RESOLUTION NO. #90-M-33

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA, RELATING TO COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT; APPROVING A COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT PLAN PURSUANT TO SECTION 163.360, FLORIDA STATUTES; AFFIRMING THE FINDING OF THE EXISTENCE OF ONE OR MORE SLUM OR BLIGHTED AREAS IN THE COUNTY; DEFINING THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AREA; MAKING CERTAIN FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS; FINDING CONFORMITY TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY TO IMPLEMENT THE PLAN; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Orange County, Florida (the "County Commission"), as the governing body of Orange County, a charter county, in its Resolution No. 90-M23 adopted on April 9, 1990, expressly found the existence of one or more slum or blighted areas within the corporate limits of the City of Orlando, Florida (the "City") and the unincorporated area of Orange County (the "County") as such area was described therein and as described in Exhibit "A" hereof (the "Community Redevelopment Area"), and determined that the rehabilitation, conservation, or redevelopment, or a combination thereof, of the Community Redevelopment Area is necessary and is in the best interests of the public health, safety, morals, or welfare of the residents of the County; and

WHEREAS, the County Commission adopted Resolution No. 90-M24 on April 9, 1990, which established and created the Community Redevelopment Agency of Orange County, Florida (the "Community Redevelopment Agency"), appointed the members of the governing body of the Community Redevelopment Agency, authorized the Community Redevelopment Agency to exercise powers under Part III, Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, as amended (the "Redevelopment Act"), within the Community Redevelopment Area pursuant to Section 163.410, Florida Statutes, and established and designated the Community Redevelopment Area as the area of operation of the Community Redevelopment Agency; and
WHEREAS, a study of the Community Redevelopment Area and a plan for the redevelopment of the Community Redevelopment Area in accordance with the Redevelopment Act have been undertaken and completed; and

WHEREAS, the Community Redevelopment Agency received the proposed community redevelopment plan and referred it to the Planning Board of Orange County, the local planning agency of the County under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act, in accordance with Section 163.360(3), Florida Statutes, and the Planning Board, after reviewing the proposed plan, has determined the plan is consistent with the County's comprehensive plan and returned the proposed community redevelopment plan to the Community Redevelopment Agency with its recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the Community Redevelopment Agency approved the proposed community redevelopment plan on June 4, 1990, and recommended its adoption to the County Commission; and

WHEREAS, notice of the County Commission's intention to adopt a resolution adopting the proposed community redevelopment plan has been given to all "taxing authorities," as that term is defined in the Redevelopment Act, as provided in Section 163.346, Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, public notice regarding the proposed community redevelopment plan was duly provided in accordance with Section 163.346, Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, all prerequisites under the Redevelopment Act having been accomplished, it is now appropriate and necessary in order to proceed further with the redevelopment of the Community Redevelopment Area in accordance with the Redevelopment Act that a community redevelopment plan for the Community Redevelopment Area be approved.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA:

SECTION 1. The County Commission does hereby affirm the finding in its Resolution No. 90-M23 adopted on April 9,
1990, that one or more slum or blighted areas (as those terms are defined in Section 163.340, Florida Statutes) exist within the Community Redevelopment Area.

SECTION 2. The area designated in Resolution No. 90-M24 finding one or more slum or blighted areas to exist in the County and as described in Resolution No. 90-M24 creating the Community Redevelopment Agency, which area is more particularly described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto, is the Community Redevelopment Area for the purpose of this Resolution and the community redevelopment plan approved hereby.

SECTION 3. The County Commission does hereby find that:

1. There has been prepared a community redevelopment plan entitled Orange Blossom Trail Redevelopment Plan providing for redevelopment of the Community Redevelopment Area in accordance with the Redevelopment Act (such plan being hereinafter defined and referred to herein as the "Plan"); and

2. the Planning Board of the County, as the local planning agency of the County under the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act, has reviewed the Plan in accordance with the Redevelopment Act and has found it to be consistent with the comprehensive plan of the County; and

3. the Community Redevelopment Agency reviewed and approved the Plan on June 4, 1990 and recommended its approval to the County Commission; and

4. a notice of public hearing was timely published in a newspaper of general circulation and notice to taxing authorities was timely mailed as provided in Section 163.346, Florida Statutes, and a public hearing has been held as required by Section 163.360(5), Florida Statutes.

SECTION 4. The County Commission finds that the Plan satisfies the requirements of Section 163.360(6), Florida Statutes, and further finds that:
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1. a feasible method exists for the location of any families anticipated to be displaced as a result of community redevelopment as proposed in the Plan in decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling accommodations within their means and without undue hardship to such families;

2. the Plan conforms to the general plan or the County as a whole;

3. the Plan gives due consideration to providing adequate park and recreation areas and facilities that may be desirable for neighborhood improvements; and

4. the Plan affords the maximum opportunity, consistent with the sound needs of the County as a whole, for the rehabilitation or redevelopment of the Community Redevelopment Area by private enterprise.

SECTION 5. The County Commission does hereby expressly find that the Plan is consistent with and conforms to the provisions of the County's comprehensive plan in effect on the date hereof.

SECTION 6. The County Commission does hereby expressly determine that it is appropriate, proper, and timely that a community redevelopment plan be approved at this time so that the provisions of the Redevelopment Act, and other resolutions, ordinances, and laws may be utilized to further redevelopment within the Community Redevelopment Area. Therefore, the County Commission does hereby approve for the Community Redevelopment Area pursuant to Section 163.360(6), Florida Statutes, the document entitled Orange Blossom Trail Redevelopment Plan, prepared by Herbert/Halback, Inc., and approved by the Community Redevelopment Agency on June 4, 1990, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "B" and made a part hereof (the "Plan"), subject to the concurrence therein by the City Council of the City (the "City Council").

SECTION 7. The Commission does hereby expressly find that the Plan is a sufficient and adequate plan for carrying out community redevelopment in accordance with the
Redevelopment Act, and does approve same as the community redevelopment plan for the Community Redevelopment Area in accordance with Section 6 hereof.

SECTION 8. The County Commission, pursuant to Section 163.356(1), Florida Statutes, does hereby propose the Plan to the City Council for its review thereof and concurrence therein in accordance with the Redevelopment Act.

SECTION 9. Immediately upon adoption of this Resolution, the Plan is deemed to be in full force and effect for the Community Redevelopment Area, and the Community Redevelopment Agency is authorized and directed to carry out such Plan and exercise those powers granted by the Redevelopment Act, or such other powers as may be granted by law or ordinance.

SECTION 10. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA, THIS __th DAY OF ____________, 1990.

ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA

BY: [Signature]
Vice Chairman, Board of County Commissioners
DATE: JUN 11 1990

ATTEST: Martha O. Haynie, Comptroller
as Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners

BY: [Signature]
Asst. Deputy Clerk
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EXHIBIT "A"
OVERALL BOUNDARIES - OBT CRA

Begin at the intersection of the south right-of-way line of West Colonial Drive (S.R. #50) and the west right-of-way line of Spring Dale Drive; thence east along the said south right-of-way of West Colonial Drive (S.R. #50) to the intersection of the centerline of Westmoreland Avenue; thence south along the said center of Westmoreland Avenue to the intersection of the easterly right-of-way line of Interstate 4 (S.R. #400); thence southwesterly along said easterly right-of-way line of Interstate 4 (S.R. #400) to the intersection of the north right-of-way line of 34th Street; thence west along said north right-of-way line of 34th Street to the intersection of the westerly right-of-way line of Interstate 4 (S.R. #400); thence north along the said westerly right-of-way line of Interstate 4 (S.R. #400) to the intersection of the north right-of-way line of 33rd Street; thence west along the said north right-of-way line of 33rd Street to the intersection of the west right-of-way line of Rio Grande Avenue; thence north along the said west right-of-way line of Rio Grande Avenue to the intersection of the shoreline of Lake Lorna Doone; thence northerly along the said shoreline of Lorna Doone to the intersection of the west right-of-way line of Jamil Avenue; thence north along said west right-of-way line of Jamil Avenue to the intersection of the south shoreline of Rock Lake; thence northeasterly along said east shoreline of Rock Lake to the intersection of the east property line of Block 'D' of Arlington Terrace; thence southwest, west, and north along said property line of Block 'D' of Arlington Terrace to the intersection of the south right-of-way line of West Amelia Street; thence north and then west along said south right-of-way line of West Amelia Street to the intersection of the west right-of-way line of North Madison Avenue; thence north along said west right-of-way line of North Madison Avenue to a point, said point being the intersection of the west right-of-way line of North Madison Avenue with the projected north right-of-way line of West Concord Street; thence east to the intersection of the east right-of-way line of North Madison Avenue and the north right-of-way line of West Concord Street; thence east along said north right-of-way line of West Concord Street to the intersection of the west right-of-way line of Spring Dale Drive; thence north along said west right-of-way line of Spring Dale Drive to the intersection of the south right-of-way of West Colonial Drive (S.R. #50) said to be the point of beginning.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 HISTORY OF STUDY

1.1.1 Purpose

This is the third of three studies initiated by the Orange Blossom Trail Development Board for the Orange County Commission and the City of Orlando for the proposed revitalization of the Orange Blossom Trail Community Redevelopment Area (OBT-CRA). The purpose of this study is to compile and assess information from the first two studies and to propose a means of implementation.

The first study, Finding of Necessity, describes the extent of slum and blighted conditions along the Trail, documenting the need for redevelopment. Specifically, this report cites problems such as crime, poor building conditions, low economic activity, poor housing and inadequate infrastructure. Further complicating revitalization opportunities are the fragmented ownership patterns and the difficulty of land assembly and relocation.

The second report, Alternative Design Concepts, deals with the opportunity for redevelopment. This study assesses the market potential and identifies eight specific 'opportunity sites' where marketable uses might best be targeted.

The Community Redevelopment Plan (CRP) utilizes information generated from the first two studies, along with sign and streetscape guidelines previously proposed for the OBT MSTU area by Herbert/Halback, Inc. for the OBT Development Board in March, 1989. The goals and objectives within the CRP are in collaboration with previous studies and other CRP's within Orange County and the City of Orlando. These include:

- Callahan/Lake Dot Neighborhood Plan
- Holden Heights Small Area Study
- City of Orlando Community Redevelopment Plan
- City of Orlando Growth Management Plan
- Orange County Growth Management Plan
1.1.2 History

Orange Blossom Trail (OBT) is a State (SR 500) and Federal Road (441) designed to connect many regional areas around Orlando. The Trail historically has served as a major north/south arterial route through greater Orlando. In the early sixties, prior to the creation of shopping malls and Interstate-4 (I-4), OBT was a thriving commercial district supported by a healthy residential community. However, changing transportation patterns and sprawling suburban growth coupled with a lack of public improvements have contributed to the decline of this aging urban area. Additionally, severe crime problems and economic decline have caused a negative public perception.

By the year 1983, it was evident that serious public intervention was required to reclaim this area as a viable and safe district within the community. A 'blue ribbon' task force was created involving both city and county representatives, with a goal of defining specific actions that would lead to revitalization. Their recommendation was to form the Orange Blossom Trail Development Board, whose purpose is to generate public interest and revitalize the Trail. Randall Grief, Executive Director of the OBT Development Board, was hired in 1985 to oversee and coordinate OBT related issues.

The initial revitalization study by the Board culminated in the formation of a Municipal Services Taxing Unit (MSTU) for the portion of the Trail between I-4 and the Bee-Line Expressway. While this area has a poor visual image due to uncontrolled signage, unenforced landscape codes, and a lack of overall development controls, it is nonetheless a viable economic strip. Since development is occurring at a rapid pace, design guidelines were developed to be implemented with Florida Department of Transportation's proposed road widening to six lanes. The MSTU will be used to make improvements to the right-of-way in conjunction with this road widening project.

The section of the Trail north of I-4 has a considerably different character. From the time it was built-out in the 1950's and 1960's, little redevelopment has occurred to infuse the area with new
character and vitality. This is due, in part, to the low income neighborhoods surrounding the area which are unable to support service business.

Additionally, the environmental quality of OBT is plagued with severe neglect, lack of economic and social interest, traffic congestion and overall deterioration. Many of the businesses have become obsolete, building conditions are deteriorated, and the area is economically depressed. Visual pollution from overhead lines, billboards, and signs contribute to the vast decline in the quality of the environment and standard of living.

1.1.3 Location

The Orange Blossom Trail Community Redevelopment Area centers on the Orange Blossom Trail (State Road 500 and Federal Hwy. 441 and 17-92), and is bounded by Colonial Drive (S.R. 50) to the north, Westmoreland Avenue to the east, Interstate-4 to the south, and Rio Grande Avenue to the west. Approximately two-thirds of the study area is within the City of Orlando, with the remainder in unincorporated Orange County. The boundary between the two jurisdictions is in the vicinity of Columbia and Grand Avenues. These boundaries were established to form logical boundaries in relation to OBT and adjacent study areas. The I-4 boundary abuts the existing MSTU area while the northern boundary is defined by West Colonial Drive. The east and west boundaries of the CRA were determined by the extent of blighted conditions within the neighborhoods which could be directly related to the negative influence of the Trail. The City of Orlando Community Redevelopment Area was expanded to join the eastern edge of the OBT Redevelopment Area. See Figure 1 for the CRA location map, Figure 2 for the Context Map, and Appendix A for the legal boundary description.
1.2 EXISTING CONDITIONS SUMMARY AND IDENTIFICATION OF SUB AREAS

The Orange Blossom Trail Community Redevelopment Area is approximately 856 acres with an estimated population of 6,407. The project area is divided into five Sub Areas, located along Orange Blossom Trail, extending east to Westmoreland Drive and west to Rio Grand Avenue. However, existing land-use patterns, east-west thoroughfare boundaries and development potential define each area.

The Sub Areas all show signs of general property deterioration and are visually cluttered with overhead utilities and poles, excessive signage and large billboards. Many properties are void of landscaping, increasing the impact of the road and paved areas. Following is a brief description of existing conditions of each Sub-Area.

Sub Area No. 1
Colonial Drive/Rock Lake

Sub Area No.1 is bordered by West Colonial Drive (Hwy. 50) to the north and Central Boulevard to the south. There are approximately 205.5 acres with 8/10's of a linear mile of OBT frontage (See Figure 3). The primary zoning classification is industrial (65%) with pockets of residential areas on the east and west borders and mixed commercial and office areas along Colonial Drive and the Trail.

This Sub Area contains a mobile home park, motels, auto related services, boat sales and light industrial facilities. Many outdoor operations are not screened from motorists' view.

Colonial Drive frontage is undergoing significant positive redevelopment in the office market which creates the potential for spin-off development on the Trail in this vicinity. Another asset to Sub Area No.1 is Rock Lake and the adjacent vacant property. Rock Lake neighborhood, located to the west of OBT near Colonial Drive, is characterized by well maintained homes and properties with mature tree-lined boulevards.

Although this Sub Area shows signs of redevelopment, there are pockets of residential and business areas that remain deteriorated. The Callahan-Lake Dot residential neighborhood falls into this category and has been previously
studied by the City Planning Bureau, Growth Management Division in 1989. The results of this study can be found in the report, *Callahan-Lake Dot Neighborhood Plan*.

Public investments in Sub Area No. 1 have been primarily minor infrastructure improvements, including median landscaping near the Colonial Drive intersection.

The County plans, however, to widen Washington Street (Old Winter Garden Road) west of the Trail which could result in increased traffic to the neighborhood on the east side of the Trail. The City is planning to mitigate this impact by reorienting the residences to side streets. Additionally, there is a new, well-kept social services building on Washington Street.

Private investments include new construction on the Trail at the intersection of Robinson Street. Redevelopment potential for this area is high and will be discussed later in this report.
ROCK LAKE NEIGHBORHOOD

CALLAHAN/ LAKE DOT
NEIGHBORHOOD

SUB AREA NO. 1

Figure 3
Sub Area No. 2
East/West Expressway

Sub Area No. 2 is bordered by Central Boulevard to the north and Citrus Avenue/Monte Carlo Trail to the south. There are approximately 209 acres, with 9/10's of a linear mile of OBT frontage. (See Figure 4) Zoning is primarily industrial (42%) with a mixture of residential and other land uses.

This area has great development potential due to the excellent transportation access from the East/West Expressway. Future plans to link the Expressway with an area wide belt-way will increase accessibility. Jones High School, located north of Gore Street to the West of the Trail, is an area landmark which is undergoing renovation of buildings and grounds.

Sub Area No. 2 is adjacent to the Orlando Citrus Bowl Complex, Tinker Field, the Sports Complex, and practice fields. There is a potential for growth associated with the continued expansion of these facilities. The possibility of a future major league baseball or football team locating a facility in this area should not be overlooked.

Recent public investments include roadway improvements along the Trail in this Sub Area.

A County-owned bus wash area and other storage type facilities are located in this Sub Area and are not screened from view. Although they are valid uses, they are an eye-sore and detract from the overall visual character. Additionally, the no-man's land they create along the Trail frontage impacts pedestrian movement.

This area has experienced the greatest private sector growth in the last few years and has been especially sensitive to development and redevelopment downtown. There are several service business operations including: fast food restaurants, service stations, a mini warehouse storage facility, a 7-11, and a motel. A City park and athletic fields provide open "green" space and are well maintained. Additionally, there has been recent building facade renovation on the west side of OBT, between South and Church Streets. The City's 'Activity-Core' designation at the Gore Street intersection appears to have contributed to this stimulation of growth.
SUB AREA NO. 2

Figure 4
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Sub Area No. 3
Grand Street

Sub Area No. 3 is bordered by Monte Carlo Trail/Citrus Avenue to the north and Miller Street to the south. There are approximately 114 acres, with over 1/3 of a linear mile of OBT frontage (See Figure 5).

