

City of Cedar Key Workshop, Feb. 4, 2025 - Follow-Up Report

"Mixed-Used Zoning in Traditional Cedar Key Neighborhoods"

NOTES AND DISCLAIMER: Please note that when multiple items were included in one ranked spot (i.e. 3 subparts to #1 Con), a judgment call was made as to how the data would be included in the ranking. Whenever possible, a new "catch-all" item was created to capture the concept. Also, when a table provided more than the total items requested sequentially (i.e. listing 7 Top ESBs, when only 5 were asked for) only the number of data points requested were included in this analysis. In addition, please note that some tables did not provide answers or the number of answers requested for every task. Lastly, we had 8 tables and 1 "Online Table Participant". Data from both live and remote sources was included in this analysis.

TASK 1 - IDENTIFY THE ESB'S OF CEDAR KEY AND RANK TOP 5

ESB'S = Essential Services and Businesses of Cedar Key (Both public/city and private)

ESB	The ESB's ranked in Top 5 by tables, and # of tables that ranked them at each level (Total of 9 Tables)					Total for ESB
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	
TOP 5:						
Fire Station		2	1		1	4
Water and Sewer District		2	2	1	1	7
Grocery Store		3	1			6
Public Works/Equipment				2		2
Post Office			2	3	1	7
Healthcare Provider Facility					1	2
Hardware Store			1	1		4
Bank				1		1
Gas Station/Convenience Ice				2		2
Police			1			1
Marina Ramps - commercial and recreational					1	1
Restaurants						1
Auto Repair Shop				1	1	2
City Services		2	1		1	5
						45

*ESB's receiving most votes in top 5 at all levels

ANALYSIS OF TASK 1			
Ranking of ESB's in terms of number of times included in the Top 5 Ranking			
RANK	ESB	# of Times Included in Top 5	Other Notables
			*BLUE HIGHLIGHT = TOP 5 ESB'S OVERALL

1st	City Services as a collective group including the times individual City Services (Fire, Police, Public Works) were ranked	12	Also ranked as the #1 most important ESB the most times (4X) - based on collective and individual mentions.
2nd and 3rd	Water and Sewer and Post Office Tied	7	
4th	Grocery Store	6	
5th	Hardware Store	4	
6th	3-Way Tie: Gas Station/Convenience Store, Auto Repair, and Healthcare Provider	2	
7th	Tie - Bank and Restaurants	1	

TASK 2 - IDENTIFY TOP 5 PROS AND CONS OF MOVING ESB'S TO HIGHER GROUND IN TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOODS

PRO	PROS ranked in the Top 5 by tables and those receiving the most mentions in the Top 5 (Total of 9 Tables)					Total for Pros
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	
TOP 5:						
Make ESBs resilient/no disruption in ESB services (private and public) (moves ESBs out of flood zone) (sustainability of ESBs)	8	2	1		1	12
No more costly/time consuming rebuilds		2	1	2		5
Insurance premium decreases				2		2
Decrease in anxiety for all			1			1
With ESBs intact, allows residence to remain in CK for recovery			1			1
Faster recovery		1		1		2
Economic stability due to no interruption in businesses that generate tax revenue income and employ people, etc.		2	1			3
Enhance livability in CK					1	1
Infrastructure cost may go up - increase City costs and budget	1					1
Increase ESBs ability to be handicap accessible.	1		1			2
Water stays potable		1				1
Consolidating City services to one area			1			1
						0

ANALYSIS OF TASK 2 - PROS				
Ranking of Top 5 Pros to Moving ESB's to Higher Ground.				
R A N K	PROS	# of Times Included in Top 5	Other Notables	*BLUE HIGHLIGHT = TOP 5 PROS OVERALL
1st	Make ESBs resilient/no disruption in ESB services (private and public) (moved out of flood zone) (sustainability)	12	Listed #1 Pro by 8 out of 9 Tables	
2nd	No more costly/timely rebuilds	5		
3rd	Economic stability due to no interruption in income generators/employers, etc.	3		
4th	Three way tie for 4th: Insurance premium decrease , faster recovery, increase ESBs ability to be handicap accessible.	2		
5th				

CONS	Cons ranked in the Top 5 by tables and those receiving the most mentions in the Top 5 (Total of 8 Tables)					Total for Cons
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	
TOP 5:						
Traffic	1				1	2
Parking congestion	2	1	1	2	1	7
Disrupt Peace in neighborhoods - noise, smell, etc.		1	5	2	2	10
Property Value Decrease	1			2	1	4
Decrease in City revenue to fund budget (if City Owned, no property taxes paid on it anymore)			1		1	2
Safety concerns		1				1
Negative impact on appearance/aesthetics in traditional neighborhoods.					1	1
Expense of rebuilding or retrofitting residential spaces and purchasing property/ Personal and private funding needs	2	1			1	4
Scattered non-cohesive business district		1				1
Displacement of residents		1				1
Loss of privacy in neighborhoods - public exposure		1				1
Loss of historical downtown/sense of community			1			1
Changing land use is time consuming				1		1
Availability of land may be a problem		1				1

