



Overlay Steering Committee Minutes

October 30, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

City of Winter Park Commission Chambers
401 S. Park Avenue | Winter Park, Florida

1. Call to Order:

Planning Director and Committee Lead Bronce Stephenson called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. in the Commission Chambers of City Hall. Steering Committee Members Present: Sally Flynn, Sheila De Ciccio, Laura Turner, Ben Ellis, Lamont Garber, Lambrine Macejewski, Michael Dick, Bill Segal and Bill Sullivan. Absent: Jill Hamilton-Buss and Phil Kean. Staff Present: Planning Director Bronce Stephenson; Senior Planner Allison McGillis and Recording Secretary/Clerk Kim Breland.

2. Minutes Approval for October 16th Meeting:

Motion made by Sheila De Ciccio, seconded by Lamont Garber to approve the October 16, 2019 meeting minutes, with amendments. The motion carried unanimously with a 9-0 vote.

Mr. Stephenson began the meeting by reminding the Committee that the November 13th meeting would be held at Mead Botanical Garden. He noted that since the last meeting, Staff had met individually with a number of the Committee members to review the draft language and thanked the members for their time and input.

Committee member Sheila De Ciccio made a request to address the Committee regarding the Progress Point property and asked the Committee members to consider keeping the maximum height for the Progress Point property at three stories and keeping the property as a greenspace. Additional discussion of Progress Point ensued.

Mr. Stephenson moved on to review the Orange Avenue Overlay District timeline. He informed the Committee that the citywide notice had been mailed on November 1st and would arrive in homes by November 4th. He stated that the Committee would be making their final recommendation to the Commission at the November 13th meeting, and provided dates for the recommendation to go before the Planning and Zoning Board and City Commission.

3. Discussion Items:

Text Changes Since Oct. 16 meeting

Mr. Stephenson reiterated that staff had met with a number of Committee members since the October 16th meeting to discuss and receive input on the overlay draft language. He moved on to present the following draft language text changes:

Floor Area Ratio for Parking Structures

Parking structures shall not count towards the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of any property within the Overlay District, as long as the parking spaces are designed to specifically accommodate new residential units or hotel guests, allow for a minimum of ~~50%~~ 75% shared-parking arrangements, provide for multi-property parking collectives, and provides parking spaces 10% above code minimum requirements, and are available to the general public during community events in the Overlay Area or for public events at Mead Botanical Garden.

Mr. Stephenson noted that the original 75% shared-parking requirement was not an achievable number, and 50% was a more appropriate figure. He explained that this meant that parking provided would have to be available for businesses to share that may have different hours of operation. He explained that the requirement would assist in relieving the parking deficit in the area as well as provide parking for new businesses.

Committee member Bill Sullivan asked Mr. Stephenson for the definition of shared parking as it relates to the draft language. Mr. Stephenson explained that an office that builds a parking structure that is only used 40 hours per week could rent out the spaces when they are not being used to other businesses that have different hours of operation, as well as lease excess parking spaces.

Mr. Stephenson explained that the following changes pertained to the reductions in required parking for retail, office and restaurants in the Central Business District, Hannibal Square and the Orange Avenue Area. He noted that the changes had been defined in a recent update to the Land Development Code.

- **General Business And Retail Commercial:** One parking space for each 333 square feet of gross floor space.
- **Office, Professional Or Public Buildings:** One parking space for each 333 square feet of gross floor space.
- **Restaurants, Food Service Establishments, Nightclubs, Taverns Or Lounges:** One space for every four seats.

Required parking may be located within 750 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.

Meaningful Open Space

Mr. Stephenson read the language changes related to meaningful open space:

At a minimum, each property 2 acres in size and above that sees major redevelopment shall provide at least 25% meaningful open space. Open space shall not be simply pervious areas such as retention ponds and parking lot islands or landscape planting areas around building bases. Open space shall be areas that are open and inviting to the public. Open space can include green areas, hardscape areas, semi-pervious areas, balcony or roof areas that are open to the public and other similar-type spaces. The intent is that each of these areas create the opportunity for social interaction, relaxation, recreation and reflection.

