



# **City of Grand Island**

**Monday, March 26, 2012**

**Council Session**

## **Item E2**

### **Public Hearing on Adoption of a Blight Study & Generalized Redevelopment Plan for CRA Blight & Substandard Area #8**

**Staff Contact: Chad Nabity**

# **Council Agenda Memo**

**From:** Regional Planning Commission

**Meeting:** March 26, 2012

**Subject:** Blight Study and Generalized Redevelopment Plan for Proposed CRA Area No. 8

**Item #'s:** E-2, G-4 & G-5

**Presenter(s):** Chad Nabity AICP, Regional Planning Director

## **Background**


The Grand Island Community Redevelopment Authority (CRA) commissioned a Blight/Substandard Study and Generalized Redevelopment Plan for the proposed Redevelopment Area No. 8 to be prepared by Olsson Associates along with Marvin Planning and Ken Bunger. The study area includes approximately 92.77 acres referred to as CRA Area No. 8. The study focused on an area south of Anna Street along Adams Street in south central Grand Island as shown on the map below.

## **OVERVIEW**

The CRA referred the Study and Plan to the Planning Commission for their review during their February 15, 2012 meeting.

The Planning Commission held a public hearing, made findings of fact and recommended approval of the blight declaration and generalized redevelopment plan at their meeting on March 7, 2012.

Below is a synopsis of their comments and discussion and the motion to recommend approval with the attached findings of fact.



## Discussion

At the Planning Commission Chairman O'Neill opened the above mentioned Public Hearing.

Nabity explained to the Commissioners the Grand Island Area Community Redevelopment Authority (CRA) commissioned a Blight/Substandard Study and Generalized Redevelopment Plan for the proposed Redevelopment Area No. 8 to be prepared by Olsson Associates along with Marvin Planning and Ken Bunger. The study area includes approximately 92.77 acres referred to as CRA Area No. 8. The study focused on an area south of Anna Street along Adams Street in south central Grand Island.

## FINDINGS FOR GRAND ISLAND

Study Area #8 has several items contributing to the Blight and Substandard Conditions. These conditions include:

## Blighted Conditions

- Substantial number of deteriorating structures,
- Unsanitary / Unsafe conditions,
- Deterioration of site or other improvements,
- Dangerous conditions to life or property due to fire or other causes,

- Combination of factors which are impairing and/or arresting sound growth,
- Average age of structures is over 40 years of age.

### **Substandard Conditions**

- Average age of the residential or commercial units in the area is at least forty years

Only one condition for blight and one substandard condition are necessary in order to make a declaration that the area is blighted and substandard.

Nabity further explained that a generalized redevelopment plan for area No. 8 is also included. The generalized plan authorized the CRA to use funding available from its tax levy to participate in redevelopment activities including purchase of property, demolition of property, renovation of commercial facades, clearance of property and similar activities. This plan anticipated the use of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) in the area but does not approve any projects using TIF. Any future TIF projects would require a plan amendment approved by Council prior to CRA entering into a redevelopment contract.

O'Neill closed the Public Hearing.

A motion was made by Eriksen to approve the Blight Study for Area No. 8 as presented and was seconded by Connelly. The motion carried with 11 members present voting in favor to forward the request to City Council (Amick, Eriksen, O'Neill, Monter, Bredthauer, Ruge, Hayes, Reynolds, Haskins, Connelly and Snodgrass) and no one voting against.

A motion was made by Eriksen to approve Resolution 2012-02 the Redevelopment Plan for Area No. 8 as presented and was seconded by Reynolds. The motion carried with 11 members present voting in favor to forward the request to City Council (Amick, Eriksen, O'Neill, Monter, Bredthauer, Ruge, Hayes, Reynolds, Haskins, Connelly and Snodgrass) and no one voting against.

## **Alternatives**

It appears that the Council has the following alternatives concerning the issue at hand. The Council may:

1. Move to approve
2. Refer the issue to a Committee
3. Postpone the issue to future date
4. Take no action on the issue



## **Recommendation**

The Hall County Regional Planning Commission recommends that the Council approve the declaration of the area under consideration as blighted and substandard based on the facts presented and identified.

Further as evidenced by the passage of Resolution 2012-02 the Planning Commission finds that the generalized redevelopment plan for CRA Area No. 8 is consistent with the Comprehensive Development Plan for the City of Grand Island and recommends approval of the Generalized Redevelopment Plan.

## **Sample Motion**

Move to approve as recommended.

**City of Grand Island, NE**  
**Blight and Substandard Study**  
**Area #8**  
**January 2012**

## **PURPOSE OF THE BLIGHT AND SUBSTANDARD STUDY**

The purpose of completing this Blight and Substandard study is to examine existing conditions within and contiguous to the City of Grand Island. The City of Grand Island has identified a targeted area for consideration of future redevelopment. Portions of the Study Area are currently within the corporate limits of the city and remaining portion is part of a County Industrial Park which is outside of the corporate limits. The area currently within the County Industrial Park will be examined as to its influence on the adjacent areas.

The City of Grand Island, when considering conditions of Blight and Substandard, will be looking at those issues and definitions provided for in the Nebraska Community Redevelopment Law as found in Chapter 18 of the Revised Nebraska State Statutes, as follows:

*“The governing body of a , to the greatest extent it deems to be feasible in carrying out the provisions of Sections 18-2101 to 18-2144, shall afford maximum opportunity, consistent with sound needs of the as a whole, to the rehabilitation or redevelopment of the community redevelopment area by private enterprises. The governing body of a shall give consideration to this objective in exercising its powers under sections 18-2101 to 18-2144, including the formulation of a workable program, the approval of community redevelopment plans consistent with the general plan for the development of the , the exercise of its zoning powers, the enforcement of other laws, codes, and regulations relating to the use and occupancy of buildings and improvements, the disposition of any property acquired, and providing of necessary public improvements”.*

The Nebraska Revised Statutes §18-2105 continues by granting authority to the governing body for formulation of a workable program. The statute reads,

*“The governing body of a or an authority at its direction for the purposes of the Community Development Law may formulate for the entire municipality a workable program for utilizing appropriate private and public resources to eliminate or prevent the development or spread of urban blight, to encourage needed urban rehabilitation, to provide for the redevelopment of substandard and blighted areas, or to undertake such of the aforesaid activities or other feasible municipal activities as may be suitably employed to achieve the objectives of such workable program. Such workable program may include, without limitation, provision for the prevention of the spread of blight into areas of the municipality which are free from blight through diligent enforcement of housing, zoning, and occupancy controls and standards; the rehabilitation or conservation of substandard and blighted areas or portions thereof by replanning, removing congestion, providing parks, playgrounds, and other public improvements by encouraging voluntary rehabilitation and by compelling the repair and rehabilitation of deteriorated or deteriorating structures; and the clearance and redevelopment of substandard and blighted areas or portions thereof.”*

