1. **administrative**
   
   a. Approve minutes from 6-19-2018

2. **action**
   
   a. Parking Code Modernization

3. **informational**

4. **new business**
   
   a. Upcoming EDAB topics
   b. Chamber update

**public comment**

**adjourn**

Next meeting: October 18, 2018

**appeals & assistance**

"If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the Commission with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he/she will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, he/she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based." (F. S. 286.0105).

"Persons with disabilities needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact the City Clerk's Office (407-599-3277) at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting."
Meeting was called to order at 8:15 a.m. in the Chapman Room of City Hall.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: John Caron, Russ Bruguiere, Wes Naylor, Betsy Gardner-Eckbert, Tara Tedrow and Bill Segal

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Joel Roberts

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Kyle Dudgeon, Kim Breland, Lindsey Hayes and Dori Stone

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:
A. Chairman John Caron began the meeting by stating that he and Kyle Dudgeon discussed the meeting calendar for EDAB and decided that, in order to respect time and schedule of the Board members, the Board will only meet when there are relevant items to discuss.

B. Approve minutes from 4-17-18
   Motion made by Betsy Gardner-Eckbert, seconded by Tara Tedrow, to approve the April 17, 2018 minutes. Motion passes 5-0.

ACTION ITEMS:
A. Lawrence Center Expansion
   Staff explained that the Lawrence Center is expanding as part of an innovative triangle that includes a new museum, future Crummer Business School and three level parking garage located at 200 E. New England Avenue and 203 E. Lyman Avenue and the Alfond Inn expansion. Staff stated that at the June 11th regular city commission meeting, staff was directed to explore a possible partnership that would include additional parking spaces for the public as part of this development.

   Staff noted that parking management is one of the major goals of the CRA plan. Supply addition was also a strategic initiative provided in the 2017 parking study. Staff stated that in a review of the CRA budget, staff determined it could account for up to $3.3 million for use of this project without significantly affecting future increment revenue or its current capital improvement plan.

   Staff remarked that the purpose of EDAB is to provide recommendations on development within the community, particularly in the downtown. This also may include operations of the garage, maintenance, access, and impact on the economic vitality of the city. Staff provided a study which included materials regarding supply additions, schedule of values for 3 level and 5 level garages and well as renderings of the and renderings of the Rollins Innovative Triangle. Staff answered questions from the Board. Discussion ensued.

   Motion made by Betsy Gardner-Eckbert, seconded by Wes Naylor to approve Staff to continue pursuing the public/private parking garage agreement. Motion carried 5-0.

   Tara Tedrow recused herself from this item.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS:
A. Economic Development & Circulator Transportation
Staff explained that in the past, the City has explored the idea of implementing circulator transportation in Winter Park and with the new 2017 parking strategies coming up, the topic has resurfaced again. Staff noted that the City has researched and attempted to provide circulator service through a variety of business models including trolley, downtown circulator, golf cart on demand service, and others and those projects were postponed, citing financial loss. Staff stated that this is consistent with many cases. Without a consistent source of income (e.g. heavy population, annual subsidy/sponsor) expenses outweigh revenues.

Staff provided materials from 2013 Strategic Planning item by the City Commission titled “City Bus or Circulator System”. This was identified as a priority to the Commission, but was not put into action due to budgetary concerns. Staff also presented documentation from the 2017 parking strategies plan provided by Kimley Horn. Serving similar purposes, the circulator would move from various activity centers to facilitate last mile travel. The report does indicates the need for increased mobility, but does state an upfront capital investment and annual operating and maintenance costs as a key characteristic. Discussion Ensued.

B. EDAB Monthly Report
Staff provided updates for the following items of interest:
Tourism
Corridor Analysis
Special Events
Mobility/Parking Issues
Fiber Optics
Mixed Use Development
Staff reviewed the Mixed Use Development presentation that was given to the City Commission on June 11, 2018. Discussion ensued.

C. Chamber Update
Betsy Gardner-Eckbert gave the Board an update on Tourism in Winter Park. She state that the new Tourism Task Force would start on June 20, 2018. She stated that the task force would meet quarterly to assess tourism in Winter Park. She stated that the Arts and Culture subcommittee was a progenitor to some of the ideas in terms of examining how best to bundle the assets of the City to present them as one offering that would create an impact for the City’s cultural institutions. She stated that the Chamber took the idea a step further to research how dining, shopping and the golf course with those assets to create a special offering for tourists. Mrs. Eckbert gave a presentation that reviewed global visitors that visited the City of Winter Park Chamber of Commerce Welcome Center. Discussion ensued.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. EDAB Summer Schedule
Next meeting scheduled for September 18, 2018
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:27 a.m.
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Subject 2a

Parking Code Modernization

motion | recommendation

Recommendation is at the pleasure of the board.

Background

In 2017, the City and CRA retained Kimley-Horn to establish a parking management strategy. These included proposals for physical improvements, policy updates, and a modernization of the city’s parking code. An analysis of the parking code included a review of select “peer cities” similar to Winter Park and their approach to parking regulations. Ultimately, recommendations were formed based on the analysis. The focus of these modernizations are not citywide, but specifically referenced for the Central Business District (CBD), commercial area of Hannibal Square, and Orange Avenue.

The proposed changes include:

1. Retail to Restaurant Conversions: Removes the ability to convert retail stores within the CBD and HSNCD without providing the parking required for the greater parking needs of the restaurant.
2. Updates to the Parking Requirements within the CBD, a portion of the HSNCD and along the Orange Avenue corridor: Change for retail and office floor spaces from one space per 250 square feet to one space for each 350 square feet.
3. Large Office Building Change: Avoid over-parking by using the current one space for 250 square feet on the first 20,000 sq. ft.; then transitioning to one space for each 350 square feet above 20,000 square feet.
4. Shared Parking Reference: Adopts the Urban Land Institute’s (ULI) Shared Parking analysis as a reference for determining when shared parking scenarios are applicable.
5. Off-site Parking: Changes the distance permitted for off-site parking from 300 feet to 450 feet.
6. Fee-in-lieu of Programs: Provides for the potential future creation of a fee-in-lieu of parking program. Enables the adoption of a future program but does not create one.

City staff presented the proposed code changes as a non-action item to the City Commission at their August 27, 2018 regular meeting. Staff was then directed to bring this to EDAB for their thoughts and recommendation.

The following backup items articulate the process, recommendations, and code modernization language provided by staff and the consultant on this item. They include:
▪ Kimley Horn Peer City Code Evaluation, March 2018
▪ Kimley Horn Parking Code Modernization Recommendations, July 2018
▪ P&Z Staff Report, August 2018
▪ History of Parking Regulations in the CBD
▪ Proposed Parking Code Change Ordinance, August 2018
▪ Walkshed Maps for the CBD, Hannibal Square, and Orange Avenue, September 2018
Peer Cities Code Evaluation
Winter Park, Florida
Peer Cities Code Evaluation
Parking Code Peer Review

- Delray Beach, FL
- St. Armands, Sarasota, FL
- Davidson, NC
- Asheville, NC
- Mt. Pleasant, SC
- Highland Park, IL
Delray Beach, FL

South Atlantic Coast destination with a thriving downtown retail and restaurants district. Festivals and seasonal events increase demand in the constrained environment.

Currently looking at eliminating free street parking and replacing with smart meters and surge pricing.

Population: 67,000
Downtown: 0.64 sq mi

Downtown parking spaces:
- 1,052 on-street
- 2,637 off-street public
St. Armands, Sarasota

High-end shopping district in Sarasota, located on an island in the Gulf, connected to downtown Sarasota by the John Ringling Causeway.

Free parking available throughout the district.

Population: 54,425 (Sarasota)
Downtown: 0.19 sq mi

Downtown parking spaces:
- 575 on-street
- 406 off-street public
Davidson, NC

North suburb of Charlotte, centers on a traditional, thriving Main Street and the campus of Davidson College. Known for their leading approach to zoning, development, and bicycle & pedestrian planning in the region.

Free parking available throughout downtown.

Population: 12,452
Downtown: 0.18 sq mi

Downtown parking spaces:
- 371 on-street
- 298 off-street public
- 1,261 off-street private
Asheville, NC

Arts, culture and outdoor destination in the Blue Ridge mountains. Congested parking throughout the downtown area is exacerbated by seasonal demand and festivals.

