattern of the neighborhoods streets and alleyways serves as the “bones” or basic framework of the historic neighborhood. This pattern encourages dispersion of traffic and improves connectivity for cars and pedestrians.

It serves to provide strong connections between the neighborhood and the downtown and other inner city neighborhoods. The alleys allow service delivery and parking in the rear of residences rather than on the narrow residential streets in the neighborhood.
Over the years, the historic street grid established has been disrupted through the vacating of streets and alleyways. In particular, 19th Avenue between 23rd and 22nd Streets and 22nd Street between 15th and 17th Avenues were abandoned to accommodate the expansion of large religious institutions. These abandonments have led to loss of connectivity and further facilitated the expansion of non-residential uses south of 23rd Street.

Since the 1970’s, the residential area of the neighborhood south of 23rd has experienced expansion of commercial, institutional and public uses replacing the predominately residential uses in that area. By comparing recent survey data compiled by staff with data from the 1970 City Atlas, more than 70 single family residences have been lost from the neighborhood blocks south of 23rd Street since 1970.

The average density of single family development is approximately 5 units per acre. Duplex and multi-family uses average 15.8 units per acre. The overall density of existing residential uses is about 9.4 units per acre.

The average density of existing multi-family and single family developed properties is higher than the allowed under the existing RM-10/12 zoning district. Many of the lots in terms of width, area, and setbacks with existing residential development don’t meet the current Code as most of the properties were developed before significant amendments were enacted to the City’s zoning regulations in the 1980’s.

Some vesting provisions exist in the Code for lots of record; however, the existing zoning is restrictive for new residential development, limiting opportunities for redevelopment and infill to more efficiently utilize available land, further stabilize the neighborhood and expand the residential population base. These restrictions may lessen the pressure to demolish these historic residential structures, but make redevelopment of these properties more difficult. (See discussion of Policy 12.6)

The RM-10/12 zoning district covers more than 72 percent of all property within the neighborhood. In addition to residential uses and congregate living facilities, this zoning allows by conditional use approval, places of worship, day care facilities, cultural activities, educational institutions, golf courses and country clubs, and public and private facilities.

Certain vested conditional uses, such as offices and medical clinics, were permitted in the neighborhood until the City’s zoning regulations were amended in 2003. These vested conditional uses are given flexibility under special vesting provisions that allow limited expansion of these uses or even a change to other conditional uses that were previously allowed in the RM-10/12 zoning district.

This historical pattern of approving new or expanded conditional uses has resulted in an estimated 46 percent of the parcels zoned RM-10/12 located south of 25th Street to be occupied by an approved conditional use. Such approvals have contributed to the further erosion of the residential character and viability of the historic neighborhood and to low home ownership rates.
This impact is somewhat reflected in a homeownership rate of 26 percent according to the 2010 U.S. Census compared to the rate for the City as a whole. Such a low rate of homeownership is not unexpected in a neighborhood where only a quarter of the housing units are single-family detached and the population is younger, with lower household incomes and more transient than in other parts of the City.

Significantly, the reduction in the number of housing units and the decrease in average household size has reduced the total resident population of the neighborhood to less than 380. To be a viable and sustainable neighborhood, Original Town needs increased residential development to expand its base of residential stakeholders. Increased housing opportunities will benefit from the connectivity and short walking distance to most parts of the historic downtown. Not only does this proximity to the downtown benefit residential development in the neighborhood, but it also benefits the downtown by giving it the increased customer base to sustain its retail, entertainment, and cultural establishments.

The proposed objective specifically addresses these issues through its supporting policies. It is based on the consolidation into one overall objective of the goals from each of the various elements of the Original Town Neighborhood Enhancement Strategies.

The predominate theme of the objective statement is neighborhood preservation through a mixture of development and public/private investment decisions, policies, and programs to stabilize the underlying physical framework of the historic residential neighborhood while limiting further intrusion of incompatible nonresidential uses into remaining predominately residential areas. Clearly stated is the need to attract additional residential growth to both stabilize and improve the viability and sustainability of the historic neighborhood.

Policy 12.1 – Boundary Map

The physical boundaries of the Original Town neighborhood must be identified in the Comprehensive Plan, since the proposed objective and policies are to be specifically applied to this geographic area. The boundary map in Figure 1-6 is drawn directly from the Original Town Neighborhood Enhancement Strategies. The physical boundaries of the neighborhood were determined with the active participation of the Original Town Neighborhood Association and residents.

Policy 12.2 – Neighborhood Contact Organization

A significant contribution to the viability and stability of any residential neighborhood is the need for an open, working relationship between its stakeholders (residents and property and business owners) and the City as well as other governmental and nongovernmental organizations. This policy recognizes the need to facilitate and build such a relationship.

It is preferable for the City to have one or more local contact organizations rather than relating to numerous individual residents and business and property owners. Such an approach allows the City to better allocate its limited resources to addressing neighborhood issues and coordinating services and infrastructure improvements. It also assists in bringing stakeholders together to
address issues of mutual concern, recognizing that the responsibility for the viability and stability of the neighborhood rests primarily with the stakeholders themselves.

