



# HISTORIC TOWN OF EATONVILLE, FLORIDA

## COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

### SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, July 15, 2025, at 5:30 PM

Town Hall (Council Chambers) – 307 E. Kennedy Blvd

**SPECIAL NOTICE:** These meeting minutes are presented in an abbreviated format intended as a public record discussion of stated meeting according to the Florida's Government-in-the-Sunshine law. Meetings are opened to the public, noticed within reasonable advance notice, and transcribed into minutes for public record. *\*\*Audio Recording are available through the Town's website on the Board Agenda Page.*

---

**CALL TO ORDER** – Chair Gardner called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

**ROLL CALL** – Quorum was established through roll call by Town Clerk.

**PRESENT:** (6) Director Donovan Williams, Director Ruthi Critton (Absent), Director Tarus Mack, Director Rodney Daniels, Vice Chair Theo Washington, Director Wanda Randolph, Chair Angie Gardner

**STAFF:** (3) Michael Johnson, **CRA Executive Director**; Marissa Bellenger, **Records Coordinator**; Greg Jackson, **Attorney**

#### **INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Chair Gardner led the invocation through a Moment of Silence followed by the Pledge of Allegiance

#### **CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:**

Angela Johnson (Resident) – Johnson asked members a series of questions regarding the proposed property: Have [you all] determined what the total estimated renovation cost is in order to get the building up and available for usage? What is the current market or appraisal value of the property? How does the CRA, in the event that it does not get an approval for a line of credit, plan to purchase it at the end of the terms of the lease? Has the town adopted a staffing budget in order to operate that building? Has there been a risk assessment done on the condition of the building? Regarding clause no. 5 of the contract, what if the property does not appraise at the value of \$650,000? What if the exchange of the purchase does not happen?

#### **BOARD DECISION:**

Review and Approve the TOECRA Lease Purchase Agreement for Property Located at 140 S. West Street, Eatonville, Florida 32751 (Administration) –

**Chair Gardner motions** to **APPROVE** Resolution CRA-R-2025-26 approving the 2025 TOECRA Lease Purchase Agreement; **moved** by Vice Chair Washington; **second** by Director Williams. **Comments/notes:** The motion, move, and second is later rescinded. Preamble read by Ms. Bellenger (acting clerk in the absence of town clerk).

Director Randolph would like Mr. Johnson to answer the questions raised by resident Angela Johnson. Director Randolph asked what the market appraisal value of the property is. Attorney Jackson answered that they currently have a pencil appraisal value which came in at \$300,000 with \$700,000 in renovation costs. Attorney Jackson looked at other properties of similar nature--what they usually call “comps in the area”-- and found that the pencil appraisal value is far less than what an actual appraised value will be for market value. Jackson clarified he is not a real estate person, but it appears that the market value is going to be more than what the pencil appraisal is. Director Randolph asked if the town has developed a staff budget? Mr. Johnson answered that the CRA is buying the property and Mr. Pressley (administration) is putting together staff. Director Randolph asked for clarity on