Blight and Substandard are defined as the following:

*“Substandard areas means an area in which there is a predominance of buildings or improvements, whether nonresidential or residential in character, which, by reason of dilapidation, deterioration, age or obsolescence, inadequate provision for ventilation, light, air, sanitation, or open spaces, high density of population and overcrowding, or the existence of conditions which endanger life or property by fire and other causes, or any combination of such factors, is conducive to ill health, transmission of disease, infant mortality, juvenile*

*delinquency, and crime, (which cannot be remedied through construction of prisons), and is detrimental to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare;”*

*“Blighted area means an area, which (a) by reason of the presence of a substantial number of deteriorated or deteriorating structures, existence of defective or inadequate street layout, faulty lot layout in relation to size, adequacy, accessibility, or usefulness, insanitary or unsafe conditions, deterioration of site or other improvements, diversity of ownership, tax or special assessment delinquency exceeding the fair value of the land, defective or unusual conditions of title, improper subdivision or obsolete platting, or the existence of conditions which endanger life or property by fire and other causes, or any combination of such factors, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the community, retards the provision of housing accommodations, or constitutes an economic or social liability and is detrimental to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare in its present condition and use and (b) in which there is at least one of the following conditions: (i) Unemployment in the designated area is at least one hundred twenty percent of the state or national average; (ii) the average age of the residential or commercial units in the area is at least forty years; (iii) more than half of the plotted and subdivided property in an area is unimproved land that has been within the city for forty years and has remained unimproved during that time; (iv) the per capita income of the area is lower than the average per capita income of the city or in which the area is designated; or (v) the area has had either stable or decreasing population based on the last two decennial censuses. In no event shall a city of the metropolitan, primary, or first class designate more than thirty-five percent of the city as blighted, a city of the second class shall not designate an area larger than fifty percent of the city as blighted, and a shall not designate an area larger than one hundred percent of the as blighted;”*

This Blight and Substandard Study is intended to give the Grand Island Community Redevelopment Authority and Grand Island City Council the basis for identifying and declaring Blighted and Substandard conditions existing within the City’s jurisdiction. Through this process, the City is attempting to address economic and/or social liabilities which are harmful to the well-being of the entire community.

The study area can be seen in Figure 1 of this report. The Redevelopment Plan portion of this report will contain, in accordance with the law, definite local objectives regarding appropriate land uses, improved traffic, public transportation, public utilities and other public improvements, and the proposed land uses and building requirements in the redevelopment area and shall include:

- The boundaries defining the blighted and substandard areas in question (including existing uses and conditions of the property within the area), and
- A list of the conditions present which qualify the area as blighted and substandard.

### **EXISTING LAND USES**

The term “Land Use” refers to the developed uses in place within a building or on a specific parcel of land. The number and type of uses are constantly changing within a community, and produce a number of impacts that either benefit or detract from the community. Because of this, the short and long-term success and sustainability of the community is directly contingent upon available resources utilized in the best manner given the constraints the City faces during the course of the planning period. Existing patterns of land use are often fixed in older communities and neighborhoods, while development in newer areas is often reflective of current development practices.

### Existing Land Use Analysis within Study Area

As part of the planning process, a survey was conducted through both in-field observations, as well as data collection online using the Hall County Assessors website. This survey noted the use of each parcel of land within the study area. These data from the survey are analyzed in the following paragraphs.

Table 1 includes the existing land uses for the entire study area. The table contains the total acres determined per land use from the survey; next is the percentage of those areas compared to the total developed land; and finally, the third set of data compare the all land uses to the total area within the Study Area.

Nearly 28% of the Study Area's developed land is in Industrial uses and another 27% is in Commercial uses. The next largest land area is the land used for streets and rights-of-way which was approximately 20% of the total area. Overall, approximately 75% of the land area in this Study area is non-residential in nature. Overall residential land uses total approximately 18%.


**TABLE 1: EXISTING LAND USE, GRAND ISLAND - 2011**

Type of Use	Acres	Percent of Developed land within the Study Area	Percent of Study Area
Residential	15.09	17.7%	16.3%
Single-family	11.58	13.6%	12.5%
Multi-family	3.51	4.1%	3.8%
Manufactured Housing	0	0.0%	0.0%
Commercial	22.67	26.6%	24.4%
Industrial	23.29	27.3%	25.1%
Quasi-Public/Public	2.6	3.0%	2.8%
Parks/Recreation	5.1	6.0%	5.5%
Transportation	16.63	19.5%	17.9%
Total Developed Land	85.38	100.0%	
Vacant/Agriculture	7.39		8.0%
<b>Total Area</b>	<b>92.77</b>		<b>100.0%</b>

Source: 2011 Grand Island Blight Study, Olsson Associates and Marvin Planning Consultants

**Figure 1**

Existing Land Use Map



Source: Olsson Associates and Marvin Planning Consultants, 2011



## **BLIGHT AND SUBSTANDARD ELIGIBILITY STUDY**

The City of Grand Island has selected a specific target area within an established part of the community for evaluation. The area is indicated in Figure 2 of this report. The existing uses in this area include single-family residential, multi-family residential, commercial, parks/recreation, quasi-public, commercial, and industrial.

Through the redevelopment process the City of Grand Island can guide future development throughout the area. The use of the Community Redevelopment Act by the City of Grand Island is intended to redevelop and improve the area. Using the Community Redevelopment Act, the City of Grand Island can assist in the elimination of negative conditions and implement different programs/projects identified for the City.

The following is the description of the designated area within Grand Island.

### ***Study Area***

POINT OF BEGINNING IS THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINES OF ANNA STREET AND LINCOLN AVENUE S; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID CENTERLINE OF LINCOLN AVENUE S TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINES OF LINCOLN AVENUE S AND PHOENIX AVENUE W; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID CENTERLINE OF PHOENIX AVENUE W TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINES OF PHOENIX AVENUE W AND CLARK STREET S; THENCE, SOUTH EASTERLY ALONG SAID CENTERLINE OF CLARK STREET S TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINES OF CLARK STREET S AND EDDY STREET S; THENCE, SOUTH ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF EDDY STREET S TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINS OF EDDY STREET S AND FONNER PARK ROAD W; THENCE, WEST ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF FONNER PARK ROAD W TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINES OF FONNER PARK ROAD W AND ADAMS STREET S; THENCE, SOUTH ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF ADAMS STREET S TO THE EXTENDED SOUTH PROPERTY LINE OF THE TRACT DESCRIBED IN FILE: 07-2412 OF THE HALL COUNTY REGISTER OF DEEDS; THENCE, WEST ALONG SAID SOUTH PROPERTY LINE TO THE WEST PROPERTY LINE OF SAID PROPERTY; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST PROPERTY LINE OF SAID PROPERTY TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF A PORTION OF LOT 21 AS DESCRIBED IN ITEMS 1 AND 2 OF INSTRUMENT NUMBER 200314398; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF WASH TWP PT SE 1/4 NW 1/4 21-11-9 (ALSO KNOWN AS PARCEL NUMBER 400206935 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE); THENCE, NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE WESTERN PROPERTY LINE OF SAID PROPERTY TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE EXTENDED WESTERN PROPERTY LINE AND THE CENTERLIN OF ANNA STREET W; THENCE, NORTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID CENTERLINE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