Mr. Stephenson explained that the change in the meaningful open space language was “Open space shall not be simply pervious areas such as retention ponds and parking lot islands or landscape planting areas around building bases. Open space shall be areas that are open and inviting to the public.”

Administrative Review

Mr. Stephenson read the changes to the language related to Administrative Review:

Unless cited within this Chapter or another Section of the Winter Park Land Development Code, review of these guidelines and compliance shall be performed at the administrative level. To ensure that the intent of the code is met, each application for a larger project that would utilize

any of the Development Enhancement Menu options shall be reviewed by a Committee Consisting of the following members or their designee:

Planning Director

Parks Director

Public Works Director

City Manager

Sustainability Director

The findings of this body shall be included in any recommendation of the project. Any appeals of the determination of the Committee shall be taken before the City Commission.

Sub Area Standards

The Committee reviewed the Sub Area policies:

Area A

Mr. Stephenson explained that Area A was the main part of the Orange Avenue Overlay that includes the small business owners and discussed requirements that would assist the business owners with the remodeling and redevelopment of their properties.

The Committee discussed the language related for rehabilitating old buildings or buildings that are nearing their end of life in Area A and asked Staff to add this topic to a list of subjects to be revisited and discussed further.

Area B

Mr. Stephenson explained that Area B was related to the properties located on the north side of Fairbanks Avenue, which contains a small strip of commercial properties and a lot to north with single-family homes. He reviewed the requirements for the area.

The Committee discussed the setbacks, stepbacks and maximum height requirements and for Area B and agreed with the draft language.

Area C

Mr. Stephenson explained that Area C was related to Progress Point property and reviewed the draft language for the area.

The Committee discussed the heights limits for this Area, the existing stormwater retention and drainage issues, setback and stepback requirements, and potential impacts any development in this Area would have on Palmetto Avenue.

The Committee talked about the possibility of keeping the height requirement at 3-stories and allowing 4-stories as part of a Conditional Use request. Mr. Stephenson stated that any development of the site would already require a Conditional Use Permit, so it would tough to approach from the Planning side.

Committee member Laura Turner summarized the conversation by stating that the Committee members were in agreement on the requirements for Area C with the exception of the height requirement. She asked that the issue be added to the list of items to be revisited and discussed. She requested that items that result in split opinions from Committee members be reflected for the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Stephenson opened the floor for public comment.

Jennifer Anderson, 1621 Roundelay Lane, Winter Park, FL addressed the Committee. She thanked the Committee for their efforts with the process and stated that she was confused as to why the district would need to have three and four story buildings in order to make the area profitable when there were already a number of profitable businesses in the area at one or two story heights. She asked the Committee to take into consideration more of what the residents and voters wanted versus the business owners.

Committee member Bill Sullivan addressed Mrs. Anderson's concerns explaining that the main reason for the increased height requirement consideration on Progress Point was to pay for the parking garage. Mr. Stephenson agreed with Mr. Sullivan and discussion ensued regarding funding for structured parking and leasable space requirements.

Michelle Heatherly, Demetree Global, 941 West Morse Boulevard, Winter Park FL, addressed the Committee. Ms. Heatherly asked for clarification on draft overlay language related to shared parking percentages, step backs for Area D and clarification for trail widths requirements for the rail trail.

Frank Hamner, 1011 N Wymore Road, Winter Park, FL addressed the Committee. He spoke about landowner needs, return on investment issues and how it has affected the lack of redevelopment in the area. He asked questions regarding setbacks, glass store fronts and parking codes in the draft language. Additionally, Mr. Hamner applauded the Committee for the efforts they've undertaken with the process.

No one else wished to speak. Public comment was closed.

Area D

Mr. Stephenson explained that Area D was related to the Demetree property and reviewed the subarea standards including base floor area ratio, the maximum achievable floor area ratio, setbacks, required development enhancements and density transfer options.

