



**CITY OF WINTER PARK
Development Review Committee**

**Regular Meeting
City Hall, Commission Chambers**

**October 20, 2016
9:00 a.m.**

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by Planning and Community Director Dori Stone at 9:00 a.m. in the Commission Chambers of City Hall. Voting Members Present: Planning & Community Development Director Dori Stone Assistant City Manager Michelle Del Valle Neuner; Public Works Director Troy Attaway; Assistant Parks and Recreation Director Brenda Moody; Absent: Director of Building George Wiggins; Also Present: City Attorney Dan Langley; Other Staff Present: Planner I Allison McGillis, Traffic Manager Wayne "Butch" Margraf, Donald Marcotte, Kyle Dudgeon, Daniel D'Alessandro Electric Utilities, Ashley Ong Building, Brooks Weiss City Architect, Jeff Briggs, Planning Manager, Deputy Fire Marshall Scott Donovan, David Zusi and Recording Secretary Lisa Smith.

Also Present: Applicant Dan Bellows representing Sydgan Corporation

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Approval of June 15, 2016 and July 20, 2016 meeting minutes

Motion made by Troy Attaway, seconded by Michelle del Valle-Neuner to approve the June 15th and July 20th meeting minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

REQUEST OF SYDGAN CORPORATION TO: MODIFY THE AMENDED AND RESTATED DEVELOPMENT ORDER FOR THE RAVAUDAGE PD DATED NOVEMBER 10, 2014 TO ALLOW PROJECT CREDIT FOR ON-STREET PRIVATE OR PUBLIC PARKING SPACES.

Planner Allison McGillis gave the staff report. She explained that the Sydgan Corporation is requesting to amend the Amended and Restated Development Order for the Ravaudage Planned Development dated November 10, 2014. Specifically:

12. THE FOLLOWING WAIVERS FOR PARKING FACILITIES ARE GRANTED:
 - A. A WAIVER FROM SECTION 38-1230(A) IS GRANTED TO ALLOW FOR ON-STREET PARKING CREDIT AND PARKING AREAS (STRUCTURED PARKING AND SURFACE PARKING/ON-STREET PARKING) MAY BE LOCATED UP TO 350' FROM THE USES THEY SERVE IN LIEU OF PARKING LOCATED WITHIN 150'.
 - B. A WAIVER FROM SECTION 38-1477 IS GRANTED TO ALLOW FOR ON-STREET PARKING CREDIT AND PARKING AREAS (STRUCTURED AND/OR SURFACE PARKING/ON-STREET PARKING) MAY BE LOCATED UP TO 350' FROM THE PRINCIPAL USE ON A SEPARATE LOT OR WITHIN THE RIGHT OF WAY OR PRIVATE STREETS IN LIEU OF PARKING PROVISION ON THE SAME LOT (PRINCIPAL USE) OR WITHIN 300' FROM THE PRINCIPAL ENTRANCE AS MEASURED ALONG THE MOST DIRECT PEDESTRIAN ROUTE.

She explained that the applicant is requesting to count on-street parking within public or private street rights-of-way located up to 350 feet from the building that they serve to count towards the minimum parking requirements. She discussed the provisions of the land development code regarding parking requirements. She noted that the original entitlements that were granted for the Ravaudage PD through Orange County presumed that each development would provide adequate parking on private property within 350 feet of the uses they serve. These entitlements did not include on-street parking within the public right-of-way. In this case the applicant is requesting to utilize on-street parking within the public right-of-way, which is contrary to the policies of both the City and Orange County. Staff feels that this Development Order should not be modified so that additional development can be built without adequate private, off-street parking. Staff recommended denial of the request.

Dan Bellows, the applicant, submitted to support his argument a legal opinion drafted by Attorney Kim Booker. He stated that the development is a PD with a recorded annexation agreement and development order thru Orange County and those two documents together grant him rights that will not be allowed anywhere else in the city. He also submitted an email from Planning Manager Alberto Vargas that discusses the provisions of the county land development code regarding on-street parking. He said that he believes he is entitled to be granted what he's requesting because he has not made the request before and in addition he is paying for it, and because the original development order was approved in Orange County.

The members of the DRC entered into a discussion with the applicant. He responded to questions as to why he didn't request a waiver through Orange County when he applied for the original waivers. The applicant responded that the processes were new to him at the time, and he didn't know to apply for the parking entitlements. Chair Stone stated to the applicant that she would like for him to provide examples of where this has been done in Orange County how it was interpreted. The City Attorney asked how is the parking credit expressed in the memo I calculated. The applicant responded that he did not know. Troy Attaway discussed his concerns regarding if the request is precedent setting, past on-street parking approvals, and if there is a background need for parking that staff needs to be addressed. The applicant and Planning Manager Jeff Briggs responded to his concerns.

Director Stone wanted more information on how Orange County approaches counting public on-street parking towards private parking needs. She requested that the applicant provide more information to support his position with specific examples of where this has been applied in Orange County and supporting interpretations. The applicant was agreeable to the request.

No one wished to speak in favor of or opposition to the request. Public Hearing closed.

Motion made by Dori Sone, seconded by Toy Attaway to table the request. Motion carried unanimously.

REQUEST OF SYDGAN CORPORATION FOR: DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL FOR A FOUR STORY, 97,600 SQUARE FOOT, MIXED USE, SELF STORAGE FACILITY AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF GLENDON PARKWAY AND LEWIS DRIVE WITHIN THE RAVAUDAGE PD.