### ***Corporate Limits***


The Corporate Limits is the entire study area excepting:

1. THE PARCEL REFERRED TO WASH TWP PT SE 1/4 NW 1/4 21-11-9 (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400206935 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) 10.92 AC
2. WASH TWP PT SW 1/4 NE 1/4 21-11-9 (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400206811 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) 10.33 AC
3. WASHINGTON TWP B. & Y. SUB LT 1 (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400209616 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) 132,422 SF
4. WASH TWP S OF RR PT NE 1/4 21-11-9 (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400206862 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) .44 AC
5. WASH TWP PT NE 1/4 PT FORMER BLKS 7-8-9-10 SOUTH PARK 21-11-9 PT VAC WASHINGTON ST (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400206846 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) 5.69 AC
6. A PIECE OF LAND REFERRED TO AS PARCEL 64
7. WASH TWP 21-11-9 W 1/2 OF VACATED WASHINGTON STREET (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400371391 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) .076 AC
8. WASH TWP PT SW 1/4 NE 1/4 21-11-9 (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400289172 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) .15 AC

Figure 2  
Study

Area

Map



Source: Olsson Associates and Marvin Planning Consultants, 2011



## **FINDINGS OF BLIGHT AND SUBSTANDARD CONDITIONS ELIGIBILITY STUDY**

This section of the Eligibility Report examines the conditions found in the study area. The Findings Section will review the conditions based upon the Statutory definitions and then will explain the reasons contributing to the findings.

### **CONTRIBUTING FACTORS**

There are a number of conditions that were examined and evaluated in the field and online. There are a number of these conditions that will be reviewed in detail, through the next several pages, while some of the Statutory conditions are present, other are not.

Specifics will be discussed from two angles, within the corporate limits and outside the corporate limits and contributing.

### **Structural Conditions**

Where structural conditions were evaluated, structures were either rated as: No problems, Adequate, Deteriorating, or Dilapidated. The following are the definitions of these terms:

#### **No Problem/ Adequate Conditions**

- No structural or aesthetic problems were visible, or
- Slight damage to porches, steps, roofs etc. is present on the structure,
- Slight wearing away of mortar between bricks, stones, or concrete blocks,
- Small cracks in walls or chimneys,
- Cracked windows,
- Lack of paint, and
- Slight wear on steps, doors, and door and window sills and frames.

#### **Deteriorating Conditions**

- Holes, open cracks, rotted, loose, or missing materials in parts of the foundation, walls, or roof (up to 1/4 of wall or roof),
- Shaky, broken, or missing steps or railings,
- Numerous missing and cracked window panes,
- Some rotted or loose windows or doors (no longer wind- or water-proof), and
- Missing bricks, or cracks, in chimney or makeshift (uninsulated) chimney.

#### **Dilapidated Conditions**

- Holes, open cracks, or rotted, loose or missing material (siding, shingles, brick, concrete, tiles, plaster, floorboards) over large areas of foundation,
- Substantial sagging of roof, floors, or walls,
- Extensive damage by fire, flood or storm, and
- Inadequate original construction such as makeshift walls, roofs made of scrap materials, foundations or floors lacking, or converted barns, sheds, and other structures not adequate for housing.

These are criteria used to determine the quality of each structure in the Study Area.

### **Corporate Limits**

In a recent conditions survey, the structures within the corporate limits were rated. Within the corporate limits portion of the study area there are a total of 106 primary structures. Accessory structures were not rated due to the limited number of them visible from the City rights-of-way (the field survey process does not include venturing onto private property). From the limited number of visible accessory structures, the overall conditions typically matched the primary structures.

After reviewing the overall conditions of the structures in the corporate limits portion include:

- 64 (63.4%) structures rated as adequate
- 24 (23.7%) structures rated as deteriorating

- 13 (12.9%) structures rated as dilapidated

Overall, 36.6% of the structures in this portion of the area are in a state of disrepair. One specific site within the corporate limits contains 8 dilapidated structures and is immediately across the street from an older residential neighborhood. Even though there is not a majority of the structures considered deteriorated or dilapidated, it is felt this represents a substantial number, considering that they are concentrated in two primary areas of the neighborhood. The data are available for inspection; however, for purposes of this study, Figure 3 only shows the data on a block level as opposed to structure. However, if there were several structures deemed to be deteriorating or dilapidated then the entire block was downgraded.

For purposes of this study there is approximately 36.8% of the block area within the corporate limits of the Study Area that has deteriorating or dilapidated structures. The remaining 63.2% was considered as "Adequate".

Due to the state of disrepair of a number of properties in the area, the conditions represent conditions which are Dangerous to conditions of life or property due to fire or other causes.

#### ***County Industrial Park area***

The conditions survey identified 18 structures within the county industrial park limits. Within this area the overall conditions of the structures include:

- 7 (38.8%) structures rated as adequate
- 4 (22.4%) structures rated as deteriorating
- 7 (38.8%) structures rated as dilapidated

Overall, 60.2% of the structures in this portion of the study area are in a state of disrepair. Even though these structures are not currently within the corporate limits of Grand Island; they are in close enough proximity to be a contributing factor to those located within the city limits.

One major part of this area contains 7 of the 18 structures that are considered to be deteriorating or dilapidated.



For purposes of this study 52.3% of the area within the county industrial tracts of the Study Area is considered to contain deteriorating or dilapidated structures.

Due to the state of disrepair of a number of properties in the area, the conditions represent conditions which are Dangerous to conditions of life or property due to fire or other causes and are a major contributing factor to the entire study area.

**Figure 3**  
**Structural**

**Conditions**



Source: Olsson Associates and Marvin Planning Consultants, 2011

### Age of Structure

Besides structural conditions of the buildings in the Study Area, age of these structures is another contributing factor to the blighted and substandard conditions in the area. Statutes allow for a predominance of structures that are 40 years of age or older to be a contributing factor regardless of their condition. The following paragraphs document the structural age of the Study Area and again it is broke down into the corporate limits and the county industrial park areas.

#### Corporate Limits

Within the corporate limits portion of the study area there is a total of 101 primary structures. After research structural age on the Hall County Assessor's and Treasurer's websites, the following breakdown was determined:

- 5 ( 5.0%) structures were determined to be less than 40 years of age
- 96 (95.0%) structures were determined to be 40 years of age or older

Overall, 95.0% of the structures in this portion of the area are 40 years old or older thus qualifying it as substantial. See Figure 4 for the locations of the structures.