The Committee discussed the number of total units that could potentially be located on each of the properties in Area D, building height restrictions, mixed-use environments for the properties, and variance restrictions. Additionally, the Committee discussed the impact that the development would have on Palmetto Avenue and Harmon Avenue. The discussion also included matching maximum building heights between buildings in areas D and H. The Committee came to a consensus to raise the maximum heights for Area D from six to seven stories.

Area E

Mr. Stephenson explained that Area E along with Area D was an area where the City would like to create a gateway feature into Winter Park.

The Committee discussed the requirements for Area E. The main conversation was related to the former Orchard Supply property. The Committee agreed that having Orchard Supply included in the Overlay was a great opportunity for redevelopment and reuse of the property. The Committee agreed with the draft language for Area E.

Area F

Mr. Stephenson stated that Area F was related to Rollins baseball field. He explained that the property could not be developed into any use other than a sports or recreation facility. The Committee agree with the draft language for Area F.

Area G

Mr. Stephenson stated that Area G is the land adjacent to the former bowling alley property that the City sold. He explained that language for Area G provides protection so that it cannot be redeveloped with any use other than parkland in the future. He explained that this language would allow opportunities to add to Martin Luther King, Jr. Park in the future. He pointed out an option in the development menu that would allow the potential to earn entitlements by donating to specific acquisition of those properties. Mr. Stephenson noted that the CRA recently reserved funds to acquire a portion of Lake Rose, the former sinkhole, which would provide regional stormwater benefit for the area. The Committee discussed and agreed with the draft language for Area G.

Area H

Mr. Stephenson stated that Area H related to existing City parkland which is required to remain City parkland. The Committee discussed and agreed with the draft language for Area H.

Area I

Mr. Stephen stated that Area I was related to the Bank of the Ozarks property and reviewed the requirements for the area. The Committee came to a consensus that the maximum height should be reduced from four stories to three stories. They also discussed the front setback requirements and agreed with the language requirements for Area I.

Area J

Mr. Stephenson stated that Area J related to the Holler Property and reviewed the requirements for the property. He discussed topics related to density transfer options, impacts on Holt Avenue, opportunities for stormwater control and right of way dedications related to the development enhancement requirement.

The Committee discussed issues related to the maximum height requirements, setbacks and stepbacks, and stormwater and drainage for Area J and agreed with the draft language for the area.

Discussion items continued:

Review Concept Drawings

Mr. Stephenson provided concept drawings for the Progress Point and Bank of the Ozark properties based on what the current code would allow on. The Committee reviewed the renderings and discussed massing, scale and square footage of buildings that could potentially be built on the sites at varying floor area ratios. They agreed that 200% floor area ratio was too much for both of the properties.

The Committee revisited and discussed topics related to height maximums for Progress Point, the parking deficit in the district and moving Palmetto Avenue. The consensus of the Committee was that there would be a benefit to moving Palmetto Avenue from its current location and requested that the option to relocate Palmetto Avenue be included in the overlay language.

Committee member Michel Dick noted that he had concerns with three areas of the draft language and would meet with Staff to discuss his feedback. Additionally, he mentioned an issue related to the enchantment menu, and asked for a brief discussion regarding whether the Committee was in agreement that the enhancement menu entitlements should directly reflect the cost of the enhancements. Based on Mr. Dick's concerns, the Committee discussed the entitlement bonus percentages for shade tree planting, onsite food production, and rain water re-use versus the cost of these elements. Mr. Stephenson added that the items needed to have a certain investment return, otherwise there would be no incentive to build the enhancements.

At the close of the meeting, Mr. Stephenson asked the Committee for final thoughts on maximum heights for the Progress Point and Bank of the Ozark properties. The consensus was a three-story maximum on the Bank of the Ozark's property and a four-story maximum on the Progress Point property.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

The next Orange Avenue Overlay Steering Committee will be held, Wednesday, November 13, 2019 at 5:30 p.m. at Mead Botanical Garden.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Breland, Recording Secretary