Parking meters and paid lots throughout downtown.

Population: 89,121
Downtown: 2.24 sq mi

Downtown parking spaces:
- 765 on-street
- 1,523 off-street public
Mt. Pleasant, SC

Upscale, fast-growing suburb of Charleston, connected via bridge. Historic downtown in a constrained environment.

Free parking throughout the town.

Population: 84,170
Downtown: 0.31 sq mi

Downtown parking spaces:
- Not available
Highland Park, IL

North shore suburb of Chicago linked by commuter rail. Walkable, thriving downtown centered on the Metra rail line.
Free parking throughout downtown.

Population: 29,641
Downtown: 0.19 sq mi

Downtown parking spaces:
- 507 on-street
- 2,547 off-street public
## Multifamily Parking Minimums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Winter Park, FL</th>
<th>Davidson, NC</th>
<th>Delray Beach, FL</th>
<th>Highland Park, IL</th>
<th>Mt. Pleasant, SC</th>
<th>Asheville, NC</th>
<th>St. Armands, Sarasota, FL</th>
<th>Peer Cities Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 per unit if building is 2 units or less; Min: 1.0 per unit Max: 2.0 per unit</td>
<td>1.0 per unit + guest spaces (see below)</td>
<td>1.25 per unit + guest spaces (see below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Bedroom</strong></td>
<td>2.50 per unit if building is 3 units or more</td>
<td>1.50 per unit</td>
<td>1.5 per unit + guest spaces (see below)</td>
<td>1.5-3.0 per dwelling unit</td>
<td>Min: 1.0 per unit Max: 2.0 per unit CBD: None</td>
<td>2.0 per unit Downtown districts: 1.0 per unit</td>
<td>1.29 per unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Bedrooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Bedrooms +</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 per unit CBD: 1.75 per unit + guest spaces (see below)</td>
<td>2.0 per unit + guest spaces (see below)</td>
<td>2.0 per unit + guest spaces (see below)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Min: 2.0 per unit Max: 3.0 per unit CBD: None</td>
<td>1.5 per unit if senior Housing</td>
<td>1.75 per unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Based on this code, Park Avenue requires...</strong></td>
<td>496 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>316 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Retail Parking Minimums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Cities Average</th>
<th>St. Armands, Sarasota, FL</th>
<th>Asheville, NC</th>
<th>Mt. Pleasant, SC</th>
<th>Highland Park, IL</th>
<th>Delray Beach, FL</th>
<th>Davidson, NC</th>
<th>Winter Park, FL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on this code, Park Avenue requires...</td>
<td>758 spaces</td>
<td>4.0 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>CBD: None</td>
<td>Min: 2.85 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>Max: 5.0 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>CBD: &lt;15k ft²: 2.5 per 1,000 ft² &gt;15k ft²: No requirement for first 2,000 ft², then 1.5 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>General Commercial &amp; Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>1,102 spaces</td>
<td>3.3 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>CBD: 3.3-5 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>Max: 5.0 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>Min: 2.85 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>Max: 5.0 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>Min: 2.0 per 1,000 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min: 2.0 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>CBD: 3.3-5 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>Max: 5.0 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>Min: 2.85 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>Max: 5.0 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>Min: 2.0 per 1,000 ft²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Restaurant Parking Minimums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Cities</th>
<th>Winter Park, FL</th>
<th>Davidson, NC</th>
<th>Delray Beach, FL</th>
<th>Highland Park, IL</th>
<th>Mt. Pleasant, SC</th>
<th>Asheville, NC</th>
<th>St. Armands, Sarasota, FL</th>
<th>Peer Cities Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 per 1000 ft² of patron use</td>
<td>Min: 2.0 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>&lt;6,000 ft²: 12.0 space per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>20 per 1,000 ft² for kitchen, serving and waiting area + 0.5 per seat</td>
<td>20 per 1,000 ft² for kitchen, serving and waiting area + 0.5 per seat</td>
<td>Min: 1 per 3 seats + 1 per 2 employees on peak shift</td>
<td>10.12 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>10.12 per 1,000 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Or 1 per 3 seats</td>
<td>Max: 3.5 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>&gt;6,000 ft²: additional 15 per 1,000 ft² over initial 6,000 ft²</td>
<td>Outdoor restaurants: 10.80 per 1,000 ft² CBD: &lt;15k ft²: 2.5 per 1,000 ft² &gt;15k ft²: No requirement for first 2,000 ft², then 1.5 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>Outdoor restaurants: 10.80 per 1,000 ft² CBD: &lt;15k ft²: 2.5 per 1,000 ft² &gt;15k ft²: No requirement for first 2,000 ft², then 1.5 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>Max: 1 per 2 seats + 1 per 2 employees on peak shift</td>
<td>Casual/Fine: 6.6 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>Casual/Fine: 6.6 per 1,000 ft²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBD: 6.0 space per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>10 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>10 per 1,000 ft²</td>
<td>CBD: None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on this code, Park Avenue requires…</td>
<td>462 spaces (assumes that 50% of square footage is “for patron use”)</td>
<td>251 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Peer Cities Average | 10.12 per 1,000 ft² | 5.42 per 1,000 ft² |
# General Office Parking Minimums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Davidson, NC</th>
<th>Delray Beach, FL</th>
<th>Highland Park, IL</th>
<th>Mt. Pleasant, SC</th>
<th>Asheville, NC</th>
<th>St. Armands, Sarasota, FL</th>
<th>Peer Cities Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter Park, FL</td>
<td>4 per 1,000 ft(^2) excluding some common areas</td>
<td>&lt;3,000 ft(^2): 4 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>Min: 2.0 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>&lt;30kft(^2): 4.0 per 1,000 ft(^2) then 3.3 per 1,000 ft(^2) each additional 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>Min: 2.85 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>2.85 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>3.16 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson, NC</td>
<td>2 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>&gt;3,000 ft(^2) above: + 3.5 per 1,000 ft(^2) over initial 3,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>Max: 3.5 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>&gt;15k ft(^2): No requirement for first 2,000 ft(^2), then 1.5 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>Max: 4.0 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>CBD: None</td>
<td>CBD: 2.66 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delray Beach, FL</td>
<td>&lt;10,000 ft(^2): 2 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>&lt;10,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>CBD: &lt;15k ft(^2): 2.5 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>3.3-5 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>Min: 2.85 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park, IL</td>
<td>&gt;10,000 ft(^2) more than 750 ft(^2) from public garage or transit station: 3.3 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>&gt;10,000 ft(^2) within 750 ft(^2) from public garage or transit station: 2.0 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>CBD: None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Pleasant, SC</td>
<td>2.5 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>&lt;15k ft(^2): No requirement for first 2,000 ft(^2), then 1.5 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asheville, NC</td>
<td>CBD: None</td>
<td>Max: 4.0 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Armands, Sarasota, FL</td>
<td>2.85 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>Min: 2.85 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Cities Average</td>
<td>3.16 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>3.3-5 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>2.85 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>2.85 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>2.85 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>2.85 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
<td>2.85 per 1,000 ft(^2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this code, Park Avenue requires... 895 spaces