The City/County line runs along and between Columbia Street and Grand Street, dividing Sub Area No. 3, with the northern portion within City jurisdiction and the remainder of the Sub-Area within County jurisdiction. There is an assortment of zoning classifications and non-conforming land uses, which gives this area a fragmented, non-consistent appearance.

This area contains two mobile homes parks, a motel, adult entertainment operations, junk yards and storage areas, a country music entertainment establishment, and a vacant gas station. There is also a small farm, warehouses and a heavy construction business in this area. Sub Area No. 3 is in critical need of revitalization and beautification.

The greatest potential of Sub Area No. 3 is through infill of the several vacant properties. No known public or private improvements have recently occurred or are proposed at this time. The two large trailer parks (only one of which is zoned R-3B) provide needed low income housing. Unfortunately, they are grossly inadequate in providing acceptable living conditions. However, undertaking the relocation of all the residents of these parks for redevelopment is not feasible or politically sound at this time. For this reason, it is advisable to concentrate on the available vacant land for infill according to zoning classification.
Sub Area No. 4
Holden Heights

Sub Area No. 4 is bordered by Miller Street to the north and by a jagged line along 27th Street, Grant Street, and mid-block of 26th and 27th streets to the south, generally following the zoning line between residential and commercial uses (See Figure 6). There are approximately 174 acres, with just over one-half of a linear mile of OBT frontage.

The primary land use is single-family housing, with a strip of commercial development along both sides of the Trail, usually no more than one lot deep.

This Sub Area contains the Holden Heights residential district. The Orange County Planning Department prepared a report, Holden Heights Study Area, in October of 1988. This report examines existing conditions, including land use and zoning, road utilities and other services, and makes policy recommendations.

Sub Area No. 4 is characterized by poor housing conditions, dirt roads, open drainage ditches, and a lack of sanitary sewers. The greatest positive factor is the presence of a generous tree canopy which is visible from the Trail. There is a small pond which has recently been improved and redefined which acts as a neighborhood amenity.

The commercial strip along OBT includes a 7-11, the Sands Motel and a power equipment business, auto service operations, an adult entertainment business (the Mousetrap). A small County-owned park and several churches are located within the residential area including the First Church of the Nazzarine on West Kaley Street. The Church plans to expand and will eventually offer community services such as day care, adult care, and a 'latch key children' program. Liquor World, a walk-in clinic, a convenience store and an office are located along Rio Grande Avenue. There has been little renovation or redevelopment in this area primarily due to the lack of sanitary sewers. The exception is the current construction of a Texaco gas station on the corner of OBT and Kaley Street.
SUB AREA NO. 4

FIGURE 6
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Sub Area No. 5
Interstate 4 (I-4)

Sub Area No. 5 is bordered by 27th Street, Grant Street, and mid-block of 26th and 27th streets on the north, and I-4 on the south. There are approximately 84 acres, with just over one third of a linear mile of OBT frontage. Zoning is primarily commercial (79%) with some residential areas (See Figure 7). The existing land uses include auto service stations, outdoor storage, a motel, adult entertainment establishments, and other small business operations. There are several houses which have been converted to businesses throughout the neighborhoods. Similar to Sub Area No. 4, this area lacks sanitary sewer service and is forced to rely on septic tank systems. However, Interstate 4 provides excellent accessibility and visibility to OBT frontage in Sub Area No. 5.

Unfortunately, there is no access from I-4 heading west to the northern section of the Trail. This forces motorists coming from downtown to exit on Michigan Avenue and travel west toward the Trail. Recent studies have offered various solutions to this problem but no plans have been finalized. One solution being considered is to close the Michigan Avenue exits, and connect the 'Central Connector' to I-4 between Kaley and Michigan. This plan would necessitate the addition of the North-bound ramp onto the Trail thereby increasing accessibility.

There have been no known recent public or private improvements. This is partially due to the lack of sanitary sewers.
1.3 FINDING OF NECESSITY SUMMARY

1.3.1 Crime

Historically, OBT has been the center for prostitution in the City and County due to the location of adult businesses. In 1983, it accounted for 36% of all sex offense arrests in the City. The County has had similar disproportionately large statistics. The City and County have recently been able to significantly curtail this activity through increased police enforcement with the assistance of the Metropolitan Bureau of Investigation. Today, OBT accounts for 15% of the sex offenses committed citywide. However, the area is still perceived as a primary prostitution locality.

While efforts to reduce prostitution have been successful, controlling the drug trade has been fruitless. OBT has seen an explosion in the amount of drugs used and sold, particularly crack cocaine. Drug offenses citywide are up 211% since 1983 and 29% in the last year. The same offenses on OBT are up 1188% since 1983 and up 49% in the last year. There has been an obvious shift in the types of crimes committed but there is no apparent reduction in the amount of crime.

1.3.2 Sanitary Sewers

The OBT Community Redevelopment Area is partially equipped with sanitary sewers supplied by the City of Orlando. However, there is inadequate or non-existent service in many areas. The lack of sanitary sewers threatens the public's health, safety and welfare. In addition, it inhibits desired growth and development. The cost of implementing an adequate sanitary sewer system has been prohibitive. As a result, approximately 400 acres of the study area rely on septic tanks for sanitary disposal. Currently, this is not a problem, but there is a concern with allowing more intense land uses than the present soils and lot sizes can accommodate. Furthermore, the Orange County Subdivision Regulations provide limiting criteria for septic tank use. This would exclude any high-density residential, large-scale commercial, or restaurant uses. Therefore, development density is restricted due to septic tank usage in the study area.
1.3.3 Street and Lot Layout

The existing street layout consists of a tight gridiron block pattern, especially south of Miller Street. This layout creates traffic problems due to the numerous cross streets that intersect OBT. The high number of traffic signals also interrupts the flow of traffic along the Trail.

The existing street pattern has also created small rectangular blocks which discourage potential development within the study area. Redevelopment is further hindered by the diversity of ownership of the commercial properties fronting the Trail. For this reason, the creation of a Community Redevelopment Area, with condemnation powers, is necessary for successful redevelopment of the study area.

1.3.4 General Deterioration

Just over half of the structures in the study area show some evidence of deterioration. Most deterioration is minor and results from the concentration of poorly maintained housing within the study area. There is a random pattern of building conditions which makes it difficult to identify any one area as requiring a higher degree of rehabilitation and renovation. While this is a problem, it also presents the opportunity to build upon the stable and established areas to encourage redevelopment. In addition to deteriorating structures, there are poorly maintained lots, a preponderance of billboards and overhead utility lines, and lack of quality landscaping.
2.0 SUMMARY OF MARKET POTENTIAL

Because of its proximity to Downtown Orlando and immediate access to I-4 and other major highways, Orange Blossom Trail is well positioned to take advantage of Orlando's real estate development trends.

The study area is bounded by S.R. 50 (Colonial Drive) which provides direct access to Downtown, while I-4 provides freeway access to Tampa on the West and Daytona Beach to the east, as well as connections to I-75, I-95, and Florida's Turnpike. The East/West Expressway bisects the study area. This major local highway is proposed to connect to Florida's Turnpike, and will become the southern loop of the proposed Orlando Beltway. Other highway projects that will have a positive impact on the Trail include the extension of the proposed John Young Parkway from the East/West Expressway west of the study area south to Sand Lake Road.

Public improvement projects including the Citrus Bowl Complex and the new Arena should enhance the real estate market along the Trail. Redevelopment opportunities are also provided by the availability of vacant land, underdeveloped parcels, and inexpensive land rent situations. The following is a summary of the opportunity analysis described in the Alternative Design Concepts/Final Report.

**Industrial Market Opportunities**

The industrial warehouse market has been the Orange Blossom Trail's strongest. It is expected that as developable space in near by adjacent industrial areas is depleted, the OBT area will increase its share of new industrial development. Regional industrial parks are presently 79% to 98% occupied. As infrastructure is provided, especially in the southern (County) portion of the study area, absorption rates of 150,000 to 250,000 square feet of industrial space per year are projected. Land costs are expected to be comparable to similarly developed areas, commanding from $2.50 - $3.50 per square foot.
Office Market Opportunities

New office development in the OBT study area has been negligible, accounting for approximately 1,000 square feet per year. However, the locational advantages of the Trail, and changing market perceptions about the Trail, could result in absorption rates of 25,000 to 50,000 square feet per year, particularly along the northern portion of the study area near Colonial Drive. Existing office parks in the Orlando region are currently 60% to 96% occupied.

Retail Market Opportunities

The opportunities for new retail development depend to a large degree on the redevelopment of other land uses. Retail development, based upon the demand created by other land uses, is estimated to equal 5% of total new office space and 1% of total new industrial space. This could amount to 8,000 retail square feet per year, up from the current 3,300 square feet per year. The amount of new retail space could increase to 10,000 to 15,000 square feet per year as redevelopment occurs and new markets for office and industrial support users are created.

Housing Market Opportunities

The OBT study area has experienced minimal population growth in the past, and is not expected to experience a great deal of net population growth, even as the population of the Orlando Metropolitan region grows. However, as new development creates new job opportunities in the area, residential infill east and west of the Trail can be expected.

Hotel Market Opportunities

While the demand for hotel rooms along the Trail has fallen, as indicated by the poor condition of many of the existing hotel structures, opportunities for a new hotel development is a possibility with redevelopment of the area.

Additionally, the location of the Trail with respect to the Citrus Bowl and the regional highway network could provide further hotel development opportunities.
3.0 REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

3.1 PURPOSE AND GENERAL GOALS

The purpose of this Community Redevelopment Plan is to provide common policies which will function to achieve goals recognized as necessary for the successful redevelopment of OBT. These goals must be obtained through the efforts and coordination of the Orange County Commission, the City of Orlando, the OBT Development Board, and all business owners and residents located within the project area.

Goals

1. Encourage land use relationships which function well together and increase the desirability of the study area.

2. Stimulate renewed economic interest along the Trail and provide opportunities for future desired growth.

3. Provide efficient, safe, and understandable vehicular and pedestrian circulation.

4. Provide sufficient utility services to support desired future development.

5. Improve physical, visual, and the perceived image of the study area.

6. Encourage preventative measures to reduce the incidence of crime, drug traffic and substance abuse.

7. Provide for outdoor recreational opportunities and community involvement.

8. Provide for the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood residents within the project area.
3.2 OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

3.2.1 Land Use

Land use regulations are the primary force in directing growth in the project area. Existing land uses often differ from designated zoning categories, making zoning enforcement difficult.

The OBT Community Redevelopment Board should initiate a Specialty Planned Area Overlay District for the project area within City jurisdiction.

This would establish specific redevelopment standards which collaborate with the goals and objectives set forth in this CRP.

This overlay district plan includes the power to regulate the location and characteristics of allowable types of development. This encourages efficient and appropriate development which strengthens the existing urban fabric and improves the quality of the project area within the City jurisdiction.

Additionally, increased development intensity directly benefits the entire project area through tax increment funding which is discussed later in this report.

Directly following the Land Use section are three maps showing suggested zoning boundaries. Proposed zoning is generalized into major categories, some of which are City and others County, as follows:

CITY
- Residential
- Activity District
- Professional Office District
- Office and Residential
- Office and Commercial
- General Industrial District
- Public Use District
- Holding District

COUNTY
- Residential
- Retail Commercial
- General Commercial
- Wholesale Commercial
- Open Space/Park
Existing zoning boundaries are depicted by solid black lines and are identified by specific zoning categories listed in the key. The following land use objectives and policies address specific land-use needs for the entire project area.

**Objective**
Define residential edges and prevent non-residential encroachment.

**Policies**
- Rezone areas as needed to encourage desired land uses and enforce the plan.
- Prohibit the expansion of non-residential uses into residentially zoned areas. (Except schools, churches, parks, community buildings, or similar land uses.)

**Objective**
Renovate and provide infill housing within residential districts to the highest intensity to encourage an urban quality of life and to maximize land use efficiency.

**Policies**
- Educate and assist building owners in obtaining financial assistance for improvements to delapidated housing.
- Increase housing stock with architecturally compatible infill.
- Provide a system for matching housing needs with interested developers.
- Encourage establishment of neighborhood associations to increase community sense of pride and involvement. These groups should determine specific land use goals and work with City and County officials to obtain these goals.
- Provide adequate affordable single family housing.

**Objective**
Develop designated areas for open space and parks within neighborhoods.

**Policies**
- Require future development to provide adequate recreational 'green space'.
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• Develop and maintain small neighborhood parks. Specifically address easily acquired or easily modified areas such as Lake June on Pond Street and the County-owned property on Kale Street.

• Involve the community in fund raising, implementation plans, maintenance of common areas and surveillance.

Objective
Create the necessary environment for light industrial development.

Policies
• Create parcels of land suitable for light industrial use.

• Provide sanitary sewer and other needed utilities to support desired development.

• Rezoned properties to coincide with City and County growth management and land use plans.

• Provide adequate transportation and parking to support additional industrial growth.

• Research methods for financial assistance for existing and potential light industrial businesses. Explore possibilities of the Enterprise Zone benefits such as tax credits.

• Encourage light industrial businesses to become involved with the community through local fund raising, beautification projects, OBT section 'adopt-a-highway' programs, participation in neighborhood meetings, and through merchant associations.

Objective
Provide opportunity for desired commercial development or redevelopment.

Policies
• Provide sanitary sewers and other necessary utilities to support desired commercial development.

• Renovate or replace existing utilities and roadway system as necessary.

• Encourage development which will meet actual needs determined through market studies.
- Rezone areas as required to encourage desired land use and which is compatible with adjacent land uses.

- Encourage a diverse and compatible business mix.

- Encourage the formation of merchant associations.

**Objective**
Encourage beautification projects to attract renewed interest in commercial OBT development.

**Policies**
- Encourage business unity and cooperation in facade, sidewalk or 'front-yard' treatments.

- Implement a long-term streetscape beautification plan.

- Screen offensive views with plant material.
SUGGESTED ZONING BOUNDARIES
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3.2.2 Economics

Objective
Create a diverse and viable commercial district.

Policies
- Encourage the organization of merchant associations to increase the effectiveness of networking, advertising, and to instill public awareness and a positive image. The organization should also act as an 'agent' for their area and recruit desirable, complimentary businesses.

- Increase the success rate of commercial businesses by encouraging service industry that supports downtown business needs. These include printing, office supply companies, and software companies.

- Increase the success rate of neighborhood oriented commercial business by encouraging service businesses to locate near residential areas. These may include banks, laundromats, convenience stores, and similar establishments.

- Take advantage of the City designated 'Activity Core' near Gore Street. Encourage a variety of businesses to locate here to form the critical element of the OBT urban core.

Objective
Attract new businesses and customers by improving the image of the Trail.

Policies
- Stimulate interest to support and fund planned improvements.

- Provide access to low interest loans for structural and aesthetic improvements.

- Provide technical and financial assistance for new small business operations and new or expanding businesses in the project area.
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3.2.3 Transportation, Circulation, Parking

Objective
To increase through traffic efficiency.

Policies
- Coordinate the City of Orlando's computerized traffic signalization system for the length of OBT within the project area.
- Phase out non-essential intersections. Do not pave or repave those roads that may be closed.
- Pave or resurface roads as necessary.
- Provide distinct curb cuts and fill in all non-essential curb cuts.
- Provide clearly marked signage and road striping at intersections.

Objective
Increase motorist and pedestrian safety.

Policies
- Provide clear site distances for motorists and pedestrians.
- Provide adequate circulation routes for emergency vehicles.
- Provide connecting walkways for safe and convenient pedestrian movement.
- Provide adequate lighting of roads, walkways, and parking areas.
- Separate vehicular and pedestrian traffic where possible.
- Upgrade or replace paved areas when necessary.

Objective
Increase convenience of parking.

Policies
- Provide adequate public and private parking.
- Provide small areas of convenient parking in front of retail stores which require short term convenient parking.
3.2.4 Utilities

Objective
Upgrade, replace or install sanitary sewer to meet existing and proposed needs.

Policies
- Coordinate Orange County and City of Orlando existing sanitary sewer systems with proposed installations.

- Provide for the installation of sanitary sewer along OBT in areas which currently are relying on septic tank systems.

- Require commercial property owners to tie into new sanitary sewer system.

- Require all new businesses and those with expansion greater than 50% to tie in to new sanitary sewer.

Objective
Provide retention ponds and adequate storm drainage to meet existing and proposed drainage and retention needs.

Policies
- Require retention ponds as needed for new development or existing development with expansion greater than 50%.

- Develop and implement an efficient storm drainage system.

- Prohibit ditch drainage.

- Prohibit unsafe drainage conditions.

Objective
Provide other utilities as required to allow desired growth and expansion.

Policies
- Require adequate fire hydrant coverage.

- Provide adequate lighting of roadway, walkway, and parking areas.

- Encourage underground placement of utilities. Consolidate location as much as possible to provide planting areas.
3.2.5 Urban Design/Aesthetic Character

Objective
Provide comprehensive streetscape improvements including: billboards, signage, overhead utilities, street trees, and landscaping to create a more inviting atmosphere.

Policies
• Adapt and incorporate OBT MSTU area Streetscape and Signage Guidelines.

• Require non-essential, deteriorated signage to be removed and replaced only with signs conforming to MSTU signage guidelines.

• Require the screening of offensive uses, including service areas, parking, and storage and junk yard areas.

• Enforce code regulations for disabled vehicles, open air markets, and other codes which may be violated.

• Encourage large areas of landscaping instead of 'spot' landscaping.