**Policy 12.3 – Prohibition on Vacating of ROW**

As noted under the analysis of the objective statement above, the historic grid street system in the neighborhood has been disrupted and connections lost due to vacating of streets for the expansion of nonresidential uses. This policy supports the objective to preserve the grid system by denying property-owner initiated petitions for abandonment of public right-of-way. It does not preclude any City sponsored action to vacate right-of-way.

**Policy 12.4 – Restrictions on Rezoning to Nonresidential Uses.**

Although the “Great Recession” has had a dampening effect on conversion of residential lands to commercial and institutional uses, over the years, nonresidential uses have expanded in the neighborhood. This expansion has been principally in the southern portion of the neighborhood resulting from approvals of new conditional uses or the expansion of existing ones. The remaining residential uses are primarily concentrated in the area north of 22nd Street and south of nonresidential development along 25th Street.

A particular concern is the threat for the rezoning of properties to POI (Professional Office Institutional) as this designation is allowed in areas designated Residential Medium or High under the Comprehensive Plan. Although Policy 1.16 in the Land Use Element ostensibly limits such rezoning to locations “principally” along arterial roadways, it still leaves the door open to rezoning of properties not so situated. The City has still not undertaken a comprehensive review of the POI district regulations as called for in Policy 1.17.

The proposed policy further limits encroachment of nonresidential development into the remaining residential area north of 22nd Street. It establishes new criteria in addition to those in Section 65.22 of the City Code and Policy 1.16 of the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan that must be met in approving any rezoning of property from residential to nonresidential.

**Policy 12.5 – Policy to Restrict Further Expansion of Conditional Uses**

This proposed policy directly addresses the issue of the encroachment and expansion of conditional uses, which now occupy 46 percent of all property within the neighborhood. In addition to conditional uses, the RM-10/12 zoning district allows by right single family, duplex and multiple-family (10 units/acre) uses, adult congregate living facilities, and nursing homes.

Although the City Code contains specific criteria required to be met in approving a conditional use, history has shown that such criteria have not been entirely effective in protecting this neighborhood from expansion of such uses. In the initial set of policies drafted by the staff, an overlay district was considered that would apply to properties zoned RM-10/12 located between 22nd and 25th Streets. This geographic area contains the remaining concentration of residential uses in the neighborhood.
The properties within this overlay district would be subject to the district’s underlying RM-10/12 regulations. However, except for a few exceptions for certain conditional uses, the establishment of new conditional uses or the expansion of existing conditional uses to vacant or parcels with residential uses would be prohibited within the overlay district.

At a neighborhood workshop held by the Planning and Zoning Board on March 20, 2014, to discuss the initial set of draft policies, some participants voiced concerns that a wholesale prohibition on expansion of conditional uses to vacant properties or properties with residential uses would be too burdensome for property owners. As proposed, it appeared to these individuals that the restrictions unfairly treated new conditional uses or expanded conditional uses the same with no recourse for a waiver or a variance.

After further reconsideration subsequent to that workshop, the staff proposed a different approach that doesn’t require the enactment of an overlay district. Instead it relies on adding a criterion to Policy 11.5 that must be met by any applicant in addition to all criteria already existing in the Land Development Regulations.

This additional criterion specifically focuses on the need to restrict the demolition of historic residential structures or alterations to these structures that negatively impact their historical authenticity. This approach is more flexible than the previously proposed “overlay district” and certainly easier to administer, but it would still serve to protect the residually historic characteristics of the neighborhood without unduly impacting or restricting the rights of property owners.

Policy 12.6 – Investigation of Regulatory Incentives for Encouraging Residential Infill

One of the strategies in the Original Town Neighborhood Enhancement Strategies is to develop and implement design guidelines for new development and substantial improvements to existing development. In response, the staff drafted a general policy establishing a framework and process for enacting overlay district regulations to limit the encroachment of incompatible uses and development through new design and development standards tailored to the community.

At the neighborhood meeting held to discuss the draft objective and policies on March 20th, concerns were raised some of the participants that the emphasis of the draft policy regarding creation of “additional overlay district regulations” in conjunction with those initially proposed in Policy 12.5, was too negative. The criticism was that it focused on more regulations restricting development in the neighborhood rather than focusing on incentives to encourage quality development.

The staff believed that this concern has some validity. Furthermore, as proposed, the policy was purely reactive, establishing procedures for addressing requests from property owners and other stakeholders for the City to prepare and enact overlay regulations. This didn’t fully address the basic need to encourage residential infill development in the neighborhood.

Based on the above considerations, the staff drafted a new Policy 12.6 that directs the staff to investigate specific residential infill concepts that may be applied to the RM-10/12 zoning
district to encourage and facilitate infill development. Specific policy guidelines for enactment of any overlay district regulations are described under Policy 12.7.