595 spaces
## Hotel Parking Minimums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Park, FL</th>
<th>Davidson, NC</th>
<th>Delray Beach, FL</th>
<th>Highland Park, IL</th>
<th>Mt. Pleasant, SC</th>
<th>Asheville, NC</th>
<th>St. Armands, Sarasota, FL</th>
<th>Peer Cities Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotel/Motel</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0 per room + any auxiliary use minimums calculated separately</strong></td>
<td><strong>Min: 2.0 per 1,000 ft²</strong></td>
<td><strong>Max: 3.5 per 1,000 ft²</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.0 per room + 2.0 per manager/owner + any auxiliary space (restaurant, meeting rooms) minimums calculated separately</strong></td>
<td><strong>Min: 1.0 per 2 rooms + any auxiliary use minimums calculated separately</strong></td>
<td><strong>Max: 1.0 per room + any auxiliary use minimums calculated separately</strong></td>
<td><strong>CBD: None</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Based on this code, Park Avenue requires...</strong></td>
<td><strong>28 spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28 spaces</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Reductions, Shared Parking & Exemptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Park, FL</th>
<th>Davidson, NC</th>
<th>Delray Beach, FL</th>
<th>Highland Park, IL</th>
<th>Mt. Pleasant, SC</th>
<th>Asheville, NC</th>
<th>St. Armands, Sarasota, FL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduction for CBD</strong></td>
<td>Allows reductions for restaurant parking only</td>
<td>May count on-street parking toward minimums</td>
<td>Reduction for restaurants in Atlantic Avenue area</td>
<td>Reducing parking requirements</td>
<td>No off-street parking required in CBD, various reductions offered in other districts throughout city</td>
<td>Buildings below 10,000 sq ft have no parking requirements; on-street may be counted toward parking requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit proximity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Parking</strong></td>
<td>Limited; may lease supply in excess of minimum requirements</td>
<td>May share up to 50% of required spaces if certain conditions are met</td>
<td>Allowed in mixed use developments based on ULI methodology; Allowable reductions: Retail/Service 15%; Food/Beverage: 15%; General Offices and Financial Institutions 5%</td>
<td>Allowed in cases as prescribed in ULI for uses with complimentary peak hours and or seasons</td>
<td>Up to 100% of parking requirements per approval of Planning and Zoning Director</td>
<td>Upon approval of Zoning Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demand Analysis
## Park Avenue Demand Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Uses Within Park Avenue</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Winter Park Current Minimum Parking Standards</th>
<th>Observed Demand per 2013 Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weekday Daytime</td>
<td>Weekday Evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>275,569</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant - Fine Dining*</td>
<td>34,705</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant - Family**</td>
<td>8,449</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant - Casual**</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office***</td>
<td>223,848</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos****</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>dwelling units</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments****</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>dwelling units</td>
<td>273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Visitors</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>dwelling units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel****</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>rooms</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2983</td>
<td>2054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of current required spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Park Avenue Demand Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Uses Within Park Avenue</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Winter Park Current Minimum Parking Standards</th>
<th>ULI Shared Use</th>
<th>Peer Communities - CBD/Downtown Districts</th>
<th>Peer Average</th>
<th>Peer CBD Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>275,569</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>Winter Park Current Minimum Parking Standards</td>
<td>ULI Shared Use</td>
<td>Peer Communities - CBD/Downtown Districts</td>
<td>Peer Average</td>
<td>Peer CBD Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant - Fine Dining</td>
<td>34,705</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>1102 992 838</td>
<td>551 964 551</td>
<td>Delray Beach, FL</td>
<td>87 87 87</td>
<td>1047 758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant - Family</td>
<td>8,449</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>347 535 826</td>
<td>69 95 416</td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant, SC</td>
<td>87 87 87</td>
<td>351 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant - Casual</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17 23 101</td>
<td>St. Armand's (Sarasota), FL</td>
<td>21 21 21</td>
<td>86 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>223,848</td>
<td>square feet</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6 8 37</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 31 31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condos</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>dwelling units</td>
<td>223 109 159</td>
<td>89 134 178</td>
<td></td>
<td>31 31 31</td>
<td>12 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>dwelling units</td>
<td>273 115 159</td>
<td>109 164 218</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 28 28</td>
<td>174 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Visitors</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>dwelling units</td>
<td>0 3 16</td>
<td>0 0 99</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>rooms</td>
<td>28 16 15</td>
<td>56 77 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 28 28</td>
<td>28 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking Spaces</td>
<td>3983</td>
<td></td>
<td>2662 2048</td>
<td>1345 2081</td>
<td></td>
<td>2388 1833</td>
<td>2748 2525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of current required spaces</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>89% 69%</td>
<td>45% 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80% 61%</td>
<td>92% 85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Davidson, NC Minimum
- Davidson, NC Average
- Delray Beach, FL
- Highland Park, IL
- Mt. Pleasant, SC
- St. Armand's (Sarasota), FL
What did we learn?
What did we learn?

- Winter Park is on track in some areas, and “overparked” in others.

- Some codes are needlessly complicated – Keep the rewrite simple.

- Even the peer city with the most suburban parking code (Mt. Pleasant) has lower parking minimums than Winter Park.

- The ULI methodology is likely a good place to start when developing a shared parking policy.

- Parking in the central business district should not be treated the same as in suburban areas.
Introduction

Project Background

In 2017, the City of Winter Park commissioned a downtown parking strategy in response to growing community concerns regarding the parking situation in the Park Avenue district. The resulting strategy identified nine recommendations that addressed three underlying concerns:

- A lack of prime parking turnover
- Under-utilization of existing parking resources
- A need to modernize the city’s parking policies and practices to better align with community expectations and prepare for the future.

Though that study focused exclusively on the Park Avenue area, it also recognized the immediate need to update Winter Park’s overall parking code to a context-sensitive approach. In 2018, Winter Park began the process of reviewing and updating its parking requirements in the Park Avenue, Hannibal Square, and Orange Avenue neighborhoods. The community identified these as areas requiring special considerations and indicated that the parking codes in these areas should be uniquely tailored to allow for continued vibrancy.

What is context-sensitive parking?

Most municipal parking codes apply the same standards across the entire city. A context-sensitive code recognizes that some areas have different needs and expectations based on the form and scale of development and mix of uses. Winter Park’s context-sensitive parking policy update allows the city’s development code and practices to reflect the unique conditions of these three neighborhoods and leverage innovative solutions to promote mobility, access, and community vibrancy.

In short, Winter Park’s context-sensitive solution:

- Aligns parking requirements with community goals and localizes parking codes to reflect Winter Park’s development conditions
- Acknowledges the market’s natural tendency to share parking facilities when complimentary uses are located nearby, and provides incentives to maximize underutilized space
- Takes a data-driven approach to parking requirements and revises policies to reflect current walking tolerances within the community
- Creates flexible requirements that meet the needs of the community and development

Process

The development of these recommendations included eight months of quantitative data analysis and conversations with community leaders and stakeholders. An initial diagnostic phase included a review of six peer cities and national best management practices. This review helped identify disconnects between Winter Park’s current code and real estate practices, demographic trends, and travel patterns. The study team also conducted a high-level demand analysis, which indicated the requirements written decades ago are likely outdated in the current environment.

Additionally, community input throughout the process indicated that Winter Park is a unique environment with a desire to move away from a one-size-fits-all parking policy toward a more tailored approach.

During the analysis and conversations with the community, four key principles surfaced:

- Keep the requirements simple and predictable
- Update parking requirements to reflect modern demand rates based on location, proximity to transit, ability to share parking resources, and walkability
- Rely on national best practices and peer cities to ensure Winter Park remains competitive and in-line with the current market trends
- Plan for the future and allow for flexibility through innovative mobility solutions

The recommendations detailed in this document were developed based on these principles, finalized in consultation with Winter Park staff and community leaders, and are tailored to fit the local context.

Peer Cities Code Evaluation

To explore how similar places are managing parking demand, six peer cities were selected in consultation with Winter Park staff:

- Delray Beach, FL
- St. Armands, Sarasota, FL
- Davidson, NC
- Asheville, NC
- Mt. Pleasant, SC
- Highland Park, IL

The study team reviewed parking codes of these peer cities to compare their minimum requirements by use, reductions, shared parking, and exemptions with Winter Park’s current parking code.

What did we learn?

- Keep the code simple; some codes are needlessly complicated
- Winter Park is on track in some areas and “overparked” in others
- Winter Park has higher parking minimums than the peer city with the most suburban parking code
- The Urban Land Institute (ULI) methodology is a place to start for shared parking practices
- Parking in the downtown core should be treated differently than in suburban areas
Recommendations

The recommendations listed below are intended to be implemented in tandem for maximum benefit. The actions build on each other to jointly address a variety of challenges and opportunities. While some of the actions are more appropriate than others for certain areas of the city, as noted in the table below, and on the following pages of the report, they all have merit as part of a comprehensive code update. Certain actions are recommended as short-term immediate modifications to the city code, while others are intended as long-term policy modifications to consider as conditions change.