• Encourage community involvement in beautification programs. This may include cleaning and painting of buildings, landscaping, signage, and personal contributions such as window displays, benches, and hanging plants.

• Provide street and sidewalk cleaning a minimum of twice a year.

• Preserve architecturally significant buildings and enhance the appearance of existing structurally sound buildings.

Objective
Create a stable, positive image of neighborhoods.

Policies
• Initiate programs designed to improve neighborhoods.

• Require the screening of undesirable views including the back of commercial and industrial uses visible from the neighborhoods, parking areas, storage areas, and other unsightly land uses.

• Install neighborhood identification signs.
• Make existing tree retention a top priority. Reforest areas as necessary to provide long term results.

• Encourage individual expression in the form of landscaping, paint color, artwork, and architecture.

• Provide adequate trash receptacles and trash removal services.

3.2.6 Safe Neighborhoods

**Objective**
Establish crime prevention measures along the OBT corridor and neighborhoods within the project area.

**Policies**
- Involve the business and residential communities in reducing crime and drug trade through education and surveillance programs.

- Provide and encourage recreational and social activities which are drug and alcohol free.

- Repair acts of vandalism within a 48 hour period to prevent further damage and to reduce their negative impact. This also acts as a deterrent for future vandalism activities.

- Initiate and maintain 'neighborhood watch' programs in all neighborhoods.

- Increase police and community officer surveillance.

- Discourage loitering.

**Objective**
Alter the physical environment to discourage criminal and drug activity.

**Policies**
- Provide a minimum of one foot candle lighting at major intersections, parking lots, and known 'bad' areas.

- Provide ease of surveillance for the pedestrian and motorists.

- Encourage vandal-resistant lighting, fences, landscaping and other site elements.
• Place plant material directly adjacent to fences, walls, and buildings to avoid 'hiding pockets'.

• Provide additional emergency phones.

• Provide a mobile drug/crime unit or police sub-station within the project area.

• Discourage 'dead end' alleys, walkways, or streets.

3.2.7 Recreational and Community Services

Objective
Provide recreational neighborhood parks for residential areas.

Policies
• Develop existing County property located on Kaley Street into an official neighborhood park.

• Landscape the existing recreational area around the pond at Pond Street. Acquire property when possible to increase park size.

• Maintain landscaping, site amenities and control litter in public use areas.

• Involve the community in the planning and construction of park amenities to develop a sense of ownership and responsibility.

Objective
Provide day-use, urban-type parks for the OBT work force.

Policies
• Encourage developers to include urban plazas in new development.

• Encourage landscaped places in office and industrial areas for employee enjoyment.

3.2.8 Neighborhood Impact

Objective
Minimize negative impacts of redevelopment on the neighborhood.
Policies
- Prevent encroachment through boundary definition and enforcement of residential land uses.
- Discourage traffic by maintaining an adequate arterial system.

Objective
Maximize positive impacts of redevelopment on the neighborhoods.

Policies
- Halt decline in population through increased housing opportunities.
- Determine service requirements of neighborhoods and identify neighborhood service nodes.

3.3 PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Physical Development Plan identifies and prioritizes needed improvements according to physical, visual and economic impact, ease of implementation, and initial and long term expenses. The plan strives to establish revitalization efforts in the project area through the involvement of both public and private interests. The ultimate goal is the creation of a self-sustaining, economically sound and safe living and working environment. Beautification efforts should not be perceived as an end product, but as a tool for reaching these goals.

3.3.1 Public Improvements

Public improvements are needed to set a precedent for future development and to provide adequate services to encourage private investment. Public buildings, open spaces, and parks should demonstrate a quality of design and construction that establishes a prototype for future development or redevelopment. Critical design elements to be considered include the following:

- Architectural context
- Relationship to other land uses
- Relationship to site
- Ratio of impervious to non-impervious surface areas
Public improvements also include services necessary for public health, safety, and welfare. This may be in the form of infrastructure improvements, maintenance, increased services, or through zoning regulations and enforcement. Public improvements are imperative to the success of the Redevelopment Project. Improvements deemed necessary include:

- Sanitary sewer installation or renovation
- Provision of retention ponds
- Paving of dirt roads, resurfacing paved areas as needed
- Provision of walks
- Piping drainage ditches
- Provision of adequate light
- Provision of an efficient traffic signal system

The City and County should work together to regulate those elements which contribute to the negative image of the Trail. These include:

- Signage size, location, frequency, and condition
- Billboard size, location, frequency and condition
- Disabled vehicle requirements
- Street and sidewalk cleanliness

3.3.2 Public Expenditures

The redevelopment plan anticipates major public expenditures to bring existing infrastructure up to acceptable standards that will encourage private investment and growth. The lack of standard conveniences, such as sanitary sewers, paved roads and underground drainage, has been repeatedly documented as the major constraint to development. In addition to these needs is the desire to continue upgrading the overall urban quality of the area. While
underground improvements are necessary for construction of new developments, aesthetic improvements show public commitment to the redevelopment of the area and are necessary to induce private support and interest. Finally, some consideration must be given to the surrounding neighborhood since the success of the commercial district is directly related to the health of the surrounding residential area. Providing alternative housing, recreation opportunities and reducing crime will all serve to strengthen the fabric of the community providing a sound basis on which to grow. The growth of the commercial strip will, in turn, help fund the neighborhood improvements.

Estimates for these improvements have been summarized in the table following.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC EXPENDITURES**

**Infrastructure Improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewers</td>
<td>$2,690,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewers</td>
<td>1,324,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Paving</td>
<td>1,518,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signalization</td>
<td>1,006,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,538,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Street Improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>$1,494,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>800,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>525,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,819,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neighborhood Improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>$1,994,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/Recreation</td>
<td>160,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,154,800.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Law Enforcement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>660,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>660,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,171,800.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.3 Private Development Opportunities

There are several development opportunities within the project area. Specific opportunities have been discussed in the previous study, OBT Alternative Development Concepts. Potential development sites are labeled 'A' through 'H' and are shown on Figures 11, 12, 13, and 14 at the end of this section.

Development Sites 'A' and 'H' are considered the most critical to the project because of their location. Refer to Appendix B for updated market feasibility information.

Sub-Area One - Colonial Drive/Rock Lake

This area has the greatest potential for attracting new development and thereby infusing the tax increment trust fund with seed money to begin redevelopment efforts.

There are three 'development opportunity sites' identified by the Alternative Design Concepts Plan which are located in the area.

Parcel A is a 4.7 acre site located at the southwest corner of Colonial Drive and Orange Blossom Trail. It contains two parcels, one of which has an existing building. The current 0-2 zoning would permit the construction of a second building and still allow for on-grade parking. (See Appendix B for the project feasibility report).

Several investors have shown interest in developing this property, including the current property owners, so it is possible that development could occur with minimum public intervention. Public improvements such as streetscaping (sidewalks, street trees, and lighting) could be offered as an inducement.

Parcel B is a much larger site comprised of six individual properties totaling 20 acres and having an extended road frontage on Orange Blossom Trail. Its industrial zoning represents a major opportunity for a large-scale mixed-use development including commercial uses along the thoroughfare. This project will probably develop in the three to five year time range. The depth and flexibility of the site also indicates a long-range potential for good quality, low-to mid-rise office development.
Parcel C is complementary to Parcel A because it forms the second side to a 'gateway' development. Its current industrial use is undesirable aesthetically and gives a negative perception to the rest of the corridor. A better use for the eight acre parcel would be a mid-rise office/showroom development.

Little or no public infrastructure improvements will be required in Sub-Area No. 1 during the first phase of the redevelopment plan since existing services are sufficient to support proposed redevelopment.

**Sub-Area 2 - East West Expressway**

This area is located directly west of the downtown core. It contains two development opportunity sites, both of which are long-range plans. Each depends on other improvements to be made, within and outside the redevelopment area, before they could be economically feasible.

Parcel D is comprised of four small blocks, between Central Boulevard and Church Street, fronting the Trail. Centered at the intersection of Norton Avenue and Pine Street this site abuts Lake Lorna Doone Park to the west. The site is perceived primarily as a gateway to the Citrus Bowl complex providing it with a 'front door' on a major thoroughfare.

Since both Central Boulevard and Church Street are strong links to the downtown with its reservoir of parking, this site could become a transit stop to some sort of transportation system linking the two areas.

The potential for the site to develop a small (100 room) hotel would depend largely on the future growth in the number and types of sporting events held here. A signature piece of architecture would add prominence to the entire complex; however, preservation of a green space around the structure to connect the park with the Trail is also very important.

Parcel E is a slightly smaller site located adjacent to the East-West Expressway. This site is strategically well located to take advantage of the increase in traffic accessibility which will occur upon completion of the Orlando Beltway. This added traffic, plus the proximity to the Citrus Bowl, would suggest that an economy or convenience-type hotel would be a marketable redevelopment opportunity in the five- to ten-year range.
The location of this area, mid-way between the two major roads, makes it suitable for light industrial, wholesale and warehouse development, for which it is currently zoned. The light density of the current land uses, coupled with the mixture of residential and commercial, gives the area a fragmented appearance.

The availability of large vacant parcels, many of which are for sale, indicates that infill development could easily occur, along with redevelopment of existing undesirable uses.

Parcel F, which constitutes about two-thirds of the land area on the west side of Orange Blossom Trail in Sub Area No. 3, contains approximately 20 acres which could accommodate over 200,000 square feet of warehouse development. However, due to the present high residential utilization and fragmentation of ownership, this site is considered a long-range redevelopment opportunity.

Parcel G contains approximately 50% of the area on the east side of Orange Blossom Trail or about 40 acres of sparsely developed industrial area. This area is estimated to have a capacity for 250,000 square feet of additional industrial warehouse space.

Sub-Area Four - Holden Heights

This area represents the greatest concentration of single-family residential in the entire redevelopment area. This is due to a great extent from the lack of sanitary sewers which has precluded any other type of development from occurring.

While redevelopment in the surrounding area could potentially put pressure on the neighborhood, it is a high priority goal of the plan to not only protect the neighborhood from commercial intrusion but to strengthen it through policies encouraging infill development of single-family housing. There are currently over 30 vacant parcels that are potential home sites, as well as numerous dilapidated structures that could be rehabilitated or redeveloped.
Sub-Area Five - Interstate 4

Sub Area No. 5 is an area in transition from a residential neighborhood to the commercial/industrial character that has taken over since the construction of I-4. Several single-family houses still remain, although many are being used to operate businesses. Most of the area contains some type of commercial use permitted by the C-3 zoning; however, it is only marginally desirable types.

The high degree of accessibility and visibility from I-4, as well as its proximity to the Orange Avenue Industrial Node, make it a prime candidate for new industrial development.

With public infrastructure improvements such as sanitary sewers, storm drainage, lighting and roadway improvements, the area could be developed into a business park character. Once these improvements are in place, it is anticipated that the proposed program could be absorbed within two to five years. Details of the project feasibility are described in Appendix C.
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4.0 FINANCIAL PLAN

4.1 PROPOSED PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT COSTS

4.1.1 Infrastructure

The provision sanitary sewers is the single largest expenditure facing the Redevelopment Agency. It is also the highest priority item since no redevelopment can occur in the County section without the sewers in place. However, the high construction cost of the sewers would necessitate that this be phased over many years before all sections can be accommodated.

The following list itemizes and prioritizes each of the expenditures so that budgets can be established for each funding year.

Sanitary Sewers

Location: • 27th, 28th, and 29th Streets from OBT to Westmoreland Avenue.

• Area bounded by Grand Avenue North, OBT West, Westmoreland Avenue East, and 27th Street South.

• Area bounded by Grand Avenue North, Rio Grande Avenue West, OBT East, and I-4 South.

Scope: Construct a new sanitary force main, lift station, piping and manholes to provide sanitary sewer service.

Estimated Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td>$604,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93</td>
<td>$638,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>$754,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-95</td>
<td>$642,650.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $2,640,000.00

Storm Sewers

Location: • Kaley Street

• Nashville Street

• Woods Street

• Grant Street

• Miller Street

• 18th Street

• 19th Street

• 20th Street

• 23rd Street

• 24th Street
Orange Blossom Trail
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Scope: Construct retention ponds, install piping and structures as required to convey all storm water underground.

Estimated Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>$74,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-95</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-2000</td>
<td>$450,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010</td>
<td>$700,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,324,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadway Paving

Location:
- Indiana Street from Rio Grande Avenue to OBT.
- Miller Street from OBT to Westmoreland Avenue.
- 19th Street from OBT to Westmoreland Avenue.
- 20th Street from OBT to Westmoreland Avenue.
- Woods Avenue from Kaley Street to 20th Street.

Scope: Paving of dirt roads including curb and gutter and R.O.W. improvements.

Estimated Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>$68,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-95</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-2000</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2005</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2010</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2020</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,518,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic Signalization

Location:
- Intersection of West Amelia Street and OBT.
- Intersection of Robinson Street and OBT.
- Intersection of Washington Street and OBT.
- Intersection of Central Boulevard and OBT.
- Intersection of Church Street and OBT.
- Intersection of South Street and OBT.
- Intersection of Anderson Street and OBT.
- Intersection of Long Street and OBT.
- Intersection of Gore Street and OBT.
- Intersection of Carter Street and OBT.
- Intersection of Grand Street and OBT.
- Intersection of Kaley Street and OBT.
- Intersection of Michigan Avenue and OBT.
- Intersection of 29th Street and OBT.
Community Redevelopment Plan

Scope: Replace traffic signalization cables with mastarms and connect to City's area wide computerized system.

Estimated Cost:
- Funding year - 1995-2000 $ 286,000.00
  Washington Street
  Gore Street
  Kaley Street
  Michigan Avenue
- Funding year - 2000-2010 300,000.00
  West Amelia Street
  Robinson Street
  Central Avenue
  Church Street
- Funding year - 2010-2020 420,000.00
  South Street
  Anderson Street
  Long Street
  Carter Street
  Grand Street
  29th Street

TOTAL $1,006,000.00

4.1.2 Street Improvements

Lighting

Location:
- 27th, 28th and 29th Streets from OBT to Westmoreland Avenue.
- Along OBT from Colonial Drive to I-4 Interchange
- Various neighborhoods.

Scope: Repair existing fixtures and install new fixtures throughout project area.

Estimated Costs:
- Funding Year - 93-94 $ 94,000.00
- Funding Year - 94-95 100,000.00
- Funding Year - 95-2000 300,000.00
- Funding Year - 2000-2010 500,000.00
- Funding Year - 2010-2020 500,000.00

TOTAL $1,494,000.00
Sidewalks

Location: • Along both sides of Trail from Colonial Drive to I-4.
• Neighborhood Streets.

Scope: Repair and replace broken or deteriorated sidewalks and install new sidewalks in pedestrian areas.

Estimated Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-95</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-2000</td>
<td>220,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$800,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Landscape and Irrigation

Location: • I-4 Interchange.
• Along 28th and 29th Streets between OBT and Westmoreland Avenue.
• In neighborhoods lacking tree canopy.

Scope: Landscape I-4 interchange to create gateway to OBT and downtown.

Plant street trees along 28th and 29th Streets to create a business park character.

Institute a street tree planting program along OBT and in neighborhoods that lack tree canopy.

Estimated Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-95</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-2000</td>
<td>130,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010</td>
<td>270,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$525,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.3 Neighborhoods

Housing

Location: • Infill projects in the Callahan and Holden Heights Neighborhoods.
Orange Blossom Trail Community Redevelopment Plan

**Scope:** Purchase vacant or distressed property for redevelopment or affordable housing.

**Estimated Costs:**
- Allowance 10% annual tax revenues
  - Funding Year - 91-95 $ 61,900.00
  - Funding Year - 95-2000 282,900.00

**Open Space/Recreation**

**Location:**
- 19th Street pond (Lake June).
- County owned park at corner of Kaley and Westmoreland Drive.

**Scope:** Develop passive neighborhood recreation amenities including walkways, benches, picnic tables, playground equipment, and shelters.

**Estimated Costs:**
- Funding Year - 91-92 $ 5,000.00
- Funding Year - 92-93 5,000.00
- Funding Year - 93-94 5,000.00
- Funding Year - 94-95 15,000.00
- Funding Year - 95-2000 50,000.00
- Funding Year 2000-2010 80,000.00

**TOTAL** $160,000.00

**Law Enforcement**

**Location:** Area wide

**Scope:** Provide increased police protection and visibility as a deterrent to crime.

Work with Orlando Police Department (OPD) and Orange County Sheriff (OCS) to create a high police profile on the streets through a temporary or mobile police substation.

**Estimated Costs:**
- Funding Year - 91-92 $ 10,000.00
- Funding Year - 92-93 50,000.00
- Funding Year - 93-94 50,000.00
- Funding Year - 94-95 50,000.00
- Funding Year - 95-2000 150,000.00
- Funding Year - 2000-2010 350,000.00

**TOTAL** $660,000.00
# Orange County Redevelopment Agency

## Capital Expenditure Budget

### Phase I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewers</td>
<td>$104,000</td>
<td>$307,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$307,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>550,000*</td>
<td>331,750*</td>
<td>284,600*</td>
<td>335,000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewers</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Paving</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>286,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>282,900</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/Recreation</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$732,750</td>
<td>$1,099,600</td>
<td>$1,200,650</td>
<td>$2,168,900</td>
<td>$2,145,000</td>
<td>$1,655,000</td>
<td>$2,095,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources other than T.I.F.*
4.2 Funding Sources

It is evident from the capital improvements list that tax increment funds alone will not be sufficient to cover the cost of all improvements required. However, the Orange Blossom Trail Development Board, under the direction of the Community Redevelopment Agency, can coordinate other sources of funding so that the plan can be fulfilled in a logical and timely manner.