Chairman Stone stated for the record that the applicant has a right to do a self-storage as a part of the original development order.

Planner Allison McGillis gave an overview of the applicant's request. She explained that the applicant, the Sydgan Corporation, is requesting development plan approval for the 97,600-

square foot, four-story, Tom and Jerry's mixed use, self-storage facility located at the northwest corner of Glendon Parkway and Lewis Drive within the Ravaudage PD. The project consists of 503 self-storage units which total 52,887.5-square feet, 9,242-square feet of retail space, and 10,193-square feet of apartments. The first floor consists of 79 storage units and 11 retail spaces, the second and third floors consists of a total of 170 storage units, and the fourth floor consist of ten (11) apartments and 84 storage units. The applicant is also proposing a pervious paver parking area consisting of 25 parking spaces to the north of the building.

She stated that based on the breakdown of the uses within the project, the project is required to provide 57 parking spaces. The proposed parking area to the north consists of 25 parking spaces that are being utilized for this project, and an additional 32 on-street parallel parking spaces along Glendon Parkway and Lewis Drive are being provided to satisfy the parking requirement. The current Development Order for Ravaudage does not give credit for on-street parking spaces to satisfy minimum parking requirements. Therefore, this approval is contingent upon the Development Order modification to count on-street parking towards parking requirements, otherwise a parking variance of 32 parking spaces is required.

The project includes ten apartment units. Based on the required recreation space for these units (2.5 acres per 1,000 residents), the project will be required to provide 2,525 square feet of recreation space that will need to be constructed prior to a Certificate of Occupancy for the apartment portion of the project. Also, the affordable housing fee of 50 cents per square foot of the apartment square footage applies.

City Architect Brooks Weiss offered the following comments:

The Corner Element

- a. The treatment of the corner, turned at an angle, is good. The corner of Glendon Park Way and Lewis Avenue deserves a special, more demonstrative architectural statement.
- b. Suggest raising the beltline of the Corner Element to the bottom of the 4th Level to provide greater differentiation from the East and South Elevations.
- c. Suggest change of color and/or materials for the Corner Element.

Floor Plans

- a. 1st Floor Plan/Retail shows virtually no articulation. Suggest greater in/out to plan for some minimal interest in the building façade. This is a big blank box that needs more than just a place to start and stop surface paint colors. How about some of the architectural interest and quality seen on West New England Avenue?
- b. 1st Floor Retail Spaces on east side are very small. Suggest making them the same 40' depth as done on the south side.
- c. 1st Floor Entry (North Side Porte Cochere)- Architectural plans and elevations show little of what is intended expression at the Entry to Lobby. We need to see more of design here.
- d. Optional Floor Plans- would like to see what is possible, should habitable use functions (office and/or residential) be inserted where Self Storage is now shown on all four (4) floor plans as future change in building usage.

Roof

- a. Are there any Tenant functional uses planned to the roof?
- b. Is there anything on the roof at the top of the Corner Element? Recreation? Meeting?
- c. Roof expression is too monolithic. Suggest rethink of "Mansard look"- more articulation in the planes of the roof- more in and out, or some additional expression of gables or hips...something with more interest! Allow vertical wall elements to end in roof forms that add to the architecture of the overall building design.

Building Elevations

- a. Awnings or Roof Extensions- Façades could use more interest. Suggest adding awnings or other roof extensions to provide greater interest to facades, especially on South and East Elevations.
- b. Either roof extensions (mentioned above) or other “capping” elements to add more interest to facades.

Glazing

- a. What glazing material(s) will be used on the building facades where Self Storage Units reach the exterior walls?
- b. Glazed “window” openings should appear the same as habitable space.
 - a. Balcony depths are not really usable.
 - b. Again, interplay of the wall planes do not allow for real balconies, just the “surface” expression of a balcony. Again, West New England is far better.
- c. Add awnings or roof extensions to make balconies more useable and better expressed from the street below.

Dan Bellows, the applicant, 425 West New England Avenue, distributed updated project plans to the DRC members. He acknowledged his conversations with the City Architect. He agreed with the comments offered by the City Architect. He walked the members of DRC and the audience through the development plans for that corner. He also stated that he is willing to modify his request to utilize 32 off-site parking spaces at the surface lot on Block H towards his minimum parking requirements for this project.

Chair Stone requested that the applicant needs to provide the DRC with a set of parameters as to what Phase 2 will have and what the allocations are to include entitlements, recreational needs and where those will be addressed prior to submittal of another project in Phase 2. The applicant was agreeable to that.

No one wished to speak concerning the request. Public hearing closed.

Motion made by Troy Attaway, seconded by Michelle Del Valle-Neuner to approve the request. Amendment to the motion offered by Chair Stone as follows: the approval is conditioned on the applicant having continued conversations with the City Architect to enhance the building and work with the Developer’s concepts and the City Architects concepts and also subject to sign-off from Urban Forestry on the landscape plan, that storm water management is addressed appropriately; that the Developer utilizes 32 parking spaces at the surface parking lot on Block H towards this project; the Developer come back with a Phase 2 plan prior to submittal of any more redevelopment projects in Phase 2, and utilize the roof-top terrace towards the recreational space (2,525 square feet is required) or allocate part of the unallocated off-site recreational space towards this requirement. Planning staff is to sign off on the additional recreational need. The amendment was accepted by the maker and seconder of the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Date of next meeting: TBD.

There was no further business. Meeting Adjourned at 10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Smith,
Recording Secretary