Short-Term Strategies

Modification of the Retail-to-Restaurant Conversion Variance

In its current iteration, city code allows for a property in the Park Avenue area to convert from retail to restaurant without requiring additional parking. While this variance has created a vibrant restaurant district, it also has created increased parking demand. It is recommended that the existing variance for the waiving of parking requirements for retail to restaurant conversions be modified to reduce the potentially harmful impacts of future conversions. This would require all future developers to adhere to the Winter Park’s parking requirements according to their use and will lead to a more diverse tenant mix by removing a competitive advantage for restaurants. This action should only be completed in tandem with updating the minimum parking requirements and shared parking guidance.

Fee-in-Lieu of Parking

A fee-in-lieu of parking allows developers to pay a set fee per space if they choose not to provide a portion of the required on-site parking spaces. This fee, which will be set by Winter Park based on a number of factors, would provide future parking and other transportation enhancements within the district where the funds were collected. Implementing this element would help to boost alternative transportation modes and ensure funding for future parking when demand arises.

Modernized Shared Parking Guidance

Shared parking is a method by which multiple uses with different peak hours (e.g., an office and a restaurant) use the same parking facility. Sharing parking resources is an efficient use of land and leads to better community design by requiring less space for parking. While some shared parking provisions exist within the current code, they are not being leveraged effectively due to the rigidity of the requirements. For shared parking to become effective, the parking code must be amended to:

- Expand the parking radius to allow off-site parking to occur within one-quarter mile or a reasonable walking distance (current standard is 300 feet)
- Require those utilizing off-site parking to meet their parking requirements to acquire a signed agreement leasing the spaces for 10 years
- Adopt the ULI protocol to calculate the correct number of spaces that can be shared between uses

Updated Minimum Parking Requirements

The current code utilizes a parking minimum set in the 1970s. The community has changed since then, with new travel patterns, mobility options, and expectations. The current parking minimums were not written for a world with ridesharing services, SunRail, and the movement toward walkable communities. In addition, modern parking codes are based on a larger pool of data and are more likely to reflect modern demand patterns. Winter Park’s minimum parking requirements should be updated to be on par with peer communities. This will help the city competitive for new development, ensure the community remains vibrant and walkable, and reduce the time and administrative cost associated with processing parking variances.

Captive Demand Reductions

Often, mixed-use sites require less parking because some demand for each use is generated by the occupants of other on-site uses. For example, a restaurant that shares space with an office will presumably require less parking because some of its patrons will walk from within the same building. Winter Park should allow such complimentary uses to reduce the minimum parking requirement of the secondary use by up to 10% to account for the captive demand.

Note: Captive demand reductions are recommended as a short-term strategy in the Orange Avenue area and as a long-term consideration in Park Avenue and Hannibal Square.

Adaptive Reuse Incentives

To preserve Winter Park’s historic architecture and existing buildings, new businesses on Orange Avenue that make use of existing spaces should be partially or totally exempt from the requirement to provide additional parking. This variance would be based on the model provided in the Park Avenue and Hannibal Square areas, which incentivizes redevelopment of those spaces. Implementing this change also acknowledges the fact that much of the demand within the corridor is likely to come from new mixed-use developments within walking distance.

Long-Term Considerations

Employer Travel Demand Management (TDM) Policies

Parking is not only about providing adequate supply, but also about managing demand. Partnering with local employers to offer incentives for non-automotive transportation can be a cost-effective way to manage parking demand and congestion while improving mobility. Other strategies, such as alternative work schedules, may also be utilized.

Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Reductions

As transit ridership and opportunities increase, developments within walking distance of premium transit stations (such as SunRail) should have parking reductions applied to encourage the use of transit, biking, or walking.

Parking Maximums

Instead of regulating parking spaces based on a minimum number of parking spaces that must be built, parking maximums establish thresholds that limit the number of spaces that can be built with new development, allowing the market to determine the correct amount of parking.
Park Avenue

The Park Avenue district is the traditional downtown of Winter Park. This thriving commercial core at the center of the community features predominantly retail and restaurants. Community concern over parking challenges has grown as the area has become more popular. Off-street parking is provided via public and private garages and surface lots, though these facilities are unevenly utilized. A major goal in this area is to encourage the proper utilization of these existing resources before building additional public or private parking.

**Goals:**

1. Right-size parking supply by modifying variance and modernizing requirements.
2. Leverage shared and centralized parking assets to support a vibrant district.
3. Allow for more intentional shared parking between uses to encourage walkability.
4. Create a centralized managed system through in-lieu fees and city-provided shared parking and transportation assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modification of the Retail-to-Restaurant Conversion Variance</td>
<td>Modifies the existing variance in the current city code that waives the parking requirements when a retail space is converted to restaurant use. While this variance has created a vibrant restaurant district, it has also created a potential parking problem.</td>
<td>Right-sizes parking supply and minimize potential conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee-in-Lieu of Parking</td>
<td>A set fee per space that a developer can opt to pay rather than provide the required amount of on-site parking. This fee supports future parking and other transportation enhancements that help accommodate community growth.</td>
<td>Boosts the use of alternative transportation modes by dedicating money for mobility enhancements. In addition, ensures funding for future parking when demand arises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernized Shared Parking Guidance</td>
<td>Updates the criteria for implementing, operating, and managing shared parking agreements, including public and private sector assets. There is currently little to no shared parking within the Park Avenue area.</td>
<td>Leverages all available spaces in both the public and private sector, while promoting a more walkable dynamic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Minimum Parking Requirements</td>
<td>Revises the outdated minimum parking requirements outlined in the current code, which were established decades ago, to reflect modern travel patterns.</td>
<td>Off-street parking requirements would more closely match actual demand patterns and serve to right-size parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captive Demand Reduction</td>
<td>Allows complimentary uses to share parking as some of the demand is generated by other uses. Reducing the minimum parking requirement for the secondary use by up to 10% will account for this captive demand.</td>
<td>Reduces redundant trips in demand calculations by accounting for a more accurate usage of space in mixed-use developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer TDM Policies</td>
<td>Provides guidelines for employers to help manage demand for parking spaces, such as offering incentives for non-automotive transportation.</td>
<td>Reduces reliance on single-occupant vehicle trips and promotes alternative methods of access into the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Reductions</td>
<td>Establishes boundaries around transit stations where minimum parking requirements would be reduced to encourage the use of alternative transportation modes.</td>
<td>Leverages SunRail and other future premium transit options to promote diverse access options and reduce the incentive to drive alone and park in the district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Park Avenue

Current Context

Shown above is an example of a typical retail-to-restaurant conversion on Park Avenue. Under the current code, restaurants converted from previous retail uses require no additional parking to be built. Outside of the variance, restaurants in this area are required to provide parking at a rate of 1 space per 4 restaurant seats.

Under these conditions, excess parking demand is accommodated in public on-street and off-street spaces, without any formal agreements or payments from the property owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Type</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>C-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Size</td>
<td>3,000 sq ft/approx. 140 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Parking</td>
<td>0 spaces required per retail-to-restaurant conversion variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Considerations</td>
<td>Retail to restaurant conversion. In parking exclusionary zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Context

With the proposed changes to the parking code, this type of development brings new possibilities and benefits to the corridor. If the retail-to-restaurant conversion variance is modified, this development likely would be required to provide some level of parking, rather than rely solely on publicly available facilities. Based on peer averages, a restaurant of this size typically would require 16 parking spaces.

The developer may choose to build those spaces on site or enter into an agreement to lease those spaces in a nearby facility, based on the provisions of shared use parking guidance.

The fee-in-lieu provision could provide the surrounding benefits district with funding to support future parking spaces, transportation alternatives, and demand management programs.

Overlay Code Options

| Modification of the retail-to-restaurant conversion variance | Some level of parking would be required when this variance is modified. Without the variance, this restaurant would have been required to build approximately 35 spaces. |
| Fee-in-lieu of Parking | If developer chooses not to provide all required spaces, Winter Park receives a set fee per space toward transportation improvements and alternative parking options. |
| Modernized Shared Parking Guidance | Development may choose to lease space in one of two public parking options within reasonable walking distance (shown above). |
| Updated Minimum Parking Requirements | Following Peer Average parking rates, this development would require 16 spaces. |

Details

Development Type: Restaurant
Zoning: C-2
Lot Size: N/A
Building Size: 3,000 sq ft/approx. 140 seats
Current Parking Requirements: 0 spaces required per retail-to-restaurant conversion variance
Special Considerations: Retail to restaurant conversion. In parking exclusionary zone.