Loss of privacy for residents in traditional residential areas		1				1
						38

ANALYSIS OF TASK 2 - CONS				
Ranking of Top 5 Pros to Moving ESB's to Higher Ground.				
R A N K	CONS	# of Times Included in Top 5	Other Notables	*BLUE HIGHLIGHT = TOP 5 CONS OVERALL
	1st	Disrupt Peace in neighborhoods - noise, smell, etc.	10	
2nd	Parking congestion.	7		
3rd and 4th	Tie for 3rd: Property value decrease and expense of rebuilding or retrofitting residential spaces and purchasing property/ personal and private funding needs	4		
5th	Tie for 5th: Traffic congestion and decrease City revenue to fund budget (if City Owned, no property taxes paid on property anymore)	2		

TASK 3 - Make a recommendation for whether or not zoning should be changed to mix-use in

Yes to Mixed Use in residential areas:	1	*Majority of tables (combined 6) recommended a change to mixed use, but 4 out of the 5 want it only in very limited areas
No to Mixed Use in residential areas:	3	
Limited Mixed Use only	5	

TASK 4 - Top 3 desirable and top 3 undesirable areas for mixed use zoning

Most Desirable Areas for Mixed Use:	1st	2nd	3rd	Totals	*Locations that essentially make same limit to around City Hall
City Hall block/area	1	1		2	
All Hud Housing	2	1		3	
Hud Housing around City Hall	2			2	
Gov't housing between G and F Streets			1	1	
1st Street between G and D Streets	1			1	
Highway 24 and Third Street (where Napa is)			1	1	
Highway 24 inside #4 Bridge			2	2	
State Museum	1			1	
Whidden Ave. near school			2	2	

High ground	1			1
Water tower area	1	1		2
Build higher in existing downtown business areas			1	1
Off Island		1		1
				20

Most Undesirable Areas for Mixed Use:	1st	2nd	3rd	Totals
Low lying areas/flood zones	1	1		2
Anywhere past the cemetery		1		1
Suberbs	1			1
Airport		1		1
All property west of Cedar Key School.	1			1
D St. to Fst between 1st and 3rd		1		1
Historic homes	1			1
Areas predominately neighborhoods	1	1		2
Keep out of deed restricted neighborhoods	1			1
Homes in all residential parts of Historic District	1			1
Sturgis Circle	1			1
Top of Hodges		1		1
Top of Gulf			1	1
Cedar Key Shores		1		1
				16

*Tied top 2 most undersirable areas for mixed use.

ANALYSIS Task 4: With the majority of tables electing limited multi-use zoning only, they also opted for limiting the mixed use zoning to (#1) only where HUD Housing currently exists; (#2) around City Hall, and more specifically to HUD Housing around City Hall. With 4 tables choosing the City Hall area (whether HUD properties or not) and others limiting multi-use only to designated streets around City Hall, the consensus is to keep all multi-use zoning around the existing City Hall area, if changed at all. The most undesirable areas for changing to multi use zoning would be low lying areas, and areas that are predominately neighborhoods without any mixed uses at this time.

TASK 5 - Top 3 additional limitations you would place on mixed use zoning to limit your cons,

Top 3 Additional Limitations (Other than location limitations)	1st	2nd	3rd	Totals
Establish review board to review every mixed use before approval	1			1
Approve a change to mixed use only on a case-by-case basis based upon certain criteria (i.e. high ground, traffic & parking friendly, area in need of gentrification.)	1	1		2

*Limitations receiving more than one mention

Only allow most essential ESBs to move into new Mixed-Use designated areas.		1	1	2
Make and enforce aesthetic requirements for commercial in residential areas.		1		1
Limit by business size	1			1
Limit hours of operation		2		2
Limit types of business (i.e. no bars)			1	1
Require off-street parking of some kind or other parking restrictions	2			2
Noise regulations in new multi-use zoned areas tightened and enforced.		1		1
Light regulations in new multi-use zoned areas			1	1
Restrict Mixed Use only to businesses without walk-in customers.	1			1
More policing to cover additional activity in new mixed use areas		1		1
More limits to Air BNB's			1	1
Require garbage cans/dumpsters to be stored out of site	1			1
Require 8ft fencing around businesses in mixed use areas		1		1
Create signage regulations			1	1
Building height restrictions.	1		1	2
Limit residential disruptions 2/5/2025 (catch-all for noise, odor, light, congestion, etc. challenges that will be brought into neighborhoods)		1	1	2
				24

ANALYSIS TASK 5: Though taking different forms, most tables voted for limitations that would reduce or eliminate the negative impacts of a commercial use on existing residential homes where multi-use is allowed- such as parking, noise, hours of operation, garbage storage, aesthetic, light, signage, fencing, height, and size regulations and limitations, for example. Also, the concept of deciding on whether a change of mixed use should occur on a case by case basis was mentioned more than once (with and without an established list of criteria).

THANKS AGAIN TO ALL THOSE WHO PARTICIPATED!