Policy 12.6 directs staff to investigate and prepare a report on potential regulatory incentives for encouraging and facilitating residential infill development. The policy calls for the report to be completed by July 15, 2015, for review by the Planning and Zoning Board and eventual recommendation to the City Council. This final report will serve as the guide in preparing appropriate amendments to the City’s Land Development Regulations.

The policy identifies at least four general options to be investigated and evaluated by the staff as follows:

- **Overlay District Amending RM-10/12 District Regulations.** Development standards for the RM-10/12, such as minimum lot area, setbacks, FAR, and open space, could be modified to facilitate infill residential development. The modifications would be enacted through an overlay district. Specific standards would be included to conserve and protect existing historic assets and the neighborhood character.

- **Residential Group Project.** Similar to the provisions in the Land Development Regulations for “Planned Development” in certain commercial zoning districts, “residential group projects” could be approved as a “conditional use” on a project-by-project basis. These projects would be able to modify various development standards or receive waivers from these standards in return from meeting specific standards to ensure compatibility with the character of the existing historic residential neighborhood.

- **Residential Infill Overlay District.** An overlay district could be enacted that would apply to all residential lots in the neighborhood meeting certain eligibility requirements. Residential projects on these lots would be subject to modified development standards intended to facilitate infill and ensure compatibility with the character of the existing historic residential neighborhood.

- **Transfer of Development Rights (TDR).** An overlay district or incorporated for the RM-10/12 zoning district could be enacted that would authorize the transfer of density from one property to another within the zoning district in the neighborhood. Such transfers would be required to meet specific standards intended to ensure compatibility with the character of the existing historic residential neighborhood. This option could be instituted through a geographic specific overlay district or as a provision in all RM-10/12 or other multiple-family zoning districts. This approach still requires further legal review to ensure it doesn’t conflict with the City Charter. It may require a further amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.
Policy 12.7  Policy on Enactment of Residential Neighborhood Overlay Districts

The 2005 Vision Plan recommended that any neighborhood overlay district that establishes restrictive development regulations should be considered only by a neighborhood request or petition representing a “super majority” of property owners. This policy provides a more practicable and less rigid approach that identifies four specific factors that should be considered in determining whether or not to proceed in preparing and enacting a special overlay district for the neighborhood.

Policy 12.8  Preservation of Historic Elements of Neighborhood

As documented in the *Historic Resource Survey Update of the Original Town and Osceola Park Area Neighborhoods*, since the 1990 survey of historic structures in Indian River County more than 14 historic buildings have been demolished in the neighborhood and few have had alterations that adversely impact their historic authenticity. Church expansions, new government buildings, and spread of parking lots to serve these uses have facilitated these changes.

However, the northern portion of the historic neighborhood still contains a significant concentration of buildings of historic significance. The *Historic Resource Survey Update of the Original Town and Osceola Park Area Neighborhoods* identified over 80 properties consisting primarily of single family, duplex, and multi-family structures north of 22nd Street as potentially eligible for historic designation or eligible as a contributing building to a National Register Historic District or a local historic district. The concentration of such eligible historic properties in the neighborhood led to the recommendation in the survey update, that a designated area of the neighborhood be considered for designation as an historic neighborhood on the National Register of Historic Places.

A National Register Historic District, similar to the district established for a portion of the Osceola Park neighborhood, would be much easier to enact than a local historic district as it would not place any regulatory requirements on property owners. As the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance requires the approval of the owner to designate a property as historic, to enact a local historic district would most likely require every property owner within the proposed district to approve such designation. Therefore, it is not considered as a viable option at this point in time.

Rather than enactment of a historic district, a “conservation or neighborhood stabilization” district could be enacted as an overlay district. A conservation district, which would be much less of a regulatory burden on property owners than a local designated historic district, would focus only on regulating those building features and site characteristics deemed necessary to retain the physical look and characteristics of the neighborhood. Such as district could be implemented as element of one of the proposed regulatory approaches identified in Policy 12.6 above and evaluated for implementation based on the four factors in Policy 12.7.

Policy 12.8 establishes a framework for the City and Historic Preservation Commission to assist the neighborhood and property owners in protecting and enhancing the historic residences in the neighborhood. Such efforts include educating and assisting property owners in obtaining historic
designation of their property or designation of the neighborhood on the National Register of Historic Places.

A third element of the policy is for the Historic Preservation Commission to work in conjunction with the Planning and Zoning Board in considering any possible regulatory approaches for the neighborhood and making recommendations to the City Council.

Policy 12.9 City Services and Programs to Stabilize and Enhance Neighborhood

Efforts to stabilize, preserve, and enhance the historic Original Town neighborhood require a comprehensive set of programs and services by the City and the active involvement and commitment of the local neighborhood contact organization, civic organizations, and stakeholders. This policy has numerous elements, the majority of which are based on recommendations of the Original Town Neighborhood Enhancement Strategies. It contains language that acknowledges limitations of the City’s financial and staff resources to deliver and support these programs to the neighborhood.