County Utility Department

This department is an enterprise department which means their operating funds come through user fees rather than property taxes. Connection fees received to install new service helps offset the cost of construction.

This department has already established a preliminary engineering budget to implement sanitary sewers as well as determine the most cost effective point of connection. This number is reflected in the conceptual improvements budget. Their long range master plan will be amended to include off-site improvements which are not eligible for tax increment funds.

Community Development Block Grants

The Holden Heights Neighborhood in the County section of the plan has been designated a target area by the Orange County Office of Housing and Community Development. This means it is eligible for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds which are distributed each year. The 1 to 1.5 million dollars available for infrastructure improvements is divided between 11 target areas and nine municipalities within the County. However, priority is rotated among the areas so that from time to time major projects can be funded. Since the redevelopment plan outlines the most pressing needs of the area, it can easily direct these funds to accomplish major goals. In addition, special funds are set aside specifically to address housing needs.

Safe Neighborhoods

The OBTDB had been working toward the creation of a Safe Neighborhood (SN) program for approximately one year when funding for that program was cut by the State Legislature. At the same time, an amendment creating a new
category of SN., the Community Redevelopment Safe Neighborhood Program was tabled. It is assumed that this worthwhile program will once again be funded, hence the OBTDB has proceeded with incorporating Safe Neighborhood elements into the Community Redevelopment Plan and will begin coordinating the public involvement once the plan has been adopted.

When fully funded, the Safe Neighborhood program not only provides technical assistance grants, but can be used to petition the legislature for capital improvement funds, if the area is combined with an Enterprise Zone. The Trail is currently within such a zone.

Request for funds can include up to 100% of the cost of improvements in 25% of the area and 50% (with matching funds) for the other 75% of the area.

4.3 FINANCING PLAN

4.3.1 Methodology

The following methodology was employed to project the tax increment for the OBT Study Area. The first step was to obtain basic assessment information on the property located within the study area. To develop an understanding of trends in assessments excluding new development, research was conducted on 100 representative parcels in the study area. Assessment estimates of previous projections were used to establish potential tax increments for new development. The increase in taxes were made based on the 1989 millage rates and assume no changes. Summarized below is a more detailed description of each of these steps.

1990 Base Assessments

Utilizing a listing of coding strips for property located within the study area the assessments for each property located in the study area were outlined. A data base was prepared which included the assessed value on each property, the millage codes, and the relevant homestead exemption codes. The assessments obtained from the property appraiser's office represent the assessed values as of January, 1990. These figures are constantly being updated by the
property appraiser's office and are not finalized until July of each year for the next year's tax roll.

The total of this database is listed on Table 1. It was adjusted upward by 1.25% to estimate a July, 1990 base. The table includes the total assessed value for all property located in the study area at $140.5 million in January of 1990. The value of all non-taxable property including publicly owned lands, churches, etc., equaled $18.6 million in January. The sum of exemptions for homestead, energy, disability, etc. was estimated at $6.6 million in January for all property which was taxable. The resulting taxable assessed value for the total study was $115.3 million in January, 1990, increased to $116.7 million for July, 1990, estimate based on a 1.25% increase.

Table 1
Assessment Totals OBT Study Area
January 1990/July 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessed Value 1/90</td>
<td>$140,484,121.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nontaxable Property Value 1/90</td>
<td>(18,643,197.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Exemptions for Taxable Property 1/90</td>
<td>(6,579,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxable Value 1/90</td>
<td>$115,261,924.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxable Value Estimate 7/90 (+1.25%)</td>
<td>$116,702,698.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Orange County Property Appraisers
Records, January 1990
Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc.

Trends in Assessments

To develop an understanding of the trends in local assessment, 100 different parcels were selected from the 1,735 properties included in the tax roles for the study area. This represents 6% of the total property. These parcels were selected to obtain a sampling of land uses and locations which have not experienced any new development. The 1985, 1987 and 1989 assessed values on these properties were researched to compare to the January, 1990 value to
obtain a trend in assessment values. Based on this research, it was found that the assessments have increased by 2.36% annually since 1985 in the study are for property without any new development. Therefore, it was decided to base further assessments on a 2.5% annual increase which excludes new growth.

Millage Rates Assumed

The 1989 millage rate of the City of Orlando for its General Fund was 6.0666. In addition to this figure, property located within the City limits paid 5.2889 mills to the County General Fund. The County millage rate for the General Fund excluding the Fire Taxing District Funds was 7.2889 for property located within unincorporated Orange County. For the sake of this analysis, it was assumed there would be no change in these millage rates. Of the total taxable value obtained in the database of $115 million, 65% of the property value was located within the City of Orlando corporate limits.

Tax Increment Excluding New Development

Table 2 provides estimates of the projected trends in revenues rounded to the nearest thousand for the study area excluding new development. As mentioned before, these projections assume no change in the millage rates and assume an annual appreciation rate of 2.5% in the assessed values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City General Fund</th>
<th>County General Fund</th>
<th>Annual Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Increment</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$460,000.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>$699,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$472,000.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$718,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$484,000.00</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$737,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$497,000.00</td>
<td>$13,000.00</td>
<td>$756,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$510,000.00</td>
<td>$13,000.00</td>
<td>$776,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$523,000.00</td>
<td>$13,000.00</td>
<td>$797,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$595,000.00</td>
<td>$14,400.00</td>
<td>$907,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tax Increment From New Development

In addition to the tax increment to be realized from the appreciation of the existing tax base in the study area, there is an expected increase in revenue due to new development in the study area. The Alternative Concepts Plan identified a series of three projections of growth in the area based on varying levels of public involvement. These were labeled: minimum action, moderate action and maximum action scenarios. These projections are summarized on Table 3.

Table 4 provides estimates of the development projections in terms of assessed values for the three scenarios. These assessments are based on the following assumptions.

   Office Construction Cost = $50/s.f. - $85/s.f.
   Industrial Construction Cost = $30/s.f.

2. The construction cost estimates were inflated by 125% to reflect market value following construction.

3. The assessment value was assumed to be 75% of market value.

Table 3
Projected Alternative Growth Scenarios
OBT Study Area
(1990 - 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commercial SF</th>
<th>Office SF</th>
<th>Industrial SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>197,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Estimates of Assessed Values for New Construction
OBT Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commercial SF</th>
<th>Office SF</th>
<th>Industrial SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc.

The estimates of ad valorem revenue generated by the new development projected within the OBT study area from the City General Fund and the County General Fund are shown on Table 5 for the three scenarios. A split of 65% City millage rates and 35% County...
millage rates was assumed. This revenue would be added to the increment estimated previously on Table 2 (for appreciation) to estimate the total increment.

Table 5
Estimated Additional Tax Revenue from New Construction OBT Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Minimum Action Scenario</th>
<th>Moderate Action Scenario</th>
<th>Maximum Action Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$ 9,800.00</td>
<td>$ 16,000.00</td>
<td>$ 28,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>20,500.00</td>
<td>57,000.00</td>
<td>109,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>36,000.00</td>
<td>81,000.00</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>53,500.00</td>
<td>105,000.00</td>
<td>196,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>67,000.00</td>
<td>151,000.00</td>
<td>295,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>78,000.00</td>
<td>171,000.00</td>
<td>352,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Average</td>
<td>$130,000.00</td>
<td>$291,000.00</td>
<td>$589,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc.

Total Tax Increment

Summarized on Table 6 which follows are projections of the total tax increment for the OBT study area from the three alternative action scenarios. Due to the time delay between construction and tax revenues, there is a year time lag assumed between year built and revenue received.

Table 6
Projected Total Annual Tax Increment OBT Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Minimum Action Scenario</th>
<th>Moderate Action Scenario</th>
<th>Maximum Action Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$ 40,800.00</td>
<td>$ 47,000.00</td>
<td>$ 59,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>51,500.00</td>
<td>88,000.00</td>
<td>140,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>68,000.00</td>
<td>113,000.00</td>
<td>182,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>86,500.00</td>
<td>138,000.00</td>
<td>229,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>101,000.00</td>
<td>185,000.00</td>
<td>329,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-2000</td>
<td>156,000.00</td>
<td>327,000.00</td>
<td>625,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc.
4.3.2 Financial Plan

The following methodology was employed to project the tax increment tepes. The irony of redevelopment financing is that few tax increment dollars will be generated unless capital expenditures can be made to attract new development. However, no capital improvement dollars are generated unless new development occurs thereby increasing tax revenues.

This is especially true in the OBT CRA, which is a relatively small area that only averages a 2.3% increase in assessed value annually. Tax increment financing dollars will be small in the initial years and increases will be predicated on attracting new development.

The potential for growth, as documented in the market analysis, will be the basis on which assumptions for tax revenues are made.

The intent of the plan is to use the taxes garnered to finance debt incurred on short term loans used to finance the capital improvements.

In the first three years of the plan, funding will be accomplished through a combination of tax revenues and loans received from City or County agencies, private institutions, or bond anticipation notes.

By the end of the third year, the cumulative debt would equal $1 million dollars, and total tax revenues would equal $381,000.00.

At that time, it is anticipated that annual tax revenues would be sufficient to support a long-term bond issue. The bond amount would cover the $1 million dollar existing debt, as well as funding for public improvements slated for the upcoming year. It is estimated that a total of $3.4 million dollars would be bonded over a three year period (funding year 1993-94 through 1995-96) to accomplish Phase I of the redevelopment plan. These funds will carry out improvements through fiscal year 1996-97.

By fiscal year 1997-98, tax revenues should amount to over $500,000.00 per year, providing amortization on the bond issues as
well as cash flow for long range public improvements through the year 2020.

Since all of these projections are made assuming that current economic conditions will continue, it is intended that a thorough review and update of the budget and finance plan will be made every two years. This will allow for comparison of actual tax revenues vs. projections, as well as adjustments due to inflationary trends, project feasibility and market strength of the overall region. The agency would then have the opportunity to adjust the schedule of improvements to reflect actual tax revenues.

The following table illustrates the funding strategy in terms of the capital improvements desired. Other sources of funds required to finance public improvements, specifically the installation of sanitary sewers, are vital to the overall plan success and are listed separately. Also, the table does not itemize the $150,000.00 per year that the City and County jointly fund to the Development Board. It is recommended that these funds continue in order to allow full use of tax monies on physical improvements.
# Orange Blossom Trail

## TABLE 7

**OBT REDEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

(Fiscal Year 1991-92 through 1999-2000)

### SOURCES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>95-96</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>99-200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Increment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$ 59,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$182,000</td>
<td>$229,000</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>318,000</td>
<td>610,000</td>
<td>939,000</td>
<td>1,364,000</td>
<td>1,889,000</td>
<td>2,614,000</td>
<td>3,439,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line of Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$ 110,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>460,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sources</td>
<td>$169,000</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$2,122,000</td>
<td>$1,229,000</td>
<td>$1,329,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$825,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Uses of Funds

#### Capital: Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>95-96</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>99-200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer</td>
<td>$104,000</td>
<td>$307,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$307,100</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Paving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signalization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>32,900</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>72,500</td>
<td>82,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/Recreation</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Expend.</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$401,000</td>
<td>$815,000</td>
<td>$665,000</td>
<td>$536,900</td>
<td>$516,500</td>
<td>$262,500</td>
<td>$396,500</td>
<td>$456,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Line of Credit Repayment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>95-96</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>99-200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Credit</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Amortization</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cost of Bond Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>95-96</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>99-200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Use of Funds</td>
<td>$161,000</td>
<td>$447,000</td>
<td>$2,125,000</td>
<td>$1,155,000</td>
<td>$926,900</td>
<td>$856,500</td>
<td>$602,500</td>
<td>$736,500</td>
<td>$796,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cash Flow

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>95-96</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>99-200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>$ 8,000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$(3,000)</td>
<td>$ 74,000</td>
<td>$402,100</td>
<td>$(431,500)</td>
<td>$(77,500)</td>
<td>$(11,500)</td>
<td>$28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>524,100</td>
<td>92,600</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>32,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Uses and Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>95-96</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>99-200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$331,750</td>
<td>$284,600</td>
<td>$335,650</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>881,750</td>
<td>1,166,350</td>
<td>1,502,000</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

5.1 PLAN ADOPTION

By initiating the study to document slum and blight conditions, Orange County and the City of Orlando, through the OBTDB, have taken the first steps toward redevelopment of the Orange Blossom Trail.

The adoption of that finding, along with the creation of a Community Redevelopment Agency and the designation of the Orange County Commission as that agency, verifies the cooperative commitment on the part of both governments. In fact, this is one of the very few times in the State of Florida that a County has established a Community Redevelopment Agency that crosses the boundary into a municipality.

Once the plan is completed, but before it can be adopted, it must be reviewed by the local planning authority which, in this case, would be both the County Planning Board and the Orlando Municipal Planning Board.

Once comments have been received and the plan is found to be consistent with all local growth management policies, as well as all provisions of Florida State Statute Sec. 163.360, the County Commission will hold a public hearing on the proposed plan. This hearing will be advertised as required in F.S. 160.360.5. At that time, the Commission may adopt the plan by resolution.

Concurrently, the City Commission of the City of Orlando must adopt a resolution concurring with the plan and thereby agreeing to allow the County Commission (as CRA) to carry out redevelopment activities within the boundaries of the City, as well as releasing property taxes collected in the City to be deposited in the Redevelopment Trust Fund to be spent on eligible projects within the Community Redevelopment Area.

5.2 THE REDEVELOPMENT TRUST FUND

At the same time the plan is adopted, the Community Redevelopment Agency must, through ordinance adoption, establish the Redevelopment Trust Fund. This fund will receive all tax increment monies generated by the redevelopment area, as well as any grants, gifts or profits from redevelopment.
activities. This fund shall remain in place until all indebtedness resulting from redevelopment activities has been remunerated.

5.3 PROPERTY ACQUISITION

By the power of the Redevelopment Act, the Agency may acquire property by purchase, condemnation, gift or other legal means in accordance with the Redevelopment Plan.

While no specific funds have been set aside for property acquisition, it is the intent of the plan that the Agency do whatever possible to facilitate new development in the redevelopment area, especially in terms of new housing.

5.4 RELOCATION PROCEDURES

If relocation of residents or businesses is required as a result of redevelopment activities, the Agency must accept responsibility for providing financial assistance to minimize hardship to those being displaced. The Agency shall generally follow those policies and procedures established by the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, which include:

1. Provide adequate notification to affected parties regarding acquisition, as well as benefits available to them.

2. Provide assistance as necessary to secure comparable accommodations that are decent, safe, sanitary and in the same general vicinity.

3. Provide comparable replacement facilities, available to all, regardless of race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

4. Provide fair and reasonable financial compensation to those displaced.

5.5 Demolition, Site Preparation

The Redevelopment Agency is authorized to prepare acquired properties for redevelopment by demolition of structures located thereon, roadways, vegetation and to clear such properties of all such encumbrances to development.
5.6 Public Improvements

The Redevelopment Agency is authorized to implement all forms of public infrastructure improvements including utility lines, street, and drainage improvements, sidewalks, lighting, open space, parking, landscaping or other improvements as required for the implementation of the Redevelopment plan.

5.7 Rehabilitation

The Redevelopment Agency is authorized to repair or improve deteriorating or delapidated structures which contribute to the slum and blight of the area or to assist the owners in securing financial assistance for such rehabilitation if eligible and necessary.

5.8 Property Disposition Procedure

The Redevelopment Agency is authorized to sell, lease, exchange, assign, pledge, encumber by mortgage or deed of trust or otherwise dispose of real property in accordance with the intent of the redevelopment plan and with applicable law.

Opportunities should be provided for owner participation in the redevelopment. The Agency shall have the right to review and approve construction plans and to refuse to approve plans found not in conformance with applicable disposition agreements, covenants or other contents.

5.9 Project Closeout

Following implementation of public and private responsibilities included in the Redevelopment Plan and the retirement of all bonds issued to pay for public improvements, the Redevelopment Agency responsibility will cease.

5.10 Plan Modification

The Redevelopment Plan may be modified in a manner consistent with applicable law and on accordance with the Community Redevelopment Act of 1989, as amended (F.S. Section 163.365).
5.11 Duration of the Plan

The controls, restrictions, covenants, and conditions imposed by the Redevelopment Plan shall be effective for thirty (30) years from the date of adoption of this plan, unless there is an express agreement between parties to the contrary.