where in the budget is the money coming from to purchase the property. Mr. Johnson replied saying the funds would come from the general fund of the CRA. Director Randolph would like to know the condition of the building. Mr. Johnson clarified that the CRA is not going to occupy the building until the code violation issues have been cleared up. Director Randolph asked if they were to get funding and it was included in the contract, but it was disproved—what are we going to do in regard to completion of the contract and the renovations you need. Mr. Johnson stated that it would be a lease not binding you to purchase and asked the attorney to clarify for Director Randolph. Attorney Jackson stated that the contractor (Mr. Kearney) has proposed a 90-day lease term—meaning that for 90 days there is a lease agreement between the CRA and Mr. Kearney to where, if he does get the building up to code, the CRA can begin to occupy the building. However, if the purchase does not go through, or the funding does not go through, then the lease ends and everyone walks away the same as they came in. The only thing that would be lost by the CRA is \$100 for the lease payment of the 90-day period. Vice Chair Washington had a question about the proposed renovations. Mr. Johnson replied that the investment that the CRA is making is going to be from the purchase price but have not negotiated the purchase. Vice Chair Washington wanted clarity on whether anything they do in regard to repairs would bring up the total price of the building. Mr. Johnson stated that the Vice Chair is correct, first the CRA needs to gain access to the building through the lease, then the CRA will go in with architects to understand the scope of renovations needed to bring it up to so that the town can use it for its intended purposes. We have to make an assessment to see what work needs to be done first. Attorney Jackson shared that the thought process was that if the board decides that they want to go ahead and purchase this property and things are going smoothly, but the owner is dragging on getting the repairs done, the board can decide to make the repairs themselves. Jackson clarified that any amount that the CRA pays to make those repairs comes off of the purchase price, so we [the CRA] does not have to worry about paying for something in addition to the purchase price. Director Williams shared that the town was initially supposed to own the building after the Kindergarten closed, but we [the previous board] dragged their feet. We can discuss this all we want, but at the end of the day it is redevelopment that is needed. Mr. Johnson reminded the board that he provided them with the community impact statement; Johnson stated that this project is about redeveloping a piece of property and providing a safe haven for our seniors. Director Daniels states that he does not agree with the comps. He is not in favor of the lease agreement. I am all for a senior citizen center, but just not there. Daniels would like to see the owner be held accountable for the code violations. Director Williams stated if all renovations pass and come off the purchase price then it is in our benefit. Mr. Johnson made board members aware that code enforcement already has an active case filed. Attorney Jackson clarified for Director Daniels that the comps were provided by Orange County, they expanded their search to find properties with similar square footage, acreage, etc., which is different from a Zillow search. Director Mack shared his opinion on the agreement, which he initially opposed but after speaking to Mr. Johnson who showed him the senior living plans, Mack was in agreement. Mr. Johnson clarified that it is a senior recreation center, not senior living due to zoning laws. Director Mack responded that he now feels misled and somewhat confused about the plans. He stated that he does not agree with the [pencil] appraisal value and would like to see plans for senior living. In response, Mr. Johnson asked Attorney Jackson if they could add “subject to appraisal” to solve Mack’s problem with the pencil appraisal. Attorney Jackson recommends that they do not say the purchase price will be based upon and subject to the appraisal price, because if it is appraised higher than the \$650,000, then now you will be paying more. Director Mack states that the board needs to reevaluate the agreement brought before them. Although Mack is for redevelopment, he wants it to be focused on a senior living facility. He stated that he does not want to see \$650,000 put into a facility that is going to be based on seniors doing things when we [the town] could get creative and do them here [at Denton Johnson or Town Hall]. Director Randolph inquired who made the decision to make it a senior recreation center. Mr. Johnson stated that he and his office (CRA) did. Director Randolph brings up the need for a conference center and states that she likes the idea of purchasing, but not the way the plan has been presented. Randolph is not in agreement with the appraisal and would like to see the building before the town buys. Chair Gardner stated that there is no need to change the staffing. Gardner also stated that the town has a \$4.1 million grant from affordable housing. If you are going to do townhomes or single family homes or affordable housing for seniors—that all could be in one package. Director Mack believes

affordable housing should be the next step. Mr. Johnson stated that the affordable housing grant is in the town’s control and not the CRA’s, so it was never part of what he was trying to recommend. Johnson said it is only costing the CRA \$100 to walk inside of the building and do the [physical] assessment and if they are not going to purchase it, they are able to walk away after the 90-day period. Director Mack suggests the CRA get with contractors to do some sort of study. Mack suggests a kitchenette and something to be incorporated into a living facility. Mr. Johnson requested that Chair Gardner table the item.

**Chair Gardner RESCINDS her motion to APPROVE Resolution CRA-R-2025-26 approving the 2025 TOECRA Lease Purchase Agreement; Vice Chair Washington and Director Donovan Williams RESCIND their move and second.**

**Chair Gardner motions to TABLE Resolution CRA-R-2025-26 approving the 2025 TOECRA Lease Purchase Agreement; moved by Director Mack; second by Director Williams; opposed by Director Randolph. MOTION PASSES 5/1.**

**ADJOURNMENT:** Chair Gardner **MOTIONS** for Adjournment of Meeting **MOVED** by Director Randolph; **SECOND** by Vice Chair Washington; **AYE: ALL, MOTION PASSES. Meeting Adjourned at 6:25 P.M.**

**Respectfully Submitted by:**

**APPROVED**

---

**Veronica L King, Town Clerk**

---

**Angie Gardner, Chair**