Due to the age of the structures in the corporate limits, age of structures would be a direct contributing factor.



**Figure 4**  
**Structural**

Age

Map



Source: Olsson Associates and Marvin Planning Consultants, 2011

#### **County Industrial Park area**

The conditions survey identified 18 structures within the county industrial park limits. Within this area the overall structural ages include:

- 1 ( 0.8%) structures were determined to be less than 40 years of age
- 17 (99.2%) structures were determined to be 40 years of age or older

Overall, over 99% of the structures in this portion of the area are 40 years old or older thus qualifying it as substantial. Even though this area is not within the corporate limits of Grand Island, the structural age of this area does have an impact on the adjacent properties. See Figure 4 for the locations of the structures.

Due to the age of the structures within the county industrial park, age of structures would be a direct contributing factor.

### Sidewalk Conditions

The sidewalk conditions were analyzed in the Study Area including both the incorporated areas and the unincorporated portions of the area. The sidewalks were rated on four categories; adequate, deteriorating, dilapidated, and missing completely. The following is the breakdown by corporate limits and county industrial park.



### Corporate Limits

Within the corporate limits portion of the study area there is approximately 12,633 lineal feet of sidewalk. After reviewing the conditions in the field, the following is how the sidewalk conditions breakdown within the corporate limits:

- 4,369 (34.6%) lineal feet of adequate sidewalk
- 2,537 (20.1%) lineal feet of deteriorating sidewalk
- 5,727 (45.3%) lineal feet of no sidewalk.
- There was no sidewalk deemed to be dilapidated.

Overall, 65% of the sidewalks are in either a deteriorating state or completely missing. Missing sidewalk is as bad as dilapidated or deteriorating sidewalk since there is no safe place to walk other than across someone else's property or in the street. See Figure 5 for the locations of these sidewalks.

Due to the large amount of deteriorating and missing sidewalk, the sidewalk conditions would be a direct contributing factor.

### County Industrial Park area

The conditions survey identified approximately 4,744 lineal feet of sidewalk or sidewalk potential within the county industrial park limits. Within this area the sidewalk conditions were as follows:

- 416 (8.8%) lineal feet were determined to be adequate
- 1,484 (31.3%) lineal feet were determined to be in a deteriorating condition
- 2,844 (59.9%) lineal feet had no sidewalk at all
- Again, no dilapidated sidewalk was identified in the field work.



Overall, 90% of the lineal feet in this area were either missing sidewalk or the sidewalk was in a deteriorated state. Again, the most critical portion of this review is the amount of missing sidewalk. Within the county industrial park there are several large tracts of land with heavily traveled streets. Some of these parcels are adjacent to a city trail which has limited connectivity to it from these areas. See Figure 5 for the locations of these conditions.

Due to the large amount of missing or deteriorating sidewalk within the county industrial park, sidewalk conditions would be a direct contributing factor and is a contributing factor to adjacent areas within the corporate limits.

### Street Conditions

The street conditions were analyzed in the Study Area including both the incorporated areas and the unincorporated portions of the area. The streets were also rated on four categories; adequate, deteriorating, dilapidating, and missing completely. The following is the breakdown by corporate limits and county industrial park.



Based upon a state statute that requires anytime a city annexes part of a street or road they are required to annex the entire street or road, the analysis assumes that unless a street or road is entirely within the county industrial park it is in the corporate limits. Due to this assumption, of the total 13,139 lineal feet of streets in the study area, all but 270 lineal feet are within the corporate limits.

### Corporate Limits

Within the corporate limits portion of the study area there is approximately 12,899 lineal feet of street. After reviewing the conditions in the field, the following is how the street conditions breakdown within the corporate limits:

- 1,929 (15.0%) lineal feet of adequate street
- 10,608 (82.2%) lineal feet of deteriorating street
- 362 (2.8%) lineal feet of gravel streets.
- There was no street deemed to be dilapidated.



Overall, 85% of the streets are in either a deteriorating state or was paved with gravel, thus an obsolete material for an urban area. See Figure 6 for the locations of these streets.

Due to the large amount of deteriorating and missing street, the street conditions would be a direct contributing factor.

### County Industrial Park area

The conditions survey identified approximately 270 lineal feet of street within the county industrial park limits. Within this area the sidewalk conditions were as follows:

- 270 (100.0%) lineal feet was gravel.
- There were no other conditions.

Overall, 100% of the lineal feet in this area were constructed of gravel. In addition, as shown in the photograph at the right, this portion of street had considerable pot holes throughout. See Figure 5 for the locations of these conditions.



Due to the fact that there is one street section that is all gravel within the county industrial park and the condition of that street is in poor condition, street conditions would be a direct contributing factor and is a contributing factor to adjacent areas within the corporate limits.

### Drainage Conditions

Grand Island has a long history of drainage issue due to the extreme flatness of the area, as well as the high water table. Topography and soils can have a major impact on how a given portion of the city drains. The area designated





in this Study Area is nearly flat or has an extremely small slope.

The field survey examined the entire area for potential drainage problems. One field survey was completed a couple of days after a rain event and the second trip was the day after a rain event. During both field visits there was standing water throughout the entire area. Water was standing in large potholes, in drainage ditches, along areas that were supposed to drain the water away.

Standing water from poor drainage can be a catalyst for Health issues like West Nile due to the potential mosquito breeding that can occur.

Drainage also can be tied directly to the next issue that was analyzed during the field investigations, curb and gutter conditions.

### **Curb and Gutter**

Curb and Gutters have a number of direct and indirect roles in neighborhoods. Their primary functions is to be a barrier that collects and directs water, drainage. On a secondary level, they can help define where the streets start and stop, and they act as a physical barrier between pedestrian and vehicular traffic.

Curb and gutter for the Study Area will be examined similarly to streets and sidewalks. The curb and gutter will be graded as either adequate, deteriorating, dilapidated, or missing. In addition, curb and gutter will be examined based upon their location, within the incorporated area or within the county industrial park.

### **Corporate Limits**

Within the corporate limits portion of the study area there is approximately 11,357 lineal feet of curb and gutter possible. After reviewing the conditions in the field, the following is how the curb and gutter conditions breakdown within the corporate limits:

- 6,432 (56.6%) lineal feet of adequate curb and gutter
- 2,756 (24.3%) lineal feet of deteriorating curb and gutter
- 2,169 (19.1%) lineal feet of no curb and gutter or rural section.
- There was no street deemed to be dilapidated.

Nearly, 45% of the curb and gutters are in either a deteriorating state or are missing. See Figure 7 for the locations of these streets.