5.12 Severability

If any provision of the Redevelopment Plan is held to be involved, unconstitutional or otherwise legally infirm, such provisions shall not affect the remaining portions of the plan.
OVERALL BOUNDARIES - OBT CRA

Begin at the intersection of the south right-of-way line of West Colonial Drive (S.R. #50) and the west right-of-way line of Spring Dale Drive; thence east along the said south right-of-way line of West Colonial Drive (S.R. #50) to the intersection of the centerline of Westmoreland Avenue; thence south along the said center of Westmoreland Avenue to the intersection of the easterly right-of-way line of Interstate 4 (S.R. #400); thence southwesterly along said easterly right-of-way line of Interstate 4 (S.R. #400) to the intersection of the north right-of-way line of 34th Street; thence west along said north right-of-way line of 34th Street to the intersection of the westerly right-of-way line of Interstate 4 (S.R. #400); thence north along the said westerly right-of-way line of Interstate 4 (S.R. #400) to the intersection of the north right-of-way line of 33rd Street; thence west along the said north right-of-way line of 33rd Street to the intersection of the west right-of-way line of Rio Grande Avenue; thence north along the said west right-of-way line of Rio Grande Avenue to the intersection of the shoreline of Lake Lorna Doone; thence northerly along the said shoreline of Lorna Doone to the intersection of the west right-of-way line of Jamil Avenue; thence north along said west right-of-way line of Jamil Avenue to the intersection of the south shoreline of Rock Lake; thence northeasterly along said east shoreline of Rock Lake to the intersection of the east property line of Block 'D' of Arlington Terrace; thence southwest, west, and north along said property line of Block 'D' of Arlington Terrace to the intersection of the south right-of-way line of West Amelia Street; thence north and then west along said south right-of-way line of West Amelia Street to the intersection of the west right-of-way line of North Madison Avenue; thence north along said west right-of-way line of North Madison Avenue to a point, said point being the intersection of the west right-of-way line of North Madison Avenue with the projected north right-of-way line of West Concord Street; thence east to the intersection of the east right-of-way line of North Madison Avenue and the north right-of-way line of West Concord Street; thence east along said north right-of-way line of West Concord Street to the intersection of the west right-of-way line of Spring Dale Drive; thence north along said west right-of-way line of Spring Dale Drive to the intersection of the south right-of-way line of West Colonial Drive (S.R. #50) said to be the point of beginning.
RESOLUTION NO.___

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA; FINDING THE EXISTENCE OF ONE OR MORE SLUM AND BLIGHTED AREAS IN THE CITY OF ORLANDO AND ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA; FINDING A NEED FOR A COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, administrative officials of Orange County, Florida (the "County") have undertaken and completed a review of an area located within the City of Orlando (the "City") and the county known as the South Orange Blossom Trail (U.S. Highway 441) for purposes of determining if slum or blighted conditions, or both, exist within all or part of such area; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of the County (the "Commission") has received a recommendation from the Orange Blossom Trail Development Board that a finding of the existence of one or more slum or blighted areas within such area of the City and the County be adopted by the Commission and that a Community Redevelopment Agency be created; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has received the Orange Blossom Trail Development Board recommendation and has received a presentation by administrative officials of the County of the conditions in such area;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA:

Section 1. The Commission does hereby find, based upon information presented to the Commission in a public meeting, that one or more slum and blighted areas, as defined in Part III, Chapter 163, Florida Statutes (the "Redevelopment Act"), exist within the area located within the City and the County as described and depicted on Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein (the "Redevelopment Area").

Section 2. The Commission further finds and determines that the rehabilitation, conservation, or redevelopment, or combination thereof, of the Redevelopment Area is necessary in the interest of public health, safety, morals, or welfare of the residents of the County.

Section 3. As a result of the finding of the existence of one or more slum or blighted areas in Section 1 hereof and the necessity for rehabilitation, conservation, or redevelopment, or combination thereof, in Section 2 hereof, the Commission does hereby find a need exists for the creation of a community redevelopment agency as provided in the Redevelopment Act for purposes of rehabilitating the Redevelopment Area and eradicating conditions of slum or blight, or both, therein.

Section 4. The Clerk to the Commission is hereby authorized and directed to notify all "taxing authorities," as that term is defined in the Redevelopment Act, of the adoption of this Resolution.
Section 5. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

ADOPTED by the Board of County Commissioners of Orange County, Florida, this 9th day of April, 1990.

(SEAL)

ATTEST:

______________________________
Clerk to Board of
County Commissioners

______________________________
Chairman, Board of
County Commissioners
RESOLUTION NO. ___

A RESOLUTION OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA, DECLARING ITSELF TO BE A COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY PURSUANT TO SECTION 163.357(1), FLORIDA STATUTES; MAKING FINDINGS; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Orange County, Florida (the "Commission"), adopted a resolution on April 9, 1990, finding one or more blighted areas, as described in said resolution (the "Community Redevelopment Area") exists in the City of Orlando, Florida (the "City") and Orange County, Florida, a charter county, (the "County"), and that a need exists for a community redevelopment agency to rehabilitate, conserve, or redevelop, or any combination thereof, the Redevelopment Area; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has determined that it is in the best interests of the County that the Commission declare itself to be such an agency;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA:

SECTION 1. Pursuant to Section 163.357(1), Florida Statutes (1989), the "Commission does hereby declare itself to be the community redevelopment agency for the Redevelopment Area, and all rights, power, duties, privileges and immunities vested by Part III, Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, in such an agency are hereby vested in the Commission, as the governing body of Orange County, Florida, to be exercised by it within the Redevelopment Area.

SECTION 2. The Commission does hereby find that in accordance with Section 163.346, Florida Statutes (1989) at least ten (10) days prior to the date hereof a notice was published in a newspaper of general circulation in the City and at least fifteen (15) days prior to the date hereof a notice was mailed by registered mail to each "taxing authority," as that term is defined in Section 163.340(2), Florida Statutes (1989), giving notice of the consideration and possible adoption of this Resolution by the Commission.

SECTION 3. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

ADOPTED by the Board of County Commissioners of Orange County, Florida, this ___ day of ____________, 1990.

ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA

__________________________
Chairman, Board of County Commissioners

(SEAL)

ATTEST:

__________________________
Clerk to Board of County Commissioners
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I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to assess the feasibility of a redevelopment project proposed at the southwest corner of the intersection of Orange Blossom Trail and Colonial Drive. The 4.75 acre site under study is located within the Orange Blossom Trail area being planned for redevelopment by the Orange Blossom Trail Development Board. This report is intended to analyze the market potential for the proposed project, to provide an understanding of the financial considerations surrounding the project and to offer recommendations for its implementation.

ORANGE BLOSSOM TRAIL MARKET PROJECTIONS

The overall market opportunities for the Orange Blossom Trail Redevelopment Area were studied by RERC, Inc. for Herbert Halbeck, Inc. and the Orange Blossom Trail Development Board in 1989. The results of this analysis were presented in a report which outlined three redevelopment scenarios for the Orange Blossom Trail corridor. These scenarios were based upon varying levels of public inducement to redevelopment and were titled Minimum, Moderate, and Maximum Scenarios. Table 1 provides the office space demand projections for the study area based upon the three scenarios.

Table 1
Office Space Projections
Orange Blossom Trail
Redevelopment Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Scenario</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Total Avg. Annual</td>
<td>Office Space (s.f.)</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>193,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>200,675</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>207,595</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>1,384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderate Scenario</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Total Avg. Annual</td>
<td>Office Space (s.f.)</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>193,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>313,755</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>443,755</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Scenario</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Total Avg. Annual</td>
<td>Office Space (s.f.)</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>193,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>443,755</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>693,755</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc.
Based on a review of the redevelopment plan, the Orange Blossom Trail Development Board has decided to encourage the last scenario to stimulate maximum redevelopment of the area. Assuming the public sector takes the necessary actions proposed, it is from the projected growth for the maximum scenario that the market potential for this specific project should be analyzed. In the 1990 to 1995 time period, the maximum growth projections anticipated the addition of 250,000 square feet of office space areawide. The following sections analyze the market potential of the specific project given these growth parameters, the financial feasibility and recommendations for its implementation.

PROPOSED PROJECT PROFILE

The proposed project has been identified in the redevelopment study(s) prepared to date as Parcel A. The 4.7± acre site is strategically located at the northern entrance to the Orange Blossom Trail Corridor being planned for redevelopment. The site includes two lots in separate ownership. The north lot comprises 141,000 square feet of land area and is the location of an older building with its associated parking. The building was built in 1956 as an industrial building and is presently being used for office space with light manufacturing.

The existing structure on Parcel A combined with the vacant property to the rear appears to be an underutilization of a key property influencing the image of the Orange Blossom Trail Corridor south of Colonial Drive. This property is a "gateway site" to the OBT corridor and offers excellent exposure to two major arterials: West Colonial and Highway 441.

The existing building on the north lot is owned by Park Center Properties out of New York and is leased to Automation Intelligence (AI). According to the current tenant of the building on-site, AI has been in the building for 5 years and plans to move in eighteen months when the lease expires. The dissatisfaction with the location involves the crime in the parking lot and the presence of homeless on the adjoining lot. The current rent being paid is $6 to 7.00 per square foot.

The southern lot sold in May of 1989 to an Orlando investor. The new owner’s plans for the property are unknown at this time. See Table 2 for information on property ownership, assessed value, and size. Map 1 provides an aerial photograph of the subject site.
### Table 4
OFFICE RENT ESTIMATE MODEL
Alternative 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Building 1</th>
<th>Building 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>v Land Area (Acres)</strong></td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v Floor to Area Ratio (FAR)</strong></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Size S.F.</td>
<td>204,732</td>
<td>204,732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Cost /S.F.</td>
<td>$23.20</td>
<td>$23.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v Land Cost Total</strong></td>
<td>$4,750,000</td>
<td>$4,750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Cost /S.F. Building</td>
<td>$66.43</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$33.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v Hard &amp; Soft Const Cost /S.F.</strong></td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost</td>
<td>$6,792,500</td>
<td>$6,792,500</td>
<td>$13,585,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces 4 / 1,000 SF</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v Cost/Space</strong></td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Cost</td>
<td>$85,800</td>
<td>$3,718,000</td>
<td>$3,718,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Cost/S.F.</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v Building Size</strong></td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td>143,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost /S.F.</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>$162.63</td>
<td>$147.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Development Cost</td>
<td>$11,628,300</td>
<td>$10,510,500</td>
<td>$22,138,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v Debt Coverage Ratio</strong></td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% Total Debt</td>
<td>$9,302,640</td>
<td>$8,408,400</td>
<td>$17,711,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Total Equity</td>
<td>$2,325,660</td>
<td>$2,102,100</td>
<td>$4,427,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Interest Expense</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>$930,256</td>
<td>$840,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Return on Equity</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>$232,566</td>
<td>$210,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Required Cash Flow</td>
<td>$1,162,830</td>
<td>$1,051,050</td>
<td>$2,213,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Size</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td>71,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Rent /S.F.</td>
<td>$16.26</td>
<td>$14.70</td>
<td>$15.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>v Operating Expenses /S.F.</strong></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Rent /S.F.</td>
<td>$21.26</td>
<td>$19.70</td>
<td>$20.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( v = \text{Variable} \)

Source: Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc (RERC)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEW BUILDING</th>
<th>REMODELED BUILDING</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v Land Area (Acres)</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Floor to Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Size S.F.</td>
<td>84,453</td>
<td>120,279</td>
<td>204,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Cost /S.F.</td>
<td>$5.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Land Cost Total</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Cost /S.F. Building</td>
<td>$14.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Est. Purchase Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Existing Building)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Hard &amp; Soft Const Cost /S.F.</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$42.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost</td>
<td>$2,975,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$4,275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces 4 / 1,000 SF</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Cost/Space</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Cost</td>
<td>$124,833</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$124,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Cost/S.F.</td>
<td>$3.57</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Building Size</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost /S.F.</td>
<td>(X) $102.85</td>
<td>$81.54</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Development Cost</td>
<td>$3,599,833</td>
<td>$5,300,000</td>
<td>$8,899,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Debt Coverage Ratio</td>
<td>(X) 1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% Total Debt</td>
<td>$2,879,867</td>
<td>$4,240,000</td>
<td>$7,119,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Total Equity</td>
<td>$719,967</td>
<td>$1,060,000</td>
<td>$1,779,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Interest Expense</td>
<td>($287,987)</td>
<td>$424,000</td>
<td>$711,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Return on Equity</td>
<td>($71,997)</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
<td>$177,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Size</td>
<td>(X) $359,983</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
<td>$889,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Required Rent /S.F.</td>
<td>$10.29</td>
<td>$8.15</td>
<td>$8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v Operating Expenses /S.F.</td>
<td>$3.85</td>
<td>$3.85</td>
<td>$3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Rent /S.F.</td>
<td>$14.14</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

v= Variable

Source: Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc (RERC)
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on current and earlier findings, a limited market exists for office space on the subject site. However, under either alternative, the project would have to be phased. The major constraint to realizing redevelopment of the site relates to the property's private ownership and the extent of financial involvement necessary by the OBT Development Board to stimulate its redevelopment. The key findings for each alternative are summarized below:

ALTERNATIVE 1 – NEW BUILDINGS

- Two office buildings could be built on the site under a phased approach, assuming the maximum market forecasts. The first building of 70,000 square feet would be fully leased within a 2.5 to 3.0 year period with rents of approximately $20.00 per square foot. The second building and structured parking could be built in the second phase and fully leased under a similar time frame.

  The lease up period will vary based on the size of the anchor tenant. RERC anticipates the leasing effort to begin before and during the construction phase.

- This alternative would produce the maximum impact on the Orange Blossom Trail area. It would set an entirely new precedent for development in the area.

- Due to the risk associated with this scenario, it would be difficult to find a private entrepreneur with resources to accomplish this plan without some form of government backing. At a minimum, a substantial anchor tenant would have to be secured.

- One possibility involves the securing of a financial institution as an anchor tenant in a new building on site and the inclusion of drive-in facilities in the redevelopment scheme. This would, however, require a change of zoning and perhaps a comprehensive plan amendment.

ALTERNATIVE 2 – MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING BUILDING AND ADDITION OF A NEW STRUCTURE

- A new 35,000 square foot office building could be built on the western portion of the northern site provided the property to the rear was acquired and new parking provided. Under the maximum market forecasts, the new building could be fully leased within two years. With the moderate market forecasts, the building could be fully leased in 2.8 years. Rents would be in the neighborhood of $14.00 per square foot.
Implementation of this alternative would not dramatically alter the appearance of the OBT corridor or its gateway. However, the existing structure is not a blight or an unstable land use. Furthermore, the addition of a highly landscaped parking lot could be a more attractive addition to the corridor than a structured garage.

This alternative could be accomplished with less public involvement due to the reduced risk associated with it. Furthermore, it would not be essential to secure an anchor tenant in a building of this size.

Rental rates which could be obtained from the existing structure could be increased from $6 to $7 per square foot to $12 per square foot with an estimated expenditure of $20.00 per square foot in remodeling.

Potential Public Action

Of the two alternatives outlined above, RERC considers Alternative 2 to be the most viable. Due to the extremely high cost of Alternative 1 and the amount of money required to bring the rents down to a competitive level, we are only considering Alternative 2 for public intervention.

RERC believes that relatively small financial incentives could help facilitate redevelopment of Parcel A. There was a $350 per space or $125,000 budgeted for improvement of the parking lot on Table 5. If OBTDB contributed the improvement of a parking lot with security fences, heavy landscaping, and an entry gate, this may be sufficient expenditures to facilitate the redevelopment of the property. However, beyond the actual outlay of funds to facilitate redevelopment of Parcel A, considerable public inducement would also be necessary in the form of contacting owners and stimulating redevelopment interest.

The preceding report offers initial information of the project feasibility assuming two alternative redevelopment scenarios. Both of these alternatives were analyzed without benefit of the property owners' input. At this point in time, the property owners of the subject property should be contacted by the OBT Development Board to learn their input. A more in-depth financial proforma could be accomplished with a refinement of the proposed redevelopment program for the subject site.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to assess the feasibility of a redevelopment project proposed on the west side of SR 441, south of Michigan Avenue, east of Westmoreland Drive and north of I-4. Parcel "H" is currently developed with a mixture of incompatible land uses with some buildings in need of redevelopment while others are viable, good quality buildings which should not be redeveloped. This report analyzes the market potential for the proposed redevelopment of portions of Parcel "H" and provides an understanding of the financial considerations surrounding the project, and offers recommendations for its implementation. See Map 1 for property location and study area.

ORANGE BLOSSOM TRAIL MARKET FORECASTS

The overall market opportunities for the Orange Blossom Trail Redevelopment area were studied by RERC, Inc. for Herbert Halbeck, Inc. and the Orange Blossom Trail Development Board. The results of this analysis were presented in a report which outlined three redevelopment scenarios for the Orange Blossom Trail corridor. These scenarios were based upon varying levels of public inducement to redevelopment and were titled Minimum, Moderate, and Maximum Public Involvement Scenarios. Table 1 on the following page provides the study area projections for commercial, office, and industrial space for the three scenarios.

Based on a review of the redevelopment plan, the Orange Blossom Trail Development Board has decided to pursue the Maximum Public Involvement Scenario to stimulate redevelopment of the area. Assuming the public sector takes the necessary actions proposed, it is from the maximum scenario that the market potential for this specific project should be analyzed. In the 1990 to 1995 time period, the maximum growth projections anticipated the addition of 250,000 square feet of office space areawide with the moderate scenario anticipating the addition of 120,000 square feet of office space. In the 1990 to 1995 time period, the maximum growth projections anticipate the addition of 50,000 square feet of retail space with the moderate forecasts projecting 40,000 square feet of retail space. By far, the greatest demand is expected to be for industrial space with the maximum projection the addition of 400,000 square feet and the moderate projections could increase 250,000 square feet areawide.

It should be noted that the growth forecasts cover the entire redevelopment area and will not be realized by a single project. Consequently, market potential for the proposed project will have to be considered assuming only a share of the areawide projected growth is realized on-site.
Table 1
LAND USE PROJECTIONS
ORANGE BLOSSOM TRAIL
REDEVELOPMENT AREA

Minimum Public Involvement Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Office</th>
<th></th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>193,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,707,699</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>988,760</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>200,675</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>1,904,584</td>
<td>196,885</td>
<td>1,022,688</td>
<td>33,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>207,595</td>
<td>6,920</td>
<td>2,101,469</td>
<td>196,885</td>
<td>1,056,575</td>
<td>33,908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moderate Public Involvement Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Office</th>
<th></th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>193,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,707,699</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>988,760</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>313,755</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>1,957,699</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>1,028,760</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>443,755</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>2,207,699</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>1,078,760</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Public Involvement Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Office</th>
<th></th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>S.F.</td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>193,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,707,699</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>988,760</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>443,755</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,107,699</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>1,038,760</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>693,755</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,507,699</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>1,098,760</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc.