Proposed Context

With the proposed changes to the parking code, this type of development brings new possibilities and benefits to the corridor. If the retail-to-restaurant conversion variance is modified, this development likely would be required to provide some level of parking, rather than rely solely on publicly available facilities. Based on peer averages, a restaurant of this size typically would require 16 parking spaces.

The developer may choose to build those spaces on site or enter into an agreement to lease those spaces in a nearby facility, based on the provisions of shared use parking guidance.

The fee-in-lieu provision could provide the surrounding benefits district with funding to support future parking spaces, transportation alternatives, and demand management programs.
Hannibal Square

Hannibal Square is a mixed-use district to the west of Park Avenue. This historic area has been revitalized in recent years and now is home to many thriving restaurants, retail shops, offices and services. Parking is less constrained in this area than the Park Avenue area and demand is unevenly distributed throughout the area’s public and private parking facilities. As new development occurs, one goal for this area is to ensure that parking requirements are in line with current demand patterns and that the area remains vibrant and walkable by appropriately allocating space for parking and active uses.

**Goals:**

1. Promote shared use parking in walkable environment.
2. Leverage existing and future parking assets.
3. Recognize and support walkable environment through reduced parking minimums and shared parking.
4. Create a system for managing centralized parking through in-lieu fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee-in-Lieu of Parking</td>
<td>A set fee per space that a developer can opt to pay rather than provide the required amount of on-site parking. This fee is designated to support future parking and other transportation enhancements that help accommodate community growth.</td>
<td>Boosts the use of alternative transportation modes by dedicating money for mobility enhancements. In addition, ensures funding for future parking when demand arises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernized Shared Parking Guidance</td>
<td>Updates the criteria for implementing, operating, and managing shared parking agreements, including public and private sector assets.</td>
<td>Leverages all available spaces in both the public and private sector, while promoting a more walkable dynamic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Minimum Parking Requirements</td>
<td>Revises the outdated minimum parking requirements outlined in the current code, which were established decades ago, to reflect modern travel patterns.</td>
<td>Off-street parking requirements would more closely match actual demand patterns and serve to right-size parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captive Demand Reduction</td>
<td>Allows complimentary uses to share parking as some of the demand is generated by other uses. Reducing the minimum parking requirement for the secondary use by up to 10% will account for this captive demand.</td>
<td>Reduces redundant trips in demand calculations by accounting for a more accurate usage of space in mixed-use developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Reductions</td>
<td>Establishes boundaries around transit stations where minimum parking requirements would be reduced to encourage the use of alternative transportation modes.</td>
<td>Leverages SunRail and other future premium transit options to promote diverse access options and reduce the incentive to drive alone and park in the district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hannibal Square

Current Context

Shown above is an example of a mixed use development in the Hannibal Square area, combining ground floor retail and second floor office. Under Winter Park’s current code, the two uses are treated independently, even with the likelihood that much of the retail demand will come from the office above. As proposed, the building has more than 90 parking spaces, requiring the developer to go underground to meet the requirements on-site.

Even though a substantial amount of parking is available in the surrounding neighborhood, it is not regarded as an option to meet this development’s need due to insufficiencies in the current code.

Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Type</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>C-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>34,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Size</td>
<td>24,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Parking Requirements</td>
<td>96 spaces required (1 per 250 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Considerations</td>
<td>Provided underground parking to meet requirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Context

The proposed changes to the parking code in this area allows for future developments to take advantage of reduced parking requirements and nearby parking availability to create a more vibrant, walkable district.

Based on peer averages, the parking requirement for this example development could be reduced by nearly 30 spaces. That reduction likely eliminates the developer’s need to provide costly underground parking, drastically lowering developer costs. New shared use guidance that allows for shared parking facilities within a walkable distance also could take advantage of the many underutilized parking facilities within 1,000 feet of the development, rather than building additional space.

Finally, a fee-in-lieu provision could provide the surrounding benefits district with funding to support future parking spaces, transportation alternatives, and demand management programs.

Overlay Code Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlay Code Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee-in-lieu of Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If developer chooses not to provide all required spaces, Winter Park receives a set fee per space toward transportation improvements and alternative parking options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernized Shared Parking Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development may choose to lease space in one of many public parking options within reasonable walking distance (shown above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Minimum Parking Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following peer average parking rates, this development would require 65 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Orange Avenue

Orange Avenue is a quickly growing area of Winter Park with increased development interest. There is a need now to clarify the community’s expectations and desires for the corridor’s future. Refining parking requirements in this corridor can help ensure future development reflects quality urban design and community vibrancy principles.

Goals:
1. Promote mixed-use walkable development.
2. Create and support shared parking program.
3. Incentivize adaptive re-use of existing historic infrastructure.
4. Support managed system of parking and transportation through in lieu fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee-in-Lieu of Parking</td>
<td>A set fee per space that a developer can opt to pay rather than provide the required mount of on-site parking. This fee is designated to support future parking and other transportation enhancements that help accommodate community growth.</td>
<td>Boosts the use of alternative transportation modes by dedicating money for mobility enhancements. In addition, ensures funding for future parking when demand arises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernized Shared Parking Guidance</td>
<td>Criteria for implementing, operating, and managing shared parking agreements, including public and private sector assets, should be modernized.</td>
<td>Leverages all available spaces in both the public and private sector, while promoting a more walkable dynamic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Minimum Parking Requirements</td>
<td>Updates the criteria for implementing, operating, and managing shared parking agreements, including public and private sector assets.</td>
<td>Off-street parking requirements would more closely match actual demand patterns and serve to right-size parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captive Demand Reduction</td>
<td>Allows complimentary uses to share parking as some of the demand is generated by other uses. Reducing the minimum parking requirement for the secondary use by up to 10% will account for this captive demand.</td>
<td>Reduces redundant trips in demand calculations by accounting for a more accurate usage of space in mixed-use developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Reuse Incentives</td>
<td>Provides a total or partial exemption from the minimum parking requirement to developments on Orange Avenue that make use of existing structures.</td>
<td>Promotes the redevelopment of existing buildings and prioritizes a walkable, vibrant corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer TDM Policies</td>
<td>Provides guidelines for employers to help manage demand for parking spaces, such as offering incentives for non-automotive transportation.</td>
<td>Reduces reliance on single occupant vehicle trips and promotes alternative access into the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Maximums</td>
<td>Established maximum thresholds that limit the number of spaces that can be built with new development.</td>
<td>Makes more space available for development or active use and makes accessing the corridor via alternative transportation modes increasingly common.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Orange Avenue

Current Context

Shown above is an example of an adaptive re-use development in the Orange Avenue corridor. This mixed-use building includes a coffee shop, brewery, cafe and salon, with a reduction in the traditional parking minimum requirement based on the parking tenant mix. Some off-site parking is utilized during peak periods based on an agreement.

This development is an example of the type of adaptive reuse that should be incentivized throughout the corridor to preserve existing buildings.

Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>Retail/Restaurant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>C-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>29,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Size</td>
<td>12,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Parking Requirements</td>
<td>41 spaces required (Retail: 1 per 250 sq ft; Restaurant: 1 per 3 seats)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Considerations</td>
<td>Adaptive reuse that was renovated into a multi-tenant, mixed-used building. Shared parking is utilized due to hours of operation for tenant mix. Offsite parking is utilized at night when both primary and secondary use are open.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Context

The proposed changes include several ways to ensure that future development in the Orange Avenue corridor prioritizes walkability, quality urban design, and integration with the surrounding community.

If an adaptive reuse incentive variance is applied, a development like the one pictured above would not be required to provide additional parking, lowering the barriers to redevelop some of the older buildings along the corridor.

Based on peer averages, it is reasonable that parking requirements for the development above could be reduced by 15 spaces, providing additional activated space to connect to the surrounding neighborhood. Additionally, a fee-in-lieu provision could provide funding to support future parking spaces, transportation alternatives, and demand management programs.