Due to the large amount of deteriorating and missing curb and gutter, the curb and gutter conditions would be a direct contributing factor.

### **County Industrial Park area**

The conditions survey identified approximately 6,200 lineal feet of curb and gutter or possible locations within the county industrial park limits. Within this area the curb and gutter conditions were as follows:

- 416 (6.7%) lineal feet was adequate curb and gutter.



- 1,484 (23.9%) lineal feet was in a deteriorating condition.
- 4,299 (69.3%) had no curb and gutter or was rural section drainage.
- There was no curb and gutter deemed to be in a dilapidated condition.

Overall, 92% of the lineal feet in this area were either deteriorating curb and gutter or there was no curb and gutter. See Figure 7 for the locations of these conditions.

Due to the fact that there is a great deal of deteriorating curb and gutter, as well as the fact there is a large portion of this area that does not have any curb and gutter this area would be contributing negatively to adjacent areas within the corporate limits.

### **Unsanitary / Unsafe conditions**

The primary issue surrounding Unsanitary/Unsafe conditions is centered on issues within the county industrial park portion of the Study Area. Even though these conditions are not completely present within the corporate limits, they are a major contributing factor on the properties within the corporate limits.

The first contributing factor is the standing water and drainage issues that are found throughout the entire Study Area. This water has the potential to be the breeding grounds for insects, especially mosquitoes and their potential to carry the West Nile Virus.

Secondly, the old Aurora COOP site contains several building that has limited use at present. It appears that a number of these structures may not be secure and the potential for individuals to sneak into the structures and injure themselves is an extreme possibility.

The final contributing factor found within the Study Area is the property along the south side of Oklahoma Avenue. The property not only contains run down structures but it also contains a large area of old machinery and other items. The property is also very weedy. The property is fenced off with a larger chain link fence; however, the fence itself is in disrepair and a potential unsafe condition. All of these conditions are along the Oklahoma Avenue side of the property.

Based upon the field analysis, there are sufficient elements present for there to be unsanitary and unsafe conditions in the Study Area. These conditions are predominately found as being a contributing factor from properties in the county industrial park.

### **Deterioration of site or other improvements**

Throughout the corporate limits of this Study Area, there is a large portion of sidewalk that is either deteriorating or missing. In addition, a large portion of the curb and gutter has been determined to be either deteriorating or missing.

Finally, the corporate limits also have a large amount of deteriorating streets. The streets have been patched over





and over due to large amounts of cracking that has been occurring in the pavement.

These are major considerations in determining if the area has deteriorated sites or improvements.

There are a number of properties in the county industrial park that lend themselves to this category. Again the old Aurora COOP site contains several structures that have a negative impact on adjacent properties within the corporate limits. In addition, several of the larger ponding locations are located on this property.

The site along the south side of Oklahoma Avenue has a security fence that is in disrepair. In addition there are a large number of overgrown weeds and volunteer trees growing along the Oklahoma Avenue property line.

Based upon the field analysis, there are sufficient elements present to meet the definition of deterioration of site and other improvements in the Study Area. These conditions include conditions found to be contributing from properties in the county industrial park.

### **Dangerous conditions to life or property due to fire or other causes**

A number of the structures within the Study Area deteriorating and appear to be getting worse. The continued deterioration from this point forward will place some of these properties at risk for fire.

In addition, there are a couple of properties that if they go untouched in the future could present a danger to life if someone were to sneak onto the property. This property needs to have a repaired security fence put into place in order to minimize the threat.

Based upon the field analysis, there are sufficient elements present to meet the definition of dangerous conditions within the Study Area. These conditions are predominately found as being a contributing factor from properties in the county industrial park.

### **Combination of factors which are impairing and/or arresting sound growth**

There is one critical element within this Study Area that is presently impairing and/or arresting sound growth, the remaining parcels that are located within the county industrial park. Currently, there is so few properties left within the county industrial park that the benefits that this economic development tool offers is extremely minimized. Therefore, any future development within this portion of the Study Area will likely be minimal thus slowing the ability of the entire area to redevelop.

Based upon the field analysis, there are sufficient elements present to meet the definition of impairing/arresting sound growth within the Study Area. These conditions are predominately found as being a contributing factor from properties in the county industrial park.

## **Blighting Summary**

These conditions are contributing to the blighted conditions of the study area.

- Substantial number of deteriorating structures
  - 30.8% of the structures identified within the corporate limits, of the Study Area, were deemed to be in a state of deterioration or dilapidation
  - 63.6% of the structures in the adjacent county industrial park where deemed to be in a state of deterioration or dilapidation.
  - The deteriorating and dilapidated structures within the county industrial park are a contributing factor on the properties within the corporate limits.
- Unsanitary / Unsafe conditions
  - The presence of standing water through the corporate limits and the county industrial park is a contributing factor due to the potential breeding grounds for insects such as mosquitoes.

- In addition one property within the county industrial park has a large amount of junk and debris. In addition the facility also has a chain link fence that is falling apart.
- **Deterioration of site or other improvements**
  - A large amount of sidewalk either in a deteriorated state or missing from properties in the corporate limits
  - A large amount of sidewalk either in a deteriorated state or missing within the county industrial park area
  - The existence of two gravel streets within the study area
  - The condition of the streets within the corporate limits and the county industrial park
  - Deteriorating curb and gutter and missing curb and gutter in both the corporate limits and county industrial park.
- **Dangerous conditions to life or property due to fire or other causes**
  - The number of deteriorating structures, especially within the county industrial park portion of the Study Area.
  - The condition of the property on the south side of Oklahoma Avenue
  - The condition of the security fence along the south side of Oklahoma Avenue
- **Combination of factors which are impairing and/or arresting sound growth**
  - The continued existence of the county industrial park
- **Average age of structures is over 40 years of age**
  - Within the corporate limits of the Study Area 97.8% of the structures meet the criteria of 40 years of age or older.
  - Within the county industrial park portion of the Study Area. 90.9% of the structures meet the criteria of 40 years of age or older.

The other criteria for Blight were not present in the area, these included:

- Defective/Inadequate street layouts,
- Faulty lot layout,
- Defective or unusual condition of title,
- Economic or social liability detrimental to health, safety and welfare,
- Conditions provision of housing accommodations,
- One-half of unimproved property is over 40 years old,
- Inadequate provisions for ventilation, light, air, open spaces or sanitation, and
- Diversity of ownership.
- Improper Subdivision or obsolete platting

These issues were either not present or were limited enough as to have little impact on the overall condition of the study area.

### **Substandard Conditions**

#### **Average age of the residential or commercial units in the area is at least forty years**

Besides structural conditions of the buildings in the Study Area, age of these structures is another contributing factor to the substandard conditions in the area. Statutes allow for a predominance of structures that are 40 years of age or older to be a contributing factor regardless of their condition. The following paragraphs document the structural age of the Study Area and again it is broke down into the corporate limits and the county industrial park areas.