PROPOSED PROJECT PROFILE

Parcel H offers a high degree of access and visibility from Interstate 4 but is presently developed in a mixture of marginal uses which do not reflect the property's true development potential. Map 2 depicts existing land use patterns and Map 3 identifies buildings which are considered to be of limited value in their present condition, and therefore are possible candidates for re-development. Based on the patterns of uses found on Map 2 and the condition of the existing structures illustrated on Map 3, RERC identified six areas within Parcel "H" which have common characteristics and redevelopment potential (see Map 4).

As can be seen from Map 2, the Michigan Avenue (27th Street) frontage is divided into small lots, many of which have homes committed to other uses or small commercial buildings. There has been considerable interest by the brokerage community and some sales activity along the Michigan frontage. Much of the Michigan frontage is suitable for redevelopment and this frontage could be
MAP 3
AREAS IN NEED OF REDEVELOPMENT

Areas in need of redevelopment.

Parcels with an assessed improvement value of less than $30,000.
enhanced by adding the lots currently occupied by housing or marginal structures along the north side of Twenty Eighth Street. The proposed redevelopment sites are numbered 4 and 5 on Map 4 and would not necessarily have to be absorbed into a larger single tract but could be redeveloped individually. The buildings fronting on Orange Blossom Trail are occupied by night clubs, a transmission shop and a motorcycle repair shop. These properties could be assembled into two significant retail sites, numbered 1 and 2 on the map.

The interior of the study area is in relatively stable land uses and should probably not be redeveloped at the present time. The church is a stable use in the area and would not detract from its redevelopment potential. The industrial buildings in area 6 appear to be sound.

The relatively large assemblage noted as number 3 on the map is in the most need of redevelopment. The houses are incompatible with the other land uses in the area. Several of the buildings are in poor condition and a major portion of site 3 is for sale. While the crane rental located north of I-4 and east of Orange Blossom Trail is a viable business, its physical appearance is not an asset to the area.

The planned redevelopment defines Parcel "H" as a business park and proposes to provide the necessary infrastructure to stimulate redevelopment. The extent of land acquisition and assemblage which could be accomplished by the redevelopment board depends greatly upon the depth of funding ability. Outlined below are alternative strategies proposed to realize the redevelopment of this property.

**Alternative 1** - The first alternative would involve the expenditure of public funds to build the necessary sewer, water, storm water, and entry features to define the business park and allow the private sector to take the initiative in the redevelopment of property in the area.

**Alternative 2** - The second alternative parallels the first with only public expenditures for infrastructure. This alternative, however, also includes an off-ramp from I-4 to Orange Blossom Trail north and a re-entry to the east. (The existing interchange does not allow for a northbound movement on to Orange Blossom Trail for I-4 traffic heading west nor does it permit traffic traveling south on Orange Blossom Trail to enter I-4 to the east.

**Alternative 3** - The third alternative involves the provision of public infrastructure improvements proposed under alternative 1 as well as the acquisition and assemblage of a block of property within Parcel H for resale to accelerate its redevelopment and to stimulate further activity in the area.
MAP 4
REDEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL
PARCEL "H" OWNERSHIP INFORMATION

Map 5, on the following page, identifies the parcels of land which have common ownership. From the county tax records a total of 77 tax roll entries (called tracts in later text) were identified within the boundaries of Parcel "H". Of those 77 entries (called "tracts" later in text), there are 52 different ownership entities, of which 25 are single family residences. Four parcels are church owned and nine of the twenty-five single family residences are owner occupied structures.

Table 2 below identifies the tracts grouped by ownership. An example of multiple tracts owned by one entity is at the top of the page is the case of Bar One, Inc., which owns parcel numbers 42, 43, 61, 32, and 33, identified on Map 5 as letter "D" and highlighted on Table 2 as letter "D". Please note the tracts in single ownership are noted as letters on Map 5 and Table 2 while single ownership tracts - tracts with a single county record entry - are noted as numbers. For example, tract number 50 on Map 5 is comprised of eight subdivision lots owned and occupied by the Holden Heights Baptist Church.

There are 43 parcels totalling 8.4 acres with buildings assessed at a value of less than $30,000 as indicated on Map 3 earlier in the report. Twenty-one of these parcels are currently vacant, totalling 3.63 acres. Unfortunately, the bulk of these lots are not contiguous and are scattered throughout Parcel "H", and therefore do not represent a significant opportunity for redevelopment. Based on our inspection of the area, a number of buildings have been significantly improved since the county’s last reappraisal. This will increase the cost and difficulty of acquisitions and to some degree decreases the need for redevelopment of those specific parcels.
TABLE 2
PARCELS I N COMMON OWNERSHIP
OBT PARCEL "H"

hlP

SALE

LAND IMPRVMT
SALE
VALUE
VALUE USE
PRICE
536,600 $92,625 5123,638 IND
578,753 WH
550,000 $138,938
$207,883 IND
$100 $39,341
$0 COh4
5100 $13.1 14
$0 COM
5100 510,901
$20,487 SF
$0 S18,051
$31,646 SF
SO $16,875
515,367 SF
523,000 $19,388
519,165 SF
548.000 $36,462
5225,000 $43,875 $111,146 COM
5100 514,123 S100.071 COM
SO COM
53,500 510,901
$26,228
58
1.773
CHC
$100
$18,798 COh4
SO $40,196
$456 COM
$0 $40,196
$16,875
$13,054
SF
529,000
SO COM
5100 510,901
$7,547
$69,819 OFF
5100
$34,974 WH
576,000 510,901
519.000
510,901
SO COM
550,000 S 16,875.
$43,339 COM
$12.752 LOT
5100,000 587.750
520,ooo 516,875
$31,765 COM
S98.000 $13,400
$63,364 COM
518.300 $25.313
$29,346 SF
538,456 COhl
5100 567.941
556,487 WH
SO $84,000
$940 COM
so 537,250
5248,000 543,083
521,277 LOT
$0 $135,000 5175,000 CHC
$17,938
$5,775 SF
$4 1,626
$520 COM
517,925
532.985 SF
$18,201
59,504COM
525,313
$82,774 IND
S20.828 SF
530.870
516,875
$11.035 SF
518.300
564,013 SF
$27.000
SO SF
519.388
525,821 SF
533,750 5125,145 WH
$35,368
524,852 COM
$16,962
SO COM

- - -

TAX
53,717
$3,857
$4,249
5225
5187
$232
5401
$597
$956
52,664
SO
50
SO
$1,014
$690
$1.030
5187
S1,330
$788
5187
51,035
51,727
5836
f 1.319
5939
$2,054
$2.414
$828
51,226
50
$408
$724
$445
5376
51,858
5889
S80
$1.415
$464
5777
$2,731
51,035
$292

LAND
SlZE
28,500
42,750
12,105
4,035
3.354
6,017
6.750
7.050
12,154
13.500
8,070
3,354
8.070
12,368
12.368
6,750
3.354
3.354
3,354
3,354
6,750
27.000
6,750
4,123
10,125
15.098
24,000
13.500
9.070
.54,ooo
5.125
11.893
6,518
6,067
10,125
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66
3
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1-2
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4
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25-26 66
22-14 66
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H23-2 60
5
71
6
71
7
71
8
71
H23-2 60
21-24 61
14
60
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20-HI 60
11-12 66
6-9
61
16-17 61
13-14 66
9-16 67
29
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30-32 71
7-8
70
9
60
15-HI 60
2-H3 61
22
60
8
60
3 4 67
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67
5-6
67
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23-24 67

OWNER
BAR ONE. INC.
BAR ONE, INC.
BAR ONE INC
BAR ONE INC
BAR ONE INC.
BARBER VERGlL & RUBY
BETHUNE S. & D.
CARAVELLA ANTHONY V.
CARTER. DAVID R: BETTY
CHOQUETTE. R. B BETTY
CHRIST FOR THE WORLD,INC
CHRIST FOR THE WORLD.INC
CHRIST FOR TllE WORLD.INC
DARDEN A. & D. CRAKER
DARDEN DDRTHY hl CRAKER
DAVlS CHARLES R: NELJDX
DAVlS HENRY B: JEANETTE
DAVlS HENRY & JEANETTE
DAVIS HENRY & JEANETTE
DAVIS HENRY R: JEANETTE
DECARLO C. & J.
DICKSON N. ((: D.
DRURY SCOTT
DYER R hlERRlTT
FANNlN ANITA S.
FIZGERALD PAUL G.
GRECO PAULINE
GRECO. PAULINE
GUZMAN FELIX VEGA
HOLDEN HEIGHTS BAPTIST
HOLT JOSEPH & SHIRLEY
HOLT JOSEPH Rr SHIRLEY
HOOPS PAUL & JACQUELINE
JENKINS L. & NIlITE CECIL
JOHNSON JUDITH
JONES RAYMOND R: PAULINE
KLAAS RICHARD cY: WANDA
LAKE MARGARET COh4P.WY
LE\\'IS EARL 8: RUBY
MACFARLANE hlARILY N. TR
MACFARLANE hlARILYN, TR
MCCXLL SERVICE INC.
MCCALL SERVICE INC.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MP</th>
<th>SALE</th>
<th>SALE</th>
<th>LAND</th>
<th>IMPRVM</th>
<th>LAND</th>
<th>BUILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>VALUE</td>
<td>IMPRVM</td>
<td>USE</td>
<td>TAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>88.08</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
<td>$21,938</td>
<td>$23,403 SF</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>83.02</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$18,006</td>
<td>$29,039 COM</td>
<td>$808</td>
<td>6,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>89.04</td>
<td>$62,000</td>
<td>$16,875</td>
<td>$11,586 SF</td>
<td>$489</td>
<td>6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>84.11</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$21,801</td>
<td>$0 COM</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>6,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>87.05</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$33,750</td>
<td>$0 COM</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>87.10</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td>$80,122 COM</td>
<td>$2,279</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>78.11</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$18,300</td>
<td>$23,342 SF</td>
<td>$715</td>
<td>6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>83.10</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$17,625</td>
<td>$19,101 SF</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>7,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>71.06</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$17,625</td>
<td>$55,848 WH</td>
<td>$1,263</td>
<td>7,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>87.08</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$14,284</td>
<td>$42,975 COM</td>
<td>$984</td>
<td>4,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>87.08</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$26,618</td>
<td>$3,681 COM</td>
<td>$920</td>
<td>8,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>88.10</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$39,741 SF</td>
<td>$1,044</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>84.05</td>
<td>$239,300</td>
<td>$57,798</td>
<td>$146,483 COM</td>
<td>$3,630</td>
<td>12,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>84.05</td>
<td>$30,700</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$0 COM</td>
<td>$464</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>85.08</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$25,313</td>
<td>$31,462 SF</td>
<td>$537</td>
<td>10,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>87.10</td>
<td>$107,000</td>
<td>$36,600</td>
<td>$42,156 SF</td>
<td>$1,353</td>
<td>12,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>85.05</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$34,895</td>
<td>$80,923 COM</td>
<td>$1,990</td>
<td>10,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.12</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$25,313</td>
<td>$33,028 SF</td>
<td>$1,003</td>
<td>10,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>77.06</td>
<td>$21,300</td>
<td>$16,785</td>
<td>$29,167 SF</td>
<td>$353</td>
<td>6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>75.06</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$11,813</td>
<td>$20,196 COM</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>87.10</td>
<td>$236,200</td>
<td>$64,332</td>
<td>$82,973 COM</td>
<td>$2,652</td>
<td>14,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>87.10</td>
<td>$43,800</td>
<td>$21,938</td>
<td>$0 COM</td>
<td>$377</td>
<td>6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$99,630</td>
<td>$30,913 COM</td>
<td>$2,364</td>
<td>19,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>77.06</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$66,580</td>
<td>$0 COM</td>
<td>$1,264</td>
<td>13,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$35,625</td>
<td>$0 COM</td>
<td>$612</td>
<td>7,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$111,701 WH</td>
<td>$3,123</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>83.11</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$18,126</td>
<td>$31,438 COM</td>
<td>$852</td>
<td>6,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$36,600</td>
<td>$41,619 SF</td>
<td>$1,344</td>
<td>12,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>83.05</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$31,430</td>
<td>$11,170 SF</td>
<td>$732</td>
<td>11,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>83.06</td>
<td>$5,870</td>
<td>$12,578</td>
<td>$0 COM</td>
<td>$216</td>
<td>3,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>83.06</td>
<td>$5,870</td>
<td>$12,578</td>
<td>$0 COM</td>
<td>$216</td>
<td>3,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>83.06</td>
<td>$25,933</td>
<td>$33,433</td>
<td>$19,798 STG</td>
<td>$914</td>
<td>10,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>83.06</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$0 COM</td>
<td>$1,160</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>79.12</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$36,680</td>
<td>$13,420 SF</td>
<td>$431</td>
<td>13,338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$582,002

Source: Orange County Records; Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc. (RERC)
II. MARKET POTENTIAL OF SITE

The potential for redevelopment of Parcel H is largely constrained by the land costs in the area. Because the property is almost fully developed, the cost of acquisition and assemblage is much higher than with raw acreage. Despite appearances and unstable uses, the area's marginal buildings still produce income and, therefore, increase the value of property.

Outlined below on Table 3 are RERC's estimates of the land values found on Parcel H including the structure. These estimates are based on 155% of their assessed values and are reflective of asking prices in the area. The site numbers relate to Map 3 presented previously in this report. See Appendix for all assessed values.

Table 3
PROPERTY VALUE ESTIMATES
PARCEL H REDEVELOPMENT SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Acquisition Cost</th>
<th>Price/Land S.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 906,000</td>
<td>$11.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$ 668,000</td>
<td>$10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,160,000</td>
<td>$ 9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td>$ 9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,640,000</td>
<td>$10.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2,633,000</td>
<td>$11.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc.

Both the high costs of site assemblage and the unsightly appearance of much of the corridor is largely responsible for the absence of any redevelopment activity initiated by the private sector.

REDEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Table 4 outlines a typical redevelopment program for the six sites assuming the properties could be assembled, cleared and made ready for new development. This program primarily relates to alternatives 1 and 3 discussed in the introduction. Under alternative 2, much of site 3 would be lost to the interchange improvement.
Table 4
PARCEL H
TYPICAL REDEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL
(Alternative 1 and 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site #</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Redevelopment Potential</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>17,800 s.f.</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15,000 s.f.</td>
<td>Commercial/Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>80,000 s.f.</td>
<td>Industrial/Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>22,500 s.f.</td>
<td>Industrial/Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>52,500 s.f.</td>
<td>Industrial/Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>59,000 s.f.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>246,800 s.f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc.

As can be seen from Table 4 and Map 4 previously presented, the frontage sites on Orange Blossom Trail are shown for commercial and commercial/service land uses. Site 1 offers a strong commercial/retail location at the intersection of Orange Blossom Trail and Michigan Avenue. This property could be redeveloped for a service station with an associated convenience outlet; this effort could probably be accomplished without public inducements. Site 2 offers a good site for commercial/service such as the transmission shop presently located on a portion of the property. This site could be redeveloped for an auto mall which offers bays for lease to automotive services such as tire sales, alternator shops, tune up specialists, etc.

The largest site assemblage possible is on the property located at the intersection of I-4 and Orange Blossom Trail. Due to the mixture of land uses, site 3 offers the greatest opportunity for change in the area. Assemblage and clearance of this property could make one or multiple sites available with exposure on Interstate 4. While access is limited from Orlando by the interchange configurations, this site still offers excellent exposure and good access from the south. Without public involvement, the redevelopment of this property would probably be very slow to occur due to the mix of ownership and uses.

Sites 4 and 5 could be redeveloped for industrial/business land uses. Based on the character of the area, it does not seem likely that the property could support office or retail uses.
PARCEL H ZONING CONSTRAINTS

Parcel H currently has two zoning districts, C-2 and C-3. The area west of Woods Street to Orange Blossom Train is zoned C-3 as the area from Woods Street east to Westmoreland is zoned C-2 (see Map 1). Inasmuch as many of the existing uses do not conform to these zoning categories, Map 2 identifies the buildings that still appear to have functional use.

From an economic standpoint, RERC believes that C-2 is not the most advantageous zoning category for the east portion of Parcel H. C-3, on the other hand, appears to be appropriate for the uses that are best suited in this area.

The following is a summary of these two zoning districts as presented in the Orange County Zoning Code (copies found in Appendix).

C-2 General Commercial District

C-2 zoning is intended to "provide for the retailing of commodities and the furnishing of several major services, selected trade shops and automotive repairs". The locations "will be encouraged along minor arterials and major arterial roads".

The C-2 zoning includes uses such as a car wash, auto shops, mobile home sales, new and used automobile sales. The portion of Parcel H (excluding the Michigan frontage) that is zoned C-2 will not likely be developed for those uses because it does not have adequate visibility to any major roads. RERC was unable to identify particular users that failed to locate in this area due to zoning, but careful analysis by a land planner is recommended to avoid constraints.

C-3 Wholesale Commercial District

C-3 zoning is intended to conduct "the business of wholesale distribution, storage and light manufacturing". They should be located "near principal thoroughfares and/or rail roads". This zoning category includes most industrial and warehouse uses except slaughter houses, petrochemical or corrosive refining, or manufacturing or other "dirty" manufacturers.