Overlay Code Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee-in-lieu of Parking</th>
<th>Development may choose to lease space in public or private parking options within reasonable walking distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modernized Shared Parking Guidance</td>
<td>Following peer average parking rates, this development would require 33 spaces (shown above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captive Demand Reductions</td>
<td>Requirements may be reduced based on assumption that some patrons will visit both uses within the same development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Reuse Incentives</td>
<td>Future redevelopment projects within the corridor may be exempt from building additional parking, even if minimum requirements call for more spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on peer averages, it is reasonable that parking requirements for the development above could be reduced by 15 spaces, providing additional activated space to connect to the surrounding neighborhood. Additionally, a fee-in-lieu provision could provide funding to support future parking spaces, transportation alternatives, and demand management programs.
The Planning Dept. is recommending adoption of an Ordinance to update and modernize the City’s parking regulations pursuant to the Kimley-Horn studies and recommendations. This August 7th meeting, we will treat this as a discussion item and ask the P&Z Board for a formal vote at your next meeting on September 11th.

As P&Z is aware, the City retained Kimley-Horn to examine our parking regulations that have not been substantially changed since the 1970’s. Their work involved research on six “peer” communities similar to Winter Park by analyzing their parking codes and requirements and also by bringing the consultant’s knowledge of parking regulation nation-wide. The primary focus of their work was on the appropriate parking codes for the Central Business District (CBD), the Hannibal Square Neighborhood Commercial District (HSNCD) and the Orange Avenue corridor.

The Kimley-Horn team met with the P&Z Board for work sessions on January 30, 2018, March 27, 2018 and April 24, 2018 to review their work as it progressed. The Kimley-Horn team also presented the data collected and observations for Code updates to the City Commission on April 23, 2018. In addition, a community forum was held on July 17th with 41 attendees at the Welcome Center, after notice to the 274 property owners within the CBD, the HSNCD and along the Orange Avenue corridor in order to solicit comments on the Kimley-Horn research and recommendations.

A summary of the major changes in the Ordinance are as follows:

1. The Ordinance removes the ability to convert retail/office spaces within the CBD and HSNCD without providing the parking required for the greater parking
needs of the restaurant. As the data at the end of this staff report indicates, within the CBD, there have been 17 retail to restaurant conversions since 2003 that have added a parking demand of 207 spaces. The City is continuing to grow the parking deficit in the CBD with every such conversion. As the City embarks on a potential partnership with Rollins College to add public parking spaces to the CBD, in order to address the parking deficit, it is not advisable to continue to grow the parking deficit via increasing the number of new restaurants in the CBD.

In addition this change is supported by the Comprehensive Plan policy below:

**Policy 1-G-3: Preserve Park Avenue as a Retail Shopping District with Complimentary Restaurant Destinations, Maintaining Existing Future Land Use Map Designations and Zoning & Prohibition of Bars/Nightclubs**

The City shall preserve the primary focus of the Park Avenue Corridor as a retail shopping district with complimentary restaurant destinations. This shall require maintaining within the Park Avenue corridor the existing Future Land Use Map policies governing height and existing vertical zoning regulations and the prohibition on bars/nightclubs. The City should also explore modifications to the zoning regulations that would limit the growth of future new restaurant locations to prevent an oversaturation of the CBD with restaurant space thereby diminishing via the loss of existing retail stores, the primary focus of the CBD as a retail shopping destination.

2. The Ordinance changes the parking requirements for new retail and office floor spaces within the CBD, the HSNCD and along the Orange Avenue corridor from one space per 250 square feet to one space for each 350 square feet. Trips to these locations are multi-destination trips. One comes to shop at more than one store. One combines a visit to an office with shopping or dining. The current code of one space per 250 adequately addresses the parking need for suburban locations. One goes to Publix and then gets back in the car to go elsewhere. These areas are multi-destination for customers/visitors.

3. The Ordinance changes the parking requirements for large office buildings by providing for the current one space for 250 square feet on the first 20,000 square feet and then transitioning to one space for each 350 square feet for the floor area above 20,000 square feet. When you look at the larger office buildings in the City, such as Heritage Park, Commerce National Bank, Seacoast Bank, etc. you see many unused parking spaces every day. The City Code over-parks larger office buildings. This is due to the inefficiency in large office buildings because the percentage of non-employee/non-client space increases as the office building gets larger and the percentage of floor space dedicated to non-employee/client space increases such as space for hallways, restrooms, elevator/stair core, conference rooms, break rooms, etc. in larger office buildings. Kimley Horn believes that the City over-parks office buildings with the one per 250 standard everywhere but our experience in smaller offices is that it works well in those scenarios.
4. The Ordinance provides for the use of the Urban Land Institute’s (ULI) Shared Parking analysis as a reference for determining when shared parking scenarios are applicable. The ULI Shared Parking analysis confirms the type of shared parking usage that we would expect and have seen occur. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noon</th>
<th>7:00 pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some types of shared use make sense. The retail or office building with residential upstairs. Peaks for retail/office during the day. Peak for residential (or hotel) at night. However, the shared parking use that we most frequently are asked about is for restaurants. But restaurants use 90-100% of their parking during the Noon and Evening peak hours so retail/office uses have little to none to share during the day. The real world survey data in their analysis only supports shared use with residential or other institutional uses such as churches.

5. The Ordinance changes the distance permitted for off-site parking from 300 feet to 450 feet. The “peer” communities surveyed by Kimley-Horn allow off-site parking ranging from 600 to 1,300 feet. That seemed too ambitious to staff but another 50 yards for an employee to walk to get to work seems reasonable.

6. The Ordinance provides for the potential future creation of a fee-in-lieu of parking program. Property owners would purchase or fund the needed parking within a city owned parking facility. Note that no such fee-in-lieu program can be established without a specific City Commission approved parking facility for which the funds collected are to be implemented for either surface or structured parking as to both location and cost and the ability to provide the same number of or more parking spaces otherwise needed to be provided on-site by the property owners electing to pay a fee-in-lieu.

**Staff Recommendation is for APPROVAL of the Ordinance.**
HISTORY OF PARKING REGULATIONS IN THE CBD

History of Parking Regulation in the Central Business District (CBD):

Winter Park is much like other cities in Florida and the Nation with respect to the treatment of parking in the downtown Central Business District (CBD). Historically, the philosophy was that the responsibility fell on the Cities to provide the parking necessary for the growth and development of their CBD. Orlando is a good example with its many city owned parking lots and parking garages in their CBD. Winter Park also has several city owned parking lots to supplement on-street parking and has partnered in parking garage projects. Most of the buildings in the Winter Park CBD were built when no private off-street parking was required and to the extent it was provided, that was done voluntarily.

When the Barnett Bank (Bank of America) building was approved in 1969 and built in 1970, both parties realized that a different approach was needed for parking. The City had no more land or money to build the parking needed to support the proposed six-story building. Barnett Bank realized that there would be nowhere for their employees to park, and it would be very difficult to lease office space within the building without private parking. Both parties reached an agreement that the approval was based upon Barnett Bank adding the parking garage to meet required parking which was one space for each 400 square feet of office at that time.

A few years later, the recognition by the City that options for further parking were limited, lead to the change in the Zoning Code in 1974 to codify the current regulations that “new” buildings or “new” floor space to be constructed had to provide “new” parking for that “new” floor space and that “existing” parking could not be utilized. Since almost no property in the CBD has surplus parking to use for new floor space, that has kept the overall size and square footage (and parking demand) of the CBD more or less constant, except for the growth in restaurants. The only real exceptions have been the construction of the Sun Trust Building by Rollins College based upon their associated parking garage and the construction of the Park Place Building by the Morse/Genius Foundation based also upon the associated parking garage.

History of Park Avenue Restaurant Zoning Regulations:

The one major impact upon growth in the parking demand within the CBD has been the evolution in the parking regulation of restaurants along Park Avenue and the growth in the number of such restaurant spaces.