#### ***Corporate Limits***

Within the corporate limits portion of the study area there is a total of 91 primary structures. After research structural age on the Hall County Assessor's and Treasurer's websites, the following breakdown was determined:

- 2 (2.2%) structures were determined to be less than 40 years of age

- 89 (97.8%) structures were determined to be 40 years of age or older

Overall, 97.8% of the structures in this portion of the area are 40 years old or older thus qualifying it as substantial. See Figure 4 for the locations of the structures.

Due to the age of the structures in the corporate limits, age of structures would be a direct contributing factor.

#### **County Industrial Park area**

The conditions survey identified 22 structures within the county industrial park limits. Within this area the overall structural ages include:

- 2 (9.1%) structures were determined to be less than 40 years of age
- 20 (90.9%) structures were determined to be 40 years of age or older

Overall, 90% of the structures in this portion of the area are 40 years old or older thus qualifying it as substantial. Even though this area is not within the corporate limits of Grand Island, the structural age of this area does have an impact on the adjacent properties. See Figure 4 for the locations of the structures.

Due to the age of the structures within the county industrial park, age of structures would be a direct contributing factor.

### **Substandard Summary**

Nebraska State Statute requires that at least one of five substandard factors be present in a community. This Study Area in Grand Island has one of the five. The other criteria for Substandard were not present or the data was not readily accessible in the area, these included:

- Unemployment in the designated area is at least one hundred twenty percent of the state or national average;
- more than half of the plotted and subdivided property in an area is unimproved land that has been within the city for forty years and has remained unimproved during that time;
- the per capita income of the area is lower than the average per capita income of the city or in which the area is designated
- the area has had either stable or decreasing population based on the last two decennial censuses.

#### **FINDINGS FOR GRAND ISLAND**

Study Area #8 has several items contributing to the Blight and Substandard Conditions. These conditions include:

#### **Blighted Conditions**

- Substantial number of deteriorating structures,
- Unsanitary / Unsafe conditions,
- Deterioration of site or other improvements,
- Dangerous conditions to life or property due to fire or other causes,
- Combination of factors which are impairing and/or arresting sound growth,
- Average age of structures is over 40 years of age.

#### **Substandard Conditions**

- Average age of the residential or commercial units in the area is at least forty years

Issues which were not researched due to a lack of data were:

- Tax/special assessment delinquency greater than fair value of land,
- Tax delinquency,

- Underemployment that equals 120% state or national average,
- Per capita income less than city wide average, and
- High Density or population and overcrowding.
- Unemployment in the designated area is at least one hundred twenty percent of the state or national average;
- more than half of the plotted and subdivided property in an area is unimproved land that has been within the city for forty years and has remained unimproved during that time;
- the per capita income of the area is lower than the average per capita income of the city or in which the area is designated


**Figure 5:  
Sidewalk Conditions**



Source: Olsson Associates and Marvin Planning Consultants, 2011




Figure 6:  
Street Conditions



Source: Olsson Associates and Marvin Planning Consultants, 2011

**Figure 7:**  
**Curb and Gutter Conditions**



Source: Olsson Associates and Marvin Planning Consultants, 2011

### **CONCLUSION**

Based upon the issues and conditions indicated from the survey of this area, there are sufficient criteria present to declare Area #8 of Grand Island as Blighted and Substandard as provided for in the Nebraska Revised Statutes. The conditions found throughout the entire area constitute a designation of blighted and substandard.

In addition, the area within the county industrial park is not only a contributing factor to the area within the corporate limits but if this area had its industrial park designation removed, the area would be able to stand on its own as Blighted and Substandard.

The eventual use of Tax Increment Financing would be of great benefit to the entire area; provided the entire area is brought into the corporate limits of the community.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This Redevelopment Plan (the "Redevelopment Plan" or the "Plan") is intended to provide a guide for the implementation of redevelopment activities within the previously examined Redevelopment Area #8 in Grand Island, Nebraska (the "City"), pursuant to the provisions of the Nebraska Community Development Law and sections 18-2145 to 18-2154 (together, the "Act").

The Grand Island Redevelopment Authority (the "CRA"), acting as a redevelopment authority pursuant to the Act, intends to undertake or provide for the redevelopment within the study area, legally described and shown on Figure 2 (the "Redevelopment Plan Area") in the Blight and Substandard Study. Redevelopment activities shall be utilized to promote the general welfare, the enhancement of the tax base, the economic and social well-being, the development of any public activities and promotion of public events in the Area, along with any and all other purposes, as outlined in the Act.

A Community Development Authority Redevelopment Plan must contain the general planning elements set out by section 18-2111 of the Act as items (1) through (6), as follows:

"(1) the boundaries of the redevelopment area with a map showing the existing uses and condition of the real property therein; (2) a land-use plan showing proposed uses of the area; (3) information showing the standards of population densities, land coverage and building intensities in the area after redevelopment; (4) a statement of the proposed changes, if any, in zoning ordinances or maps, street layouts, street levels or grades, or building codes and ordinances; (5) a site plan of the area; and (6) a statement as to the kind and number of additional public facilities or utilities which will be required to support the new land uses in the area after redevelopment.

Section 18-2113 of the Act, provides that a Community Redevelopment Authority must consider certain planning matters prior to recommending a redevelopment plan to the City Council for adoption. These considerations are defined therein, as follows:

"...whether the proposed land uses and building requirements in the redevelopment project area are designed with the general purpose of accomplishing, in conformance with the general plan, a coordinated, adjusted and harmonious development of the City and its environs which will, in accordance with present and future needs, promote health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, and the general welfare, as well as efficiency and economy in the process of development; including, among other things, adequate provision for traffic, vehicular parking, the promotion of safety from fire, panic, and other dangers, adequate provision for light and air, the promotion of the healthful and convenient distribution of population, the provision of adequate transportation, water, sewage, and other public utilities, schools, parks, recreational and community facilities and other public requirements, the promotion of sound design and arrangement, the wise and efficient expenditure of public funds, and the prevention of the recurrence of insanitary or unsafe dwelling accommodations, or conditions of blight."

## **CONCLUSION**

While this Redevelopment Plan establishes overall policies and intentions toward the comprehensive redevelopment of the Area, additional phases may require subsequent project plans and redevelopment agreements consistent with this Redevelopment Plan



## **REDEVELOPMENT PLAN**

The planning process for the Redevelopment Area has resulted in a listing of general planning and implementation recommendations. As previously discussed in the Blight and Substandard Determination Study, there are several structural and substandard conditions which are detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the community and generally obsolete in respect to the development and living environment expectations of Nebraska communities, including the City of Grand Island. To eliminate these conditions and enhance private development activities within the Redevelopment Area, the City of Grand Island will need to consider the following planning and redevelopment actions:

- rehabilitation of residential, commercial, industrial and public/quasi-public properties;
- maintain and/or replace, as necessary, the current infrastructure in the Area;
- code enforcement program for the clean-up of areas in violation and detrimental to health, safety and general welfare of the community;
- screening and/or buffering of adjacent industrial areas (beyond the Redevelopment Area) from residential uses, including the use of berms and, or, landscaping to partially screen parking or storage areas and enhance vehicular and pedestrian right-of-ways; and,
- condemnation of un-safe structures, acquisition where necessary and demolition of substantially deteriorated structures, and replacement with appropriate residential, commercial or industrial development.