In essence, C-3 zoning encompasses the types of uses that appear best suited for Parcel H.
ABSORPTION POTENTIAL OF REDEVELOPED SITES

Table 5 below estimates the absorption potential of redeveloped sites given the three alternatives. Under alternatives 1, 2, and 3, public infrastructure improvements would be made to the area including water, sewer, stormwater, and signage. Alternative 2 assumes the on-site public infrastructure improvements would be made as well as interchange improvements to I-4. As mentioned before, it is felt that much of site 3 would be lost to interchange improvements. However, improved access to I-4 would help larger scale redevelopment of Parcel "H".

Table 5
ABSORPTION POTENTIAL FOR REDEVELOPED SITES WITHIN PARCEL H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Development</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Resale Time Frame</th>
<th>Industrial/Business</th>
<th>Resale Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32,800 s.f.</td>
<td></td>
<td>164,000 s.f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Absorption Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>5,000 s.f.</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>30,000 s.f.</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>16,000 s.f.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>80,000 s.f.</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>7,000 s.f.</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>60,000 s.f.</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc.
Because there are existing income-producing structures, the land cost could be significantly higher than in a comparable development on raw land. After demolition, acquisition costs will range from $9.00 to $11.50 per square foot, which is extremely high land cost for industrial properties in the Orlando market. Such prices could, in fact, be higher than the potential resale price of the redeveloped industrial parcels.

Summarized below are the financial estimates of the project costs for Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 outlined on page 6 and an analysis of Alternative 3 for two sites, 1 and 3. The variable in these two alternatives is the size and cost of the land. The costs associated with Alternative 2 are not included in this analysis.

**ALTERNATIVE 1**

Table 6 below provides estimates of the cost of implementation of the public infrastructure improvements. These estimates assume this is the first sewer improvement program to be implemented in the overall area and therefore includes extensive off-site costs. Orange County has agreed to contribute $850,000 in off site sewer costs to assist the project. In total, the infrastructure improvement cost estimates equal $930,000. This alternative does not include any means to recover these costs. Due to the blighted condition of much of the property in Parcel H, it does not appear feasible to assess the adjoining property owners for these costs. But rather, these costs will probably have to be expenditures made by the public sector in an effort to induce redevelopment of the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer on-site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets, curb, gutters, entry features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater, lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain/Loss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATIVE 2**

The costs associated with right-of-way acquisition and construction for an I-4 on and off ramp will likely be too high to justify serious consideration of this option. RERC believes that land
Table 2
Property Information

Parcel A

North Lot:

Owner: Park Center Properties
150 Broadway
Menands, NY 12204

Land: 141,000 square feet
Building: 56,142 square feet
33,747 square feet (heated)
Assessed Value: $2,931,141
Date of Purchase: 1984
Year Built: 1956

South Lot:

Owner: James Baskin
614 N. Orange Blossom Trail
Orlando, Florida 32805

Land: 84,453 square feet
Building: 1,695 square feet
Assessed Value: $404,864
Date of Purchase: May, 1989
Price: $406,600 ($4.81/square foot)

Source: Orange County Property Records, 1990

Upon review of the subject property, RERC identified two alternatives that consider two general development approaches. This report analyzes these two redevelopment alternatives for the property as briefly described below:

Alternative 1: The first would involve clearing the property of existing structures (and at a building density permitted under O-2 zoning). This would include two buildings with a total of 143,000 square feet of space and structured parking in the rear.

Alternative 2: The second alternative is a less ambitious. In this alternative, the south lot could be redeveloped for surface parking in a heavily landscaped and secured, park-like setting. This parking would serve the existing building as
well as provide supplemental parking for a new building on the western portion of the property. The new building would include approximately 35,000 square feet of space. The existing building would still be available for rent in its current condition. Improving the parking and security situation and adding a new building adjacent to the existing structure could induce renovation of the older building. This option does not preclude its future demolition and replacement by higher quality, more intensive office space and structured parking.
II. MARKET POTENTIAL OF PROJECT

The area office market was analyzed in the opportunities analysis prepared in March of 1989 by RERC, Inc. Essentially, office construction has been virtually non-existent in the OBT study area for a number of years. A weak market in the study area has been perpetuated by the very strong office growth in other suburban markets and the negative perception of OBT.

The subject site exists somewhat apart from the balance of the OBT study area due to its location along W. Colonial Drive. As such, it could also be considered with the small office sub-market found along West Colonial Drive. New construction has been moderately more active along this corridor. The major recent office project in this area is the Orlando Executive Center, the location of two 30,000 square foot buildings and a 60,000 square foot building added since 1984. Other additions to the office supply in this general area include the Pardue Heid Building with 19,940 square feet built in 1983 (100% occupied), the Gouchenaur building with 20,234 square feet built in 1984 (75% occupied), and the Rolls building with 8,000 square feet built in 1988 (75% occupied). Occupancy rates are stable in all of these buildings today.

Table 3 provides a listing of the types of tenants found in offices located along West Colonial Drive between Orange Blossom Trail and Tampa Avenue. As can be seen from the table, the most common tenants are real estate related businesses, attorneys, and advertising agencies. Unlike other locations, much of the occupied office space in this area is either owner occupied or single tenant buildings. The area’s locational characteristics offer proximity to the downtown, but still allow easy access and surface parking on-site. Another factor contributing to the tenant characteristics are the presence of smaller buildings in this area.

Rental rates for office space in this node average $10 - $12.50 per square foot. An exception is The Orlando Executive Center which is asking for rents as high as $16 per square foot of any future tenants. As mentioned, before the rent received on the existing building on-site is between $6 and $7 per square foot.

A negative feature of the W. Colonial area is the number of vacancies and properties for sale in the smaller office conversions, particularly those found on the south side of Colonial Drive between Orange Blossom Trail and Tampa Avenue. Crime has been sighted as a continuing problem in this area. The small, older buildings have more security problems that can be better solved with shared costs in the multi tenant buildings. As a result, the multi tenant offices in this node have less security complaints.
Table 3
Tenant Profile
West Colonial Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attorneys</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Brokers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors/Design</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Companies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial (Plan/Invest/Etc.)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Reps.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Agencies</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists &amp; Related</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiropractor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Clinic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Therapist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Union Offices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Bureau</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Related</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Non-Profit Offices</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering Service</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier Service</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Investigator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


ALTERNATIVE 1 - NEW BUILDINGS

The absorption potential of any new office structures relates primarily to the type of space offered and the rental rates. The next section of this report analyzes rental rates given assumptions concerning typical building costs and structured parking. This analysis anticipates that rental rates of $20.00 per square foot would be necessary in new structures on-site with structured parking. The basis for this rate structure is explored in more detail on pages 9-11. At this rate and for this type building, the competition would be largely from first class downtown office buildings.
The RERC forecasts anticipated 25,000 to 50,000 square feet of office space could be absorbed in the overall study area depending upon the level of public investment in the area. Not all of this space could be captured in a single project. Assuming the newly built structure would capture fifty percent under the maximum growth forecast or sixty percent under the moderate growth forecasts of this demand, the estimated absorption potential would fall between 15,000 square feet and 25,000 square feet annually.

**ALTERNATIVE 2 - MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING BUILDING AND ADDITION OF SECOND STRUCTURE**

The absorption potential of a single new building of a smaller scale with surface parking would be somewhat different from the first alternative. Based on the performance outlined in the next chapter, the rental rates would be approximately $14.00 per square foot. With this pricing structure, the competition would be more from suburban office space in the area.

Under this scenario, a new building with 35,000 square feet could be leased within twenty-four to thirty months with an average annual absorption between 12,500 and 17,500 square feet. This assumes a capture of approximately fifty percent under the maximum growth forecast or 55 percent under the moderate growth forecast. Alternative 2 may capture a smaller share of the total market compared with Alternative 1 because the older, remodeled building may not be as desirable as a new building.
III. FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

To analyze the financial feasibility of alternative development options, a simple model was prepared. This model is designed to produce an estimated rent per square foot based on land cost, building costs, required debt to equity ratio and operating expenses. Tables 4 and 5 illustrate and contrast the two alternative development scenarios presented earlier in this report.

METHODODOLOGY

The model uses a number of variables to arrive at a final per square foot rent rate. It begins by calculating an estimated construction cost (includes hard and soft costs plus a 5% vacancy factor) and land cost to arrive at total project cost. Using a debt coverage ratio, the total debt requirement was calculated. The balance of the total cost is the required equity. The next line item calculates the annual interest expense and the annual return on equity to arrive at the total required annual cash flow. This number was then divided by the building’s total square footage at the rent per square foot. This number was added to the estimated operating expenses to arrive at an effective rent per square foot. We used these numbers to compare the proposed projects against current market conditions.

Alternative 1

Table 4 presents the analysis of Alternative 1. In this scenario, RERC assumes that a .7 Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) is attainable which allows two buildings totaling 143,000 square feet. This plan is based on the assumption that the Colonial Drive property with the building could be purchased for $4 million and that the property to the south could be purchased for $500,000. Demolition costs are estimated at $3.50 per square foot of building or approximately $250,000.

- $4,000,000.00 Purchase price-existing building/land
- $250,000.00 Demolition
- $500,000.00 Vacant land
- $4,750,000.00 Total

Effective land price $23.20 per square foot

This alternative anticipates the development of two buildings. The first will not require a parking structure but when the second building is built, a parking garage will be required to serve both buildings. A parking structure would add a cost of approximately $26 per leasable square foot of building. The effective rent required in this alternative is almost $20.50 per square foot. In the Orlando office market, rents that equal $20.00 are not achieved except in the "A" class office buildings in downtown (Sunbank Center and DuPont Center for example).
Alternative 2

Alternative 2 (Table 5) anticipates development of a new 35,000 square foot building on the parking lot of the existing Automation Intelligence building and provision of most of the required parking for the two buildings on the vacant site to the south of that parcel. This plan also proposes the remodeling of the existing 65,000 square foot structure into good quality office space after the successful lease up of the new 35,000 square foot building. In this scenario, we anticipate a slightly lower quality building, for the new and/or remodeled structure. Because there is no need for structured parking, the rents are significantly lower and it appears much more feasible from a market standpoint.

Rents in this case would be $14.44 per square foot in the new building and $12.00 per square foot in the remodeled building. The overall rate for the two buildings is $12.75 per square foot.
values could increase as much as $2.00 per square foot with the construction of these ramps, if, however, the entire 18.8 acres were cleared and re-developed, this would only equate to $1.6 million of additional value. This would not cover the cost of the new I-4 ramps acquisition and development. Therefore, RERC has eliminated this Alternative from further consideration.

**ALTERNATIVE 3 (Site 3 Redevelopment)**

Table 7 provides estimates of the cost and revenue associated with implementation of Alternative 3 for site 3 (see Map 4). In addition to the infrastructure costs estimated for alternative 1 at $980,000 this alternative includes a cost for acquisition and clearance of site 3 adjacent to I-4. Based on current market values achieved for I-4 frontage in suburban locations north and south of the site, we estimate a sale price of $6.00 to $8.00 per square foot at site 3. This alternative also includes revenue potential from the resale of site 3 estimated at $1,882,000. This revenue is based on the higher land sale price of $8 per square foot which is less than the acquisition estimate of $9.20 per square foot. As found under Alternative 1, this program also will have a significant cost associated with it which cannot feasibly be recaptured from the private sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer on-site</strong></td>
<td>$590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street, curbs, gutters, entry features</strong></td>
<td>$340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stormwater, lighting</strong></td>
<td>$2,157,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Acquisition (Site #3)</strong></td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demolition (Site #3)</strong></td>
<td>$3,212,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,882,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATIVE 3 (Site 1 Redevelopment)**

Table 8 below provides the cost and revenue associated with implementation of Alternative 3 on Site 1. The cost of infrastructure is the same as above but RERC estimates a land acquisition cost of $906,000 and demolition of $39,000. (The acquisition cost may range between $900,000 to $1,250,000 depending
on the negotiated price.) RERC believes that this parcel may be sold in two out-parcels for $12.50 per square foot or $980,100. The net loss in this alternative is $895,000 to $1,245,000.

Table 8
Alternative 3
Project Cost and Revenue
(Site 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer on Site</td>
<td>$590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets, curbs, gutters, entry features, stormwater, lighting</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition (Site 1)</td>
<td>$906,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,875,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resale of Site 1 (1.8 Acres @ 12.50/s.f.)</td>
<td>$980,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain/Loss</td>
<td>$(895,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The total redevelopment of Parcel "H" - that is acquiring all of the 18.8 acres and demolishing and redeveloping it into a business park - does not appear to be financially feasible. High land cost and the relative difficulty of purchasing property which supports successful businesses imposes real economic barriers that must be considered in planning a further strategy. That said, however, we believe that certain actions could be taken to help facilitate the redevelopment of Parcel "H".

The first alternative is the acquisition of site 3. This action could change the public perception of the area by creating new activity on the I-4 frontage. Furthermore, this property could yield some of the highest prices of the industrial land in Parcel "H". This would help defray the losses from the acquisition and redevelopment of the high priced properties making up site 3. This option could cost almost $2.2 million, net of sale proceeds.

The second alternative considered was the acquisition of Site 1 (found on Map 4). This plan would have a strong impact on Orange Blossom Trail but not on the I-4 frontage. This option could cost from $900,000 to $1,250,000 depending on the cost of land acquisition.

Working with current land owners in the redevelopment process would be advantageous in bringing about change in the area. The addition of aesthetic features such as signage, landscaping and functional features such as sewer and master retention would help push the redevelopment process along. The existence of single family residences in the area contributes to the instability of the business environment. (Crime is associated with these residences, but there is a diminished perception of the area as a suitable location for industrial and warehouse uses.)

RERC believes that there could be a substantial demand for industrial and warehouse uses in this location due to the strong transportation network that allows easy access north and south on Orange Blossom Trail, as well as east and west on a regional basis and north and south on a local basis to I-4.
### APPENDIX I

**INVENTORY OF PROPERTY LOCATED IN PARCEL H**

#### Site 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Land S.F.</th>
<th>Bldg. S.F.</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pauline Greco</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>5,378</td>
<td>$140,487</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mich. Peter</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mich. Peter</td>
<td>12,844</td>
<td>4,779</td>
<td>204,281</td>
<td>Night Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>H. Tessinani</td>
<td>14,296</td>
<td>2,385</td>
<td>147,305</td>
<td>Night Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>H. Tessinani</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,938</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pauline Greco</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,190</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,390</td>
<td>12,542</td>
<td>$589,201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessed Value = $ 7.70/s.f.  
Market Estimate = $11.70/s.f.  
155% ($906,500)

#### Site 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Land S.F.</th>
<th>Bldg. S.F.</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>P. Fitzgerald</td>
<td>15,098</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>$106,897</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>F. Gauzman</td>
<td>9,070</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>64,360</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>M. Dyer</td>
<td>4,123</td>
<td>6,184</td>
<td>76,764</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>J. Opper</td>
<td>8,190</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>30,299</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>J. Opper</td>
<td>4,395</td>
<td>2,791</td>
<td>57,259</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>D. Dauden</td>
<td>12,368</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,652</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>S. Dauden</td>
<td>12,368</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>58,994</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>65,612</td>
<td>18,789</td>
<td>$434,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessed Value = $ 6.62/s.f.  
Market Estimate = $10.18/s.f.  
155% ($668,800)
### Site 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Land S.F.</th>
<th>Bldg. S.F.</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A. Moody</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>$28,461</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>F. Simmons</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>32,461</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>R. Myers</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>36,726</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>J. Nuccitelli</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>73,473</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>M. MacFarlane</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>45,209</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>A. Caravella</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>34,755</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>McCall Ser.</td>
<td>12,861</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>60,220</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>McCall Ser.</td>
<td>6,168</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,962</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>P. Hoops</td>
<td>6,518</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>50,910</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>R. Westbury</td>
<td>11,429</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>42,600</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>M. Wofford</td>
<td>13,338</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>50,100</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>E. Moody</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,801</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Bar One</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,901</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Christ Church</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,901</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>H. Davis</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,901</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>H. Davis</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>77,396</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>H. Davis</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>2,758</td>
<td>45,875</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>H. Davis</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,901</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>W. Wessel</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,578</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>W. Wessel</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,578</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>W. Wessel</td>
<td>10,287</td>
<td>4,239</td>
<td>53,231</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>D. Saceder</td>
<td>10,737</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>115,818</td>
<td>Auto Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Thomas Lumber</td>
<td>19,926</td>
<td>2,688</td>
<td>130,543</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Thomas Propl</td>
<td>13,316</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66,580</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Thomas Lumber</td>
<td>7,125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,625</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Thomas Lumber</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>12,480</td>
<td>181,701</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>W. Wessel</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>J. Holt</td>
<td>5,125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,713</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>J. Holt</td>
<td>11,893</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42,146</td>
<td>Auto Sales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 235,963 8,334 $390,904

Assessed value = $5.94/s.f.
Market estimate = $9.14/s.f.
@ 155% ($2,157,000)

### Site 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Land S.F.</th>
<th>Bldg. S.F.</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>W. Persand</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>$60,741</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>R. Jones</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>51,698</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>M. Murrell</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>132,622</td>
<td>Auto Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>J. McLoughlin</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>45,341</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>N. Dickson</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>100,502</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 63,750 8,334 $390,904

Assessed value = $6.13/s.f.
Market estimate = $9.43/s.f.
@ 155% $601,000
### Site 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Land S.F.</th>
<th>Bldg. S.F.</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>D. Carter</td>
<td>12,154</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>$55,627</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>H. Venmaaren</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>78,219</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R. Saigal</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>78,756</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S. Murrell</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>41,642</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>L. Marjarel</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>82,343</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>L. Jenkins</td>
<td>6,067</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>27,705</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B. Thompson</td>
<td>6,042</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>49,564</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>V. Barber</td>
<td>6,017</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>38,538</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B. Mignault</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>47,045</td>
<td>Auto Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S. Bethune</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>48,521</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S. Drury</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>48,640</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>J. Johnson</td>
<td>10,125</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>108,087</td>
<td>Mfg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E. Price</td>
<td>10,125</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>56,775</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>D. Scott</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>46,042</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F. Fannin</td>
<td>10,125</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>54,659</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>D. Scott</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>46,042</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>R. Klaas</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>27,910</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>C. Decarlo</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>60,214</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>C. Davis</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>59,929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>153,882</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,068,557</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessed value $= $ 6.94/s.f.