The regulation of restaurants within the Central Business District has undergone an evolution over the last 40 years. Back in the early 1970’s there were only 4 restaurants along Park Avenue. By 1982 that number had grown to 18 restaurants. At that time in 1982, the retail merchants were complaining that these restaurants were hurting the “Avenue” because all of the available parking was being dominated
by the restaurant staff and customers. In response to the outcry by the merchants and other parking concerns, the City Commission established a Downtown Parking Advisory Commission to make recommendations on the parking issues in the downtown. Their recommendation on the zoning issue, which was adopted by the City Commission in early 1983, was to make restaurants a “Conditional Use”. The idea was that new restaurants then could be approved only when they had sufficient parking. Exceptions were made for bakeries, coffee shops, ice cream and dessert shops.

Ten years later in 2003, the Economic Development Advisory Board, largely in response to competition to Park Avenue from the new Winter Park Village, recommended a change to the zoning rules to allow “fine dining” restaurants to be treated as permitted uses versus conditional uses. The definition of “fine dining” restaurants are waiter/waitress table service versus front counter order or self service restaurants.

That change was made because it was felt two circumstances had changed since 1983. One was that the City had seen a reduction in the number of restaurants along Park Avenue. La Belle Verrierre, Two Flights Up in the Colony Building and East India Ice Cream Company had closed and those spaces converted to retail stores. It was estimated that there were 400 less restaurant seats along Park Avenue that at the peak in the 1980's.

The other circumstance was the competition from the Winter Park Village and their array of destination fine dining restaurants. The merchants along Park Avenue believed that attracting new restaurants to Park Avenue would help the retail climate. As a result, most restaurants (except fast food) were made a permitted use and could locate in the CBD without regard to providing any incremental increase in parking needed for the restaurant versus the previous retail store use.

Since 2003, that Zoning Code change has allowed 17 new restaurants to be established in the CBD with a total seat count of 1,471 new seats. (See tables attached) Based on the City’s parking code of one space for each four restaurant seats in the CBD, those 1,471 new restaurant seats equate to 372 parking spaces. However, these 17 new restaurants replaced former retail store locations that had a parking demand as retail stores. The net increase comparing the retail parking code versus the restaurant parking code is a net increase in parking demand of 207 spaces.
## Existing Restaurant Locations in the CBD Prior to Year 2003

- Café De France
- Umi Japanese
- Blu On the Avenue
- 310 Park South
- Park Plaza Gardens
- Pannullo's
- Boca Kitchen
- Park Avenue Pizza
- Powerhouse Café
- Park Avenue Smoothie
- Palmano's
- Al Bacio
- Garp & Fuss
- Briarpatch Restaurant

## Restaurants Approved Via Conditional Use Prior to 2003 Based on Adequate Parking

- Luma on Park
- Starbucks Coffee
- Wine Room
- Panera Bread

## Restaurants After 2003 Code Change Without Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restaurants After 2003 Code Change Without Parking</th>
<th>Seat Count</th>
<th>Parking Required (1 space/4 seats)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosphorus Turkish Cuisine</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prato</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briarpatch Restaurant</td>
<td>70 (70 to 150)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchid Thai Cuisine</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maestro Cucina</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parkview</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rustic Table</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnie’s Coffee Kitchen</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burger Fi</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocina 214</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boi Brazil</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Merce</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braccia Pizzaria</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome’s Flavours</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish 31</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croissant Gourmet Bakery</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,471</strong></td>
<td><strong>372</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Restaurants After 2003 Code Change Without Parking

- Bosphorus Turkish Cuisine                         | 3,750      | 15                                  |
- Prato                                             | 4,271      | 17                                  |
- Laurel                                            | 3,000      | 12                                  |
- Briarpatch Restaurant                             | N/A        | 0                                   |
- Orchid Thai Cuisine                               | 1,100      | 4                                   |
- Maestro Cucina                                    | 1,792      | 7                                   |
- The Parkview                                      | 2,300      | 9                                   |
- The Rustic Table                                  | 2,009      | 8                                   |
- Barnie’s Coffee Kitchen                           | 1,158      | 5                                   |
- Burger Fi                                         | 3,200      | 13                                  |
- Cocina 214                                        | 8,267      | 33                                  |
- Boi Brazil                                        | 2,700      | 11                                  |
- La Merce                                          | 1,690      | 7                                   |
- Braccia Pizzaria                                  | 1,000      | 4                                   |
- Rome’s Flavours                                   | 1,000      | 4                                   |
- Irish 31                                          | 3,000      | 12                                  |
- Croissant Gourmet Bakery                          | 900        | 4                                   |
| **Total:**                                        | **41,137** | **165**                             |

\[ \Delta = 207 \text{ parking spaces} \]
ORDINANCE NO. __________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA AMENDING CHAPTER 58 “LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE”, ARTICLE III, “ZONING REGULATIONS” SUBSECTION 58-86 “OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING REGULATIONS” SO AS TO MODIFY THE RETAIL, OFFICE AND RESTAURANT PARKING REGULATIONS WITHIN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, HANNIBAL SQUARE NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICT AND THE ORANGE AVENUE CORRIDOR; PROVIDING FOR OFF-SITE PARKING OPTIONS; PROVIDING FOR A SHARED USE METHODOLOGY, PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, CODIFICATION, SEVERABILITY, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Florida Legislature has adopted Chapter 163, Florida Statutes which requires all local communities to adopt amendments to their Land Development Codes to implement the growth and development policies of Comprehensive Plans adopted pursuant to Chapter 163, Florida Statutes and Florida Administrative Rules in order to provide appropriate policy guidance for growth and development: and

WHEREAS, the Winter Park City Commission adopted a new Comprehensive Plan on April 24, 2017 via Ordinance 3076-17; and

WHEREAS, the Winter Park Planning and Zoning Board, acting as the designated Local Planning Agency, has reviewed and recommended adoption of proposed amendments to the Zoning Regulations portion of the Land Development Code having held an advertised public hearing on September 11, 2018, and rendered its recommendations to the City Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Winter Park City Commission has reviewed the proposed amendments to the Zoning Regulations portion of the Land Development Code and held advertised public hearings on __________, 2018 and on __________, 2018 and advertised notice of such public hearings via quarter page advertisements in the Orlando Sentinel pursuant the requirements of Chapter 166, Florida Statutes and placed the proposed amendments on the City’s website on ______________, 2018; and.

WHEREAS, the portions of Chapter 58, Land Development Code, Article III, Zoning Regulations that are to be amended and modified as described in each section and amended to read as shown herein where words with single underlined type shall constitute additions to the original text and strike through shall constitute deletions to the original text.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK:
SECTION 1. That Chapter 58 "Land Development Code", Article III "Zoning" of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended and modified within Section 58-86 "Off-street Parking and Loading Regulations", Subsections (a) (1) "Central business district exclusion" and (2) Hannibal square district exclusion” in the “Zoning” Article of the Land Development Code to read as follows:

Sec. 58-86. Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations.

(1) Central business district exclusion. The following described area shall be known as the central business district for the provision of off-street parking spaces, and shall be exempt from furnishing parking facilities, as required by this article. This exemption is made because of the traditional exclusion from providing parking in central business districts and the existing development within the district. Property owners, however, are encouraged to provide off-street parking space whenever possible.

Begin at the intersection of Lyman and New York Avenues, run thence east on Lyman Avenue to Knowles Avenue, thence north on Knowles Avenue to Canton Avenue, thence west on Canton Avenue to New York Avenue, thence south on New York and Lot 1-4, Block 14; Lots 1-4, Block 15, all Block 66; Lots 1-10 and 22, 23, Block 76; and Lots 1-8, Block 77, Town of Winter Park according to the plat thereof recorded in Public Records of Orange County, Florida.

a. The foregoing exclusion shall apply only to existing square footage or floor space. Parking shall be provided as required by this section for any net new building or net new floor space created by redevelopment, new construction, additions, alterations or remodeling or for any change in use requiring additional parking such as an office or retail space conversion to restaurant. Existing parking spaces may be counted to satisfy this requirement only where such existing spaces are in excess of the parking space requirements of this section for any existing floor space.

b. The foregoing exclusion shall not exempt properties within this exclusion area from compliance with subsection “Location of parking lots”, which prohibits the use of remote leased parking to satisfy the parking requirements of any new building or new floor space.