Both a timeline and budget should be developed for the Redevelopment Plan. Each of these processes should be designed in conformance with the resources and time available to the CRA and the City. A reasonable timeline to complete the redevelopment activities identified in the Redevelopment Plan would be 10 to 15 years.

Various funding sources exist for the preparation and implementation of a capital improvement budget designed to meet the funding needs of proposed redevelopment activities. These include, in addition to city and federal funds commonly utilized, Community Development Block Grant funding, HOME funding, special assessments, general obligation bonds, redevelopment bonds, occupation taxes and tax increment financing.

### **Future Land Use Pattern**

The existing land use patterns within Redevelopment Area were described in the Blight and Substandard Determination Study portion of this document. In general, the Redevelopment Area contains six distinct land uses. The primary developed uses include single and multifamily residential, commercial, industrial, parks/recreational and quasi-public use. There is also an under-utilized tract south of the existing commercial area that would be available for commercial or industrial development.

Future land uses recommended for Redevelopment Area are planned to be in general conformance with the current zoning pattern depicted in the Blight and Substandard Determination Study. However, expansion of the industrial and commercial uses within the area is recommended, including the expansion of current industrial uses into other non-residential districts within the Redevelopment Area.

Infill development in conformance with the associated future land use and zoning criteria are advocated throughout Redevelopment Area for vacant parcels. These lots, or parcels, are cost

effective to develop as all required infrastructure is present.

### **Future Zoning Districts**

A future zoning plan for Redevelopment Area is reflected in the existing zoning map contained in the Blight and Substandard Study. The map illustrates the future zoning classifications are in conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan and current zoning classifications. However, as stated above, expansion of the industrial and commercial uses within the area is recommended, including the expansion of current industrial uses into other non-residential districts within the Redevelopment Area.

### **Recommended Public Improvements**

**Streets:** Although sufficient infrastructure generally exists in the Redevelopment Area the installation and upgrading of streets and sidewalks is ongoing by the City through its various programs. The Blight and Substandard Study identified deteriorating, dilapidated and rural section curb and gutter, as well as sidewalks, as a major contributing substandard condition. An upgrade of these improvements is a primary and first step in the redevelopment of the Area. Gravel streets, which are to remain public streets, in the area should be improved to City standards.

**Storm Water:** Although sufficient infrastructure generally exists in the Redevelopment Area the installation and upgrading of storm sewer lines and facilities is ongoing by the City through its various programs. .

**Potable Water and Gas:** Although sufficient infrastructure generally exists in the Redevelopment Area the installation and upgrading of water and gas lines is ongoing.

**Sanitary Sewer:** Although sufficient infrastructure generally exists in the Redevelopment Area the installation and upgrading of sanitary sewer lines and facilities is ongoing by the City through its various programs.

**Electrical Power:** Although sufficient infrastructure generally exists in the Redevelopment Area the installation and upgrading of electrical power lines and facilities is ongoing by the City through its various programs.

**Recreation:** The current recreational facilities will be upgraded from time to time in accordance with the City Comprehensive Plan.

### **Residential District**

Primary redevelopment focus should concentrate on housing rehabilitation and overall site condition improvements. Additionally, the City or CRA may improve certain lots by demolishing deteriorated structures on those lots. The City or CRA will market the acquired and improved lots to allow for the private construction of the replacement residential units. The lots selected to be acquired as part of an initial project, and each future project, need not be contiguous, but shall be selected on availability, funding and likelihood of successful development. The CRA may also develop a residential revolving fund to provide funding to owners to upgrade their property. Initial and on-going funding is discussed below.

### **Commercial/Industrial District**

Overall upgrade of site conditions and structures are a primary focus. Expansion of such uses as well as a combination of properties is necessary for the redevelopment of the Area. Various public financing tools, as described in this Redevelopment Plan, may be made available for such commercial and industrial redevelopment. Public streets, where appropriate, may be vacated to encourage contiguous commercial or industrial

redevelopment. Traffic patterns for commercial/industrial truck traffic should be studied to minimize the effect on the adjacent residential area.

## Financing

### Redevelopment Bonds

The Plan proposes that the CRA issue a series of redevelopment bonds (the “Bonds”) to be repaid from several sources as set out in the each particular issuance. These sources include all or a portion of the excess *ad valorem* real estate taxes generated by a series of redevelopment projects pursuant to §18-2147 of the Nebraska Revised Statutes (“Tax Increment Financing” or “TIF”) for a period of 15 years from the respective project effective dates, special assessments, *ad valorem* real estate taxes from the special redevelopment levy, grants and other income from the Redevelopment Area. The proceeds of the Bonds to assist in payment of project costs, as further defined in a subsequent redevelopment contract or contracts. The costs of adequate redevelopment of the Area is too great to be absorbed by either the Developer or public without the assistance of Tax Increment Financing, as further described in the cost benefit analysis to be provided with each project.

The Bonds issued for the commercial/industrial redevelopment would generally be purchased by the developer using such funds granted to it by the CRA. In addition to necessary public improvements, the Bond proceeds would be used to provide funding for allowable expenses incurred by the Developer.

Each of these subsequent redevelopment project plans may contain a provision for the division of *ad valorem* taxes for each respective project, thereby allowing the excess *ad valorem* taxes that are collected from each project to be available and pledged to the outstanding Bonds for the full statutory period. The effective date of each pledge, as described above, shall be the date determined either by contract or by modification of the outstanding Bond terms.

### Loan/Grant Programs

The CRA and the City of Grand Island should seek funding sources to create a revolving loan and/or grant program for the rehabilitation and improvement of buildings and public uses in Redevelopment Area. The rehabilitation of residential, commercial and industrial buildings would prolong the life of the structures, create safe and decent living and shopping environments and enhance the pride of the community. As discussed above, funding may be available through the CRA levy or from the excess *ad valorem* taxes from each project as it develops.

### Façade Improvement Program

This citywide program used in blighted and substandard areas is appropriate for this Area. The program provides funding assistance to commercial properties to rehabilitate building frontages.

## SUMMARY

The recommendations listed above are to grant authority to the City of Grand Island and the CRA in creating a viable and sustainable living environment in Grand Island, through the full use of the Community Development Law.