Market estimate @ 155% $= $10.68/s.f.

$1,643,900

### Site 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Land S.F.</th>
<th>Bldg. S.F.</th>
<th>Assessed Value</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bar One</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>$216,263</td>
<td>Mfg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bar One</td>
<td>42,750</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>217,691</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Christ/World</td>
<td>8,070</td>
<td>8,512</td>
<td>108,001</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bar One</td>
<td>12,105</td>
<td>19,430</td>
<td>247,224</td>
<td>Mfg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Bar One</td>
<td>4,035</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,114</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Christ/World</td>
<td>8,070</td>
<td>4,662</td>
<td>114,194</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>E. Lewis</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>G. MacFarlene</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>158,895</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>S. Moore</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Church/Bapt.</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>R. Myers</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>36,726</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>J. Nuccitelli</td>
<td>7,050</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>73,473</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>R. Choquette</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>155,021</td>
<td>Auto Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>225,630</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,774</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,711,352</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessed value $= $ 7.58

Market estimate @ 155% $= $11.66

($2,633,000)
ARTICLE XI. C-2 GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT*

Sec. 1. Intent and purpose.

The intent and purpose of this district is as follows:

This district is composed of certain lands and structures used to provide for the retailing of commodities and the furnishing of several major services, selected trade shops and automotive repairs. This district will be encouraged at locations along minor arterials and major arterial roads where general commercial uses would be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Characteristically, this district occupies an area larger than that of the retail commercial district, serves a considerably greater population, and offers a wider range of services. This district will be promoted within the urban service area or in rural settlements where uses of this intensity are already established. (BCC, 8-17-82)

Sec. 2. Permitted uses.

Only the following principal uses and structures shall be permitted:

(1) Any use permitted in the C-1 retail commercial district.

(2) Amusement and recreational facilities such as, but not limited to, miniature golf courses, go-cart tracks, golf driving ranges, baseball batting ranges and trampoline centers.

(3) Car wash.

(4) Enclosed mechanical garage, without paint and body and motor work unless incidental to dealer use.

(5) Modular and pre-fab home display.

(6) New and used automobiles, motorcycles and service, and mobile home and boat sales and mechanical services.
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(7) Outdoor display of goods and products.
(8) Outdoor storage of merchandise, parts or other equipment.
(9) Printing, bookbinding, lithography and publishing plants.
(10) Radio and television studios and offices.
(11) Recreational and commercial vehicle sales and rental.
(12) Veterinary hospitals and kennels when confined within a building.
(13) Washing and packaging of fruit when accessory to retail fruit sales on the premises.
(14) Car rental agency. (P & Z, 1-19-84; BCC, 1-23-84)
(15) Muffler shops. (P & Z, 1-19-84; BCC, 1-23-84)
(16) Churches. (BCC, 6-18-84)
(17) Other uses which are similar or compatible to the uses permitted herein, that would promote the intent and purpose of this district. Determination shall be made by authority and directive of the planning and zoning commission without public notice or public hearing. (BCC, 8-17-82)

Sec. 3. Prohibited uses.

The following uses shall be prohibited in any C-2 general district:

(1) Any use or activity which is not in full compliance with all the requirements and standards set forth in this article.

(2) Uses listed in Section 2 (except uses listed at Section 2(1)) or Section 3 of the C-3, wholesale commercial district [Article XXII hereof]. (BCC, 8-17-82)

Sec. 4. Special exceptions.

The following uses may be permitted as a special exception, provided that any review and hearing of an application for a special exception shall consider the character of the neighbor-
hood in which the proposed use is to be located, its effect on the value of surrounding lands, and the area of the site as it relates to the required open spaces and off-street parking facilities.

Each application for a special exception shall be accompanied by a site plan incorporating the regulations established herein. As a part of the application, the site plan shall include a simple plan drawn to an appropriate scale, including legal description, lot area, site dimensions, right-of-way location and width, parking areas and number of parking spaces, proposed building location and setbacks from lot lines, total floor area proposed for any building, proposed points of access, location of signs, location of existing easements, and a general plan of proposed landscaping. Said site plan shall be submitted to and approved by the board of zoning adjustment prior to the granting of land use permit. Only substantial changes will require amendment by the board of zoning adjustment. Development under the special exception shall comply with all applicable county codes and ordinances.

(1) Mini-warehouses for dry storage only.

(2) Open-air flea markets.

(3) Auctions.

(4) Living quarters in conjunction with a commercial use to be occupied by the owner of the business or an employee.

(5) Institutional uses, public or private, such as schools, hospitals, nursing homes, libraries, community centers, universities and correctional institutions. (BCC, 6-18-84)

(6) Zero lot line commercial developments. (BCC, 8-17-82)

Sec. 5. Performance standards.

Performance standards are hereby established in order to assure adequate levels of light, air, building space, lot coverage and density; to maintain and enhance locally recognized values of community appearance and design; to encourage the combination of smaller parcels into functional sites; to accommodate multiple ownership of land and improvements within the develop-
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ment; to provide for collective ownership of common areas; to promote functional compatibility of uses; to promote the safe and efficient circulation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic; and to otherwise provide for orderly site development standards in order to protect the public health, safety and general welfare.

(1) Minimum lot size: Eight thousand (8,000) square feet.

(2) Minimum lot width: One hundred (100) feet on major streets as identified in Article XXI, eighty (80) feet for all other streets. Corner lots shall be one hundred twenty-five (125) feet on major streets as identified in Article XXI, one hundred (100) feet for all other streets.

(3) Minimum front yard: Twenty-five (25) feet.

(4) Minimum side yard: Five (5) feet, fifteen (15) feet when abutting residential district, fifteen (15) feet from a side street.

(5) Minimum rear yard: Fifteen (15) feet, twenty (20) feet when abutting a residential district.

(6) Minimum floor area: Five hundred (500) square feet.

(7) Minimum open space: Fifteen (15) percent excluding retention areas, or twenty (20) percent including retention areas. (Res. No. 82-Z-18, § 1, 11-8-82)

(8) Maximum building height: Fifty (50) feet, thirty-five (35) feet within one hundred (100) feet of all residential districts.

(9) Landscape provisions: Where a C-2 parcel abuts any residential district, a landscaped area five (5) feet in width shall be provided along the lot lines. Landscaping shall reach a minimum height of five (5) feet within eighteen (18) months of planting and shall be at least fifty (50) percent opaque and shall be provided with irrigation facilities. A wall or solid fence (e.g., cement brick, block, brick or concrete) at least five (5) feet in height may be substituted for the landscape requirement. No landscaping, tree, fence, wall or similar item shall be maintained near any
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corner, driveway, street or intersection where traffic safety would be impaired or create a traffic hazard.

(10) Parking lot landscaping: (See landscape ordinance, Orange County Ordinance No. 74-1, Section 4, as amended).

(11) Signs: (Refer to Article XXII, as amended).

(12) Refuse or solid waste areas shall not be located within any front yard setback and shall be located at least five (5) feet from the side or rear property line.

(13) Open storage areas shall have a minimum fifteen-foot setback from all property lines.

(14) Outdoor storage of merchandise, equipment or commodities must be enclosed in an area of which the boundary is fifty (50) percent opaque, adjacent to a side or rear lot line of a residential district. Said storage area shall be shielded by a landscape screen or fencing at least five (5) feet in height. When landscaping is used for screening, the height and opacity requirement shall be attained within twelve (12) months after open storage uses are established.

(15) No entrances or exits shall direct traffic into adjacent residential districts.

(16) Setbacks shall be a minimum of fifty (50) feet from the normal high water elevation on every natural surface water body. (P & Z, 8-17-82; BCC, 8-31-82)

Sec. 6. Sketch plan.

Developers of existing parcels evaluated for rezoning or variances, that are less than the minimum frontage or area requirements, shall submit a sketch plan indicating how the lot will function in meeting other criteria established in this district. (BCC, 8-17-82)

Sec. 7. Off-street parking and loading regulations.

All requirements in Article XIX shall be met, provided that a minimum of four (4) spaces will be provided regardless of building size or use. (BCC, 8-17-82)
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ARTICLE XII. C-3. WHOLESALE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT*

Sec. 1. Intent and purpose of district.

The intent and purpose of the district is as follows:

This district is composed of those lands and structures which, by their use and location, are especially adopted to the conduct of the business of wholesale distribution, storage, and light manufacturing. Such lands are conveniently located near principal thoroughfares and/or railroads. This district will be encouraged at locations which are accessible to rail, highways, and air transportation facilities. Warehouse and distribution uses should be located on principal arterials or in industrial parks. The site size should be large enough to accommodate storage yards and warehouse facilities for future facilities’ expansion. This district will be promoted within the urban service area to be close to available labor markets and where adequate services and facilities are available to support the intensity of uses characterized in this district. (BCC, 8-17-82)

Sec. 2. Permitted uses.

The following uses shall be permitted within any C-3 wholesale commercial district:

(1) Any use permitted in the C-2 general commercial district.
(2) Auctions.
(3) Bakeries.
(4) Building material storage and sales (new, no junk or used material).
(5) Bulk paint mixing.
(6) Bus, cab, truck repair, storage, and terminals.

*Editor's note—Section 1 of Res. No. 82-Z-08, executed by the board of county commissioners on Aug. 17, 1982, amended Art. XII to read as herein set forth. Prior to said amendment, former Art. XII, which also pertained to the C-3 district, consisted of §§ 1-8 which had not been amended since their original enactment.
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(7) Confectionery manufacture.

(8) Contractors' storage and equipment yards, including well drilling equipment and land clearing equipment.

(9) Dyeing, dry cleaning and laundering.

(10) Furniture stripping.

(11) Garment manufacturing.

(12) Heating and air conditioning sales and service.

(13) Heavy equipment rental and sales.

(14) Machine shop.

(15) Machinery sales and storage.

(16) Manufacture and assembly of scientific, electrical, optical, and precision instruments or equipment.

(17) Manufacture of novelties and souvenirs.

(18) Meat storage, cutting and distribution.

(19) Mechanical garage, including automobile body shop and painting.

(20) Milk bottling and distribution plants; ice cream manufacturing.

(21) Mini-warehouses.

(22) Portable toilet storage.

(23) Sign manufacturing.

(24) Soft drink bottling.

(25) Storage and wholesale distribution warehouse.

(26) Testing of materials, equipment and products.

(27) Trade shops, including tinsmith, cabinet maker, rug and carpet cleaning, upholstering, mattress renovation, electrical, roofing and plumbing shop.

(28) Truck stop.

(29) Veterinary hospitals and kennels with outside runs.
(30) Welding shop.
(31) Wholesale meat and produce distribution.
(32) Churches. (BCC, 6-18-84)
(33) Other uses which are similar to the uses permitted herein, which are not specifically prohibited in Section 3, and which would promote the intent and purposes of this district. Determination shall be made by authority and directive of the planning and zoning commission, which shall be made without public notice or public hearing. (BCC, 8-17-82)

Sec. 3. Uses prohibited.
The following uses shall be prohibited in any C-3 wholesale commercial district:

(1) Any use or activity which is not in full compliance with all the requirements and standards set forth in this article.
(2) Animal slaughtering, or the confinement of animals for feeding, finishing and preparation for slaughter, including stockyards and feeding pens.
(3) Asphalt manufacturing or refining, or any similar petroleum or petrochemical refining or manufacturing process.
(4) Asphalt or concrete paving, mixing or batching plant.
(5) Corrosive acid manufacture or bulk storage, including but not limited to, hydrochloric, nitric, sulphuric, or similar acids.
(6) Bone distillation or the reduction, rendering, incineration or storage of garbage, offal, animals or animal waste, fats, fish, or similar materials or products.
(7) Blast furnace, or similar heat- or glare-generating operations.
(8) Cement, lime, gypsum or plaster of Paris manufacture, or the open storage of raw materials or finished products related to such manufacture.
(9) Glue, size or gelatin manufacture where the processes involve the refining or recovery of such products from fish, animal or refuse materials.
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(10) Tallow, grease, lard or vegetable oil refining.

(11) Junk, salvage or wrecking yard or structure wherein motor vehicles, appliances, or similar used equipment or materials are stored, dismantled, or sorted for display, sale or packing.

(12) Other uses which are similar to those listed above which are not specifically permitted in Section 2; the prohibition of which would promote the intent and purposes of this district. Determination shall be made by authority and directive of the planning and zoning commission which shall be without public notice or public hearing. (BCC, 8-17-82)

Sec. 4. Special exception.

The following uses may be permitted as a special exception, provided that any review and hearing of an application for a special exception shall consider the character of the neighborhood in which the proposed use is to be located, its effect on the value of the surrounding lands, and the area of the site as it relates to the required open spaces and off-street parking facilities.

Each application for a special exception shall be accompanied by a site plan incorporating the regulations established herein. As a part of the application, the site plan shall include a simple plan drawn to an appropriate scale, including legal description, lot area, site dimensions, right-of-way location and width, parking areas and number of parking spaces, proposed building location and setbacks from lot lines, total floor area proposed for any building, proposed points of access, location of signs, location of existing easements, and a general plan of proposed landscaping. Said site plan shall be submitted to and approved by the board of zoning adjustment prior to the granting of a land use permit. Only substantial changes shall require amendment by the board of zoning adjustment. Development under the special exception shall comply with all applicable county codes and ordinances.

(1) Dwelling unit in conjunction with a commercial use to be occupied by the owner, operator or employee of the business,

(2) Bottle clubs.
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(3) Institutional uses, public or private, such as schools, hospitals, nursing homes, libraries, community centers, universities and correctional institutions. (BCC, 6-18-84)

(4) Zero lot line commercial developments. (P & Z, 7-7-82; BCC, 8-17-82)

Sec. 5. Performance standards.

Performance standards are hereby established in order to assure adequate levels of light, air, building space, lot coverage, and density; to maintain and enhance locally recognized values of community appearances and design; to encourage the combination of smaller parcels into functional sites; to accommodate multiple ownership of land and improvements within the development; to provide for collective ownership of common areas; to promote functional compatibility of uses; to promote the safe and efficient circulation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

(1) Minimum lot size: Twelve thousand (12,000) square feet.

(2) Minimum lot width: One hundred twenty-five (125) feet on major streets as identified in Article XXI, one hundred (100) feet for all other streets, except that corner lots shall be one hundred fifty (150) feet on major streets as identified in Article XXI, and one hundred twenty-five (125) feet on all other streets.

(3) Minimum front yard: Twenty-five (25) feet.

(4) Minimum side yard: Five (5) feet, twenty-five (25) feet from abutting residential district; fifteen (15) feet from a side street.

(5) Minimum rear yard: Fifteen (15) feet, thirty (30) feet when abutting residential district.

(6) Minimum floor area: Five hundred (500) square feet.

(7) Minimum open space: Fifteen (15) percent excluding retention areas or twenty (20) percent including retention areas. (Res. No. 82-Z-19, § 1, 11-8-82)

(8) Maximum building height: Seventy-five (75) feet, thirty-five (35) feet within one hundred (100) feet of all residential districts.
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(9) Landscape provisions: Where a C-3 parcel abuts any residential district, a landscaped area five (5) feet in width shall be provided along the lot lines. Said area shall reach a height of five (5) feet within eighteen (18) months of planting and shall be at least seventy-five (75) percent opaque. A decorative stucco masonry wall of equal height and opacity may be substituted to meet the seventy-five (75) percent opacity landscape requirement. No landscaping, tree, fence, wall or similar item shall be maintained near any corner, driveway, street or intersection where traffic safety would be impaired or create a traffic hazard.

(10) Parking lot landscaping: (See landscape ordinance, Orange County Ordinance No. 74-1, Section 4, as amended).

(11) Signs: (Refer to Article XXII, as amended).

(12) Refuse or solid waste areas shall not be located within any front yard setback and shall be located at least five (5) feet from the side or rear property line.

(13) Open storage areas shall have a minimum fifteen-foot setback from all property lines.

(14) Outdoor storage of merchandise, equipment or commodities must be enclosed in an area of which the boundary is fifty (50) percent opaque, adjacent to a side or rear lot line of a residential district. Said storage area shall be shielded by a landscape screen or fencing at least five (5) feet in height. When landscaping is used for screening, the height and opacity requirements shall be attained within twelve (12) months after open storage uses are established.

(15) No entrances or exits shall direct traffic into adjacent residential districts.

(16) Setbacks shall be a minimum of fifty (50) feet from the normal high water elevation on every natural surface water body. (BCC, 8-17-82; BCC, 8-31-82)

Sec. 6. Sketch plan.

Developers of existing parcels evaluated for rezoning or variances, that are less than the minimum frontage or area requirements, shall submit a sketch plan indicating how the lot will
function in meeting other criteria established in this district. (BCC, 8-17-82)

Sec. 7. Off-street parking and loading.

All requirements in Article XIX shall be met, provided that a minimum of four (4) spaces will be provided regardless of building size or use (BCC, 8-17-82)
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