(2) Hannibal Square district exclusion.

a. The following described area shall be known as the Hannibal Square district for the provisions of off-street parking spaces and shall be exempt from furnishing parking spaces and shall be exempt from furnishing parking facilities as required by this article. The Hannibal Square district shall include Lots 5-10, Block 42, Lots 11-13 and the west 50 feet of Lot 14, Block 41, Lots 1-6, Block 54 and Lots 8-10, Block 55, Town of Winter Park according to the plat thereof recorded in Public Records of Orange County, Florida.

b. On properties within this district that have existing buildings, as of January 1, 1998, the foregoing exclusion shall apply only to existing building square foot area. Such existing building square foot area may be renovated, reused and redeveloped even if it involves the demolition and subsequent reconstruction of a same size to the existing building square foot area without providing any off-street parking spaces. However, this exclusion shall not apply to additional building square footage or for any change in use requiring additional parking such as an office or retail space conversion to restaurant. Parking shall be provided, as required by this article, for any increase in building square foot area. Existing parking spaces may be counted to satisfy this requirement only where such existing spaces are in excess of the parking space requirements of this article for any existing building square foot area.
SECTION 2. That Chapter 58 “Land Development Code”, Article III "Zoning" of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended and modified within Section 58-86 “Off-street Parking and Loading Regulations”, Subsection (b) (9), (18) and (22) in the “Zoning” Article of the Land Development Code to read as follows:

(b) Specific requirements for various uses and buildings. Listed below are the minimum parking spaces required for various buildings and uses. When the computation results in a requirement for a fractional space, a fraction of one-half or less shall be disregarded. When the fraction exceeds one-half, one additional off-street parking space will be required. Parking spaces, other than handicapped spaces, shall be nine (9) feet wide by eighteen (18) feet deep. Variances to reduce the size of parking spaces are prohibited.

(9) General business and retail commercial: Within the Central Business District, Hannibal Square Neighborhood Commercial District and along the Orange Avenue Corridor, one parking space for each 350 square feet of gross floor space and within the other areas of the City, one parking space for each 250 square feet of gross floor space in the building.

(18) Office, professional or public buildings: Within the Central Business District, Hannibal Square Neighborhood Commercial District and along the Orange Avenue Corridor, one parking space for each 350 square feet of gross floor space and within the other areas of the City, one parking space for each 250 square feet of gross floor space in the building up to the first 20,000 square feet of floor area, and one space for each 350 square feet of floor space in the building for floor area more than 20,000 square feet in size, or one parking space for each 220 square feet of gross floor space excluding areas of common public use and circulation. In computing the latter requirement the exclusion is to be used for public stairs, elevators, lobbies, arcades and atriums but not for common restrooms, mechanical areas or hallways beyond 20 feet from the lobby area.

(22) Restaurants, food service establishments, nightclubs, taverns or lounges: One parking space for each 50 square feet of floor space for patron use on the premises or one space for every three seats, whichever is greater. However, within the Central Business District, along the Orange Avenue Corridor and within the Hannibal Square Neighborhood Commercial District, the minimum requirement shall be one space for every four seats. Establishments with 12 seats or less shall be classified as retail.

SECTION 3. That Chapter 58 “Land Development Code”, Article III "Zoning" of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended and modified within Section 58-86 “Off-street Parking and Loading Regulations”, Subsection (3) (h) in the “Zoning” Article of the Land Development Code to read as follows:

(3) Design, construction and operation of parking lots and parking garages.

h. Mixed uses and shared parking. In the case of mixed uses and shared parking, the total requirements for off-street parking and loading spaces shall be the sum of the requirements of the various uses computed separately as specified in the off-street parking regulations and off-street loading and unloading regulations of this article. The off-street parking and off-street loading space for one use shall not be considered as providing the required off-street parking and/or off-street loading space for any other use unless specifically approved by the city commission provided for based upon the entire time period of usage and need as supported by the Urban Land Institute’s Methodology for Shared Parking Exclusion report, as may be amended. In any multi-family building or mixed use building or project, that includes residential units, constructed after September 1, 2017, at least one of the required parking spaces provided for each residential unit shall be
dedicated and reserved for each particular residential unit and shall be provided to each residential unit at no additional cost as part of a monthly or other lease term other than as included in the basic lease rate applicable to all other similar units and shall not be an additional cost for purchase over the agreed upon purchase price of the residential unit.

**SECTION 4.** That Chapter 58 “Land Development Code”, Article III "Zoning" of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended and modified within Section 58-86 “Off-street Parking and Loading Regulations”, Subsection (3) (f) in the “Zoning” Article of the Land Development Code to read as follows:

(3) Design, construction and operation of parking lots and parking garages.

f. Location of parking lots. Parking spaces provided pursuant to this section for any new building or building additions or increase in intensity of use, located in the area bounded by Swoope, New York, Fairbanks and Interlachen Avenues shall be on the same property as the principal building or on a remote, properly zoned lot within four hundred fifty (450) three hundred (300) feet that is in the same ownership as the principal building/property and permanently dedicated and recorded as committed to parking uses. For other properties located outside of this area, parking provided pursuant to this section may be located on a remote, properly zoned lot within four hundred fifty (450) three hundred (300) feet of the building, where such parking to be leased is in excess of the parking requirements for that building. Such distance shall be the walking distance measured from the nearest point of the parking lot to the nearest boundary of the lot on which the building is located that such parking lot is required to serve. In the event of new construction, addition, or change in intensity of use of the principal building or property being serviced by the remote parking lot, all existing parking spaces located on such remote lot shall be allocated to the existing building or principal use to meet the minimum requirements of this article, and any additional spaces may then be allocated to that portion of the building or property which is the subject of the new construction, addition, or change in intensity of use.

**SECTION 5.** That Chapter 58 “Land Development Code”, Article III "Zoning" of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended and modified within Section 58-86 “Off-street Parking and Loading Regulations”, by adding a new Subsection (6) “Fee-in lieu of parking” in the “Zoning” Article of the Land Development Code to read as follows:

(6) Fee-in lieu of parking. The City Commission may approve and establish by resolution following public notice and public hearing to affected property owners, fee-in lieu of parking programs for specific areas of the city. Such fee-in-lieu programs shall allow property owners or tenants to pay a fee to the city, as established by the City Commission, which may be a one-time fee-in-lieu or an annual fee-in-lieu of providing private parking for new buildings, building additions or changes in use requiring additional parking. Such fee-in-lieu programs established by the City Commission shall identify a specific City Commission approved shared parking facility for which the funds collected are to implemented or utilized for either surface or structured parking as to both location and cost and the ability to provide the same number of spaces or more parking spaces otherwise needed to be provided on-site by the property owners electing to pay a fee-in-lieu. Such fee-in-lieu fees may also include costs associated with the continual maintenance of such parking facilities. Payment of such a fee-in-lieu does not provide the property owners or tenants, ownership or exclusive use of such parking, nor the ability to sign such spaces as reserved for any particular property or business. Instead the City shall manage such spaces as part of the public parking inventory subject to management of that resource as deemed appropriate by the City.
SECTION 6. SEVERABILITY. If any Section or portion of a Section of this Ordinance proves to be invalid, unlawful, or unconstitutional, it shall not be held to invalidate or impair the validity, force, or effect of any other Section or part of this Ordinance.

SECTION 7. CODIFICATION. It is the intention of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida, and it is hereby ordained that the provisions of this Ordinance shall become and be made a part of the Code of Ordinance of the City of Winter Park, Florida;

SECTION 8. CONFLICTS. All Ordinances or parts of Ordinances in conflict with any of the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION 9. EFFECTIVE DATE. This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its passage and adoption.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida, held in City Hall, Winter Park, on this _____ day of ________________, 2018.

______________________________  Steve Leary, Mayor
ATTEST:
______________________________
City Clerk
WALKSHED ANALYSIS
CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT
City of Winter Park
Florida

LEGEND
Points of Interest
1 City Hall
2 City Lot A
3 Lawrence Center
4 Park Place Garage

- 300' Walkshed
- 450' Walkshed
WALKSHED ANALYSIS
HANNIBAL SQUARE
City of Winter Park
Florida

LEGEND
Points of Interest
1. Hannibal Square Garage

- 300' Walkshed
- 450' Walkshed