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY  
GRAND ISLAND, NEBRASKA

RESOLUTION NO.130

A RESOLUTION OF THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF GRAND ISLAND, NEBRASKA (the "Authority") MAKING RECOMMENDATION WITH RESPECT TO BLIGHT AND SUBSTANDARD AREA #8 AND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN.

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Council of the City of Grand Island, Nebraska (the "City"), by its Ordinance passed and adopted June 27, 1994, created the Community Redevelopment Authority of the City of Grand Island, Nebraska, pursuant to Sections 18-2101 through 18-2153 of the Nebraska Community Development Law; Reissue Revised Statutes of Nebraska, as amended (the "Act");

WHEREAS, on February DATE 15<sup>th</sup>, the Community Redevelopment Authority commissioned Olsson Associates of Lincoln, Nebraska to prepare a Blight and Substandard Study to determine whether the property generally described as: POINT OF BEGINNING IS THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINES OF ANNA STREET AND LINCOLN AVENUES; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID CENTERLINE OF LINCOLN AVENUE S TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINES OF LINCOLN AVENUE S AND PHOENIX AVENUE W; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID CENTERLINE OF PHOENIX AVENUE W TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINES OF PHOENIX AVENUE W AND CLARK STREET S; THENCE, SOUTH EASTERLY ALONG SAID CENTERLINE OF CLARK STREET S TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINES OF CLARK STREET S AND EDDY STREET S; THENCE, SOUTH ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF EDDY STREET S TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINS OF EDDY STREET S AND FONNER PARK ROAD W; THENCE, WEST ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF FONNER PARK ROAD W TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE CENTERLINES OF FONNER PARK ROAD W AND ADAMS STREET S; THENCE, SOUTH ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF ADAMS STREET S TO THE EXTENDED SOUTH PROPERTY LINE OF THE TRACT DESCRIBED IN FILE: 07-2412 OF THE HALL COUNTY REGISTER OF DEEDS; THENCE, WEST ALONG SAID SOUTH PROPERTY LINE TO THE WEST PROPERTY LINE OF SAID PROPERTY; THENCE NORTH ALONG THE WEST PROPERTY LINE OF SAID PROPERTY TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF A PORTION OF LOT 21 AS DESCRIBED IN ITEMS 1 AND 2 OF INSTRUMENT NUMBER 200314398; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF WASH TWP PT SE 1/4 NW 1/4 21-11-9 (ALSO KNOWN AS PARCEL NUMBER 400206935 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE); THENCE, NORTHWESTERLY ALONG THE WESTERN PROPERTY LINE OF SAID PROPERTY TO THE INTERSECTION OF THE EXTENDED WESTERN PROPERTY

LINE AND THE CENTERLINE OF ANNA STREET W; THENCE, NORTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID CENTERLINE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

### ***Corporate Limits***

The Corporate Limits is the entire study area excepting:

1. THE PARCEL REFERRED TO WASH TWP PT SE 1/4 NW 1/4 21-11-9 (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400206935 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) 10.92 AC
2. WASH TWP PT SW 1/4 NE 1/4 21-11-9 (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400206811 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) 10.33 AC
3. WASHINGTON TWP B. & Y. SUB LT 1 (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400209616 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) 132,422 SF
4. WASH TWP S OF RR PT NE 1/4 21-11-9 (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400206862 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) .44 AC
5. WASH TWP PT NE 1/4 PT FORMER BLKS 7-8-9-10 SOUTH PARK 21-11-9 PT VAC WASHINGTON ST (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400206846 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) 5.69 AC
6. A PIECE OF LAND REFERRED TO AS PARCEL 64
7. WASH TWP 21-11-9 W 1/2 OF VACATED WASHINGTON STREET (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400371391 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) .076 AC
8. WASH TWP PT SW 1/4 NE 1/4 21-11-9 (ALSO REFERRED AS PARCEL NUMBER 400289172 ON THE HALL COUNTY ASSESSORS SITE) .15 AC

Located in the City of Grand Island, Hall County, Nebraska" fulfilled the blight/substandard criteria of the Nebraska Community Development law; and

WHEREAS, Olsson Associates completed said Blight/Substandard Study which indicates the presence of substandard and blighted conditions in the area and,

WHEREAS the Blight/Substandard Study indicates that the area is in need of redevelopment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF GRAND ISLAND, NEBRASKA, as follows:

1. The Authority has considered the factors specified in Section 18-2103 of the Act, including proposed land uses and building requirements in the Redevelopment Project area, development of the City in accordance with its present and further welfare, as well as efficiency and economy in the process of development, including traffic, parking, safety from fire, panic and other dangers, adequate provisions for light and air, the promotion of healthful and convenient distribution of population,

adequate transportation, water, sewerage, and other public utilities, schools, parks, recreation and community facilities, and other public requirements, the promotion of sound design and arrangement, the wise and efficient expenditure of public funds, and prevention of the recurrence of unsanitary or unsafe dwelling accommodations, or conditions of blight.

2. The Authority forwards this Study to the Council for Action by the Grand Island City Council including sending this Study to the Regional Planning Commission for their recommendation.
3. The Authority recommends to the Mayor and City Council of the City of Grand Island, Nebraska, approval of the Blight and Substandard Area #8 and Redevelopment Plan.

Passed and adopted by the Authority this 15<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2012.

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT  
AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF  
GRAND ISLAND, NEBRASKA

By: Benny J. Schubert  
Chairperson

ATTEST:

ChMA  
Director/Secretary

Resolution Number 2012 - 02

HALL COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

**A RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF A REDEVELOPMENT PLAN OF THE CITY OF GRAND ISLAND, NEBRASKA; AND APPROVAL OF RELATED ACTIONS**

**WHEREAS**, the Chairman and Board of the Community Redevelopment Authority of the City of Grand Island, Nebraska (the "**Authority**"), referred that certain Redevelopment Plan to the Hall County Regional Planning Commission, (the "**Commission**") a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit "A" for review and recommendation as to its conformity with the general plan for the development of the City of Grand Island, Hall County, Nebraska, pursuant to Section 18-2112 of the Community Development Law, Chapter 18, Article 21, Reissue Revised Statutes of Nebraska, as amended (the "**Act**"); and

**WHEREAS**, the Commission has reviewed said Redevelopment Plan as to its conformity with the general plan for the development of the City of Grand Island, Hall County;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HALL COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION AS FOLLOWS:**

**Section 1.** The Commission hereby recommends approval of the Redevelopment Plan.

**Section 2.** All prior resolutions of the Commission in conflict with the terms and provisions of this resolution are hereby expressly repealed to the extent of such conflicts.

**Section 3.** This resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage as provided by law.

**DATED:** March 7 2012.

HALL COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

ATTEST:

By [Signature]  
Chair

By: [Signature]

Secretary