



Orange Avenue Overlay Steering Committee Minutes

November 13, 2019 at 5:30 p.m.

Mead Botanical Garden
1300 S. Denning Drive | Winter Park, Florida

Call to Order:

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

Minutes Approval for October 16th Meeting:

Motion made by Laura Turner, seconded by Sheila DeCiccio to approve the October 30, 2019 meeting minutes, with amendments. The motion carried unanimously with a 10-0 vote.

Mr. Stephenson began the meeting by reviewing the Orange Avenue Overlay timeline after the Steering Committee meetings are finished, and noted that in addition to the dates reflected, Staff would be having another meeting to provide the public with information on the process and have a booth at the Farmer's Market to answer questions the public may have regarding the Overlay.

Mr. Stephenson stated that the present meeting was the Steering Committee's final meeting and the next step in the process was to take their recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Board on December 3, 2019, and City Commission on January 13, 2020.

Mr. Stephenson reviewed the agenda for the meeting and explained that when the Committee reached item 5 of the agenda, the final draft of the Orange Avenue Overlay district the discussion would be open for any conversation the Committee would like to have. He stated that the Committee had reviewed every section of the code, and could discuss any changes made since the October 30th meeting. He stated that a strikethrough and underlined version of the draft, as well as a clean version, had been provided to the Committee and the public. Lastly, he stated that at the end of the meeting, under action item 7, he would ask the Committee to take a vote on the Overlay Language. The Committee then discussed the procedure for voting on the Overlay language.

Special Presentation:

Mr. Stephenson presented certificates of appreciation to all of the Committee members for their dedication to their community and willingness to participate in the Orange Avenue Steering Committee.

Orange Avenue Overlay Process Video:

Mr. Stephenson presented a video that documented the Orange Avenue Overlay process, "Inside the City".

Following the video, Mr. Stephenson read an excerpt from the Ordinance that created the Orange Avenue Steering Committee and the goal of the Committee:

Orange Avenue Overlay Ordinance:

WHEREAS, in accordance with Chapter 2, Section 2-48(n), City of Winter Park Code of Ordinances, the City Commission hereby creates a temporary eleven (11) member Orange Avenue Overlay Steering Committee for the purpose of evaluating the potential creation of an

Orange Avenue Overlay District and associated changes to the Land Development Code and Comprehensive Plan and making recommendations concerning the same to the City Commission.

Goal of the Steering Committee:

The Steering Committee shall guide code language for the successful implementation of the Orange Avenue Overlay. The language shall incorporate the city's Vision and Comprehensive Plan goals of creating a mixed-use district and a gateway into Winter Park. The language shall enhance the Orange Avenue area identity and experience while increasing safety and mobility. It shall provide enhanced and flexible development standards to create the opportunity for positive and sustainable public and private improvements and redevelopment of the area. The Committee shall make a recommendation of the draft language to the Planning and Zoning Board and City Commission for final approval.

Mr. Stephenson stated that as the Committee reached its final step in the process, it was important to remember the purpose and the goals of the Committee. He noted that the Committee was placemaking for one specific area, and not creating rules for any area outside of the Orange Avenue Overlay area. The goal was to create the next "great place" in Winter Park.

Final Draft of Orange Avenue Overlay District Language

The Committee referenced the strikethrough version of the draft for the discussion (see Appendix A).

Additional Changes Proposed Not in Draft

Mr. Stephenson began the discussion by noting a change made to the draft related to mixed-use which read:

- Make all development/re-development in Subareas C, D, I & J require at least 25% mixed-use, so we don't have any single-user developments that don't create the vibrant, mixed-use area that is desired (located on page 32 of the strikethrough version of the draft).

Committee member Lamont Garber requested that the Committee consider moving the Jewett property from Category A to Category C due to the size of its land area. The Committee had a brief discussion regarding the property and decided to table the discussion until later in the meeting.

The Committee then reviewed the changes made to the draft language referenced in Appendix A. Changes were made to the following sections:

- **Applicability**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
- **Purpose of the Orange Avenue Overlay District**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
- **WINTER PARK COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
- **VISION WINTER PARK**
The Committee reviewed draft language to the draft language to the draft language. No additional changes were made.
- **USES IN THE ORANGE AVE OVERLAY DISTRICT AREA**
 - **Allowed Uses**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
 - **Single-Family Residential**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
 - **Previously Approved Projects or Developments**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.

- **LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
- **ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS**
 - **Building Height & Setbacks/Stepbacks**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
 - **Building Height, Setbacks/Stepbacks & Building Envelope**
The Committee reviewed draft language. There was a brief discussion regarding stepback expectations for the area, building envelope and visual massing. No additional changes were made to the draft language.
 - **Façades**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
 - **Other Notes on the Treatment of Façades**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
 - **Lower Story**
The Committee reviewed draft language. The Committee discussed maximum allowable building height for mechanical equipment. They proposed to add language that would better clarify the maximum allowable building heights and include a definition.
 - **General Requirements**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
- **PARKING**
 - **Parking Walkshed**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
 - **Hotel**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
 - **Restaurants, Food Service Establishments, Nightclubs, Taverns or Lounges**
The Committee reviewed draft language. A brief discussion ensued regarding the requirements for leased parking and the 750-foot walkshed. The Committee decided to change the language on page 23 to “nearest available parking lot or within the nearest parking garage” in relation to the measured walking distance of the parking lot.
 - **Off-Street Parking Design**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
 - **Floor Area Ratio for Parking Design**
The Committee reviewed draft language and discussed parking structure screening treatment options, the process to establish the size of parking structures and the 2% parking space minimum for electric vehicles in parking structures. In addition, it was noted that there was no definition for murals in the draft language. A brief discussion ensued regarding concern that murals could be misinterpreted as signage for parking structures. The Committee recommended a definition for murals be included to the draft language.
- **MEANINGFUL OPEN SPACE**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
- **SIGNAGE**
The Committee reviewed draft language and briefly discussed window sign requirements. No additional changes were made.
- **SIDEWALKS**
The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.
- **CONNECTIVITY**

The Committee reviewed draft language. Discussion ensued regarding challenges with creating a bike path connection for the District area north of Minnesota Avenue along the railroad tracks. The Committee asked that the issue and other solutions for a bike/pedestrian connection be considered when the City updates its transportation plan. No additional changes were made.

- **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW**

The Committee reviewed draft language. The Committee discussed how the administrative review would impact small business owners in Area A. Mr. Stephenson clarified that the administrative review for properties in Area A would be on an “as needed” basis. No additional changes were made.

- **ORANGE AVENUE OVERLAY SUB-AREAS & STANDARDS**

Mr. Stephenson read the language changes related to variances and the Committee went to review the changes to the Orange Avenue Overlay Sub-Areas and Standards.

Area A:

The Committee reviewed draft language and continued to discuss in-depth Mr. Garber’s concerns regarding the Jewett properties and removing the properties from Area A due to the size of their properties. The Committee decided to table the discussion on Jewett properties until the end of the meeting.

Area B:

The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.

Area C:

The Committee reviewed draft language. Committee member Sheila De Ciccio reiterated her opposition to having a four-story maximum height requirement for Progress Point. She expressed concerns related to increased traffic and parking deficit for the area and asked that the four-story height requirement be removed from the language. In-depth discussion continued regarding the future use of the Progress Point site, specifically parking needs for the District and the maximum height requirement for the site. The Committee was reminded that a consensus vote for a four-story maximum allowable height was made at the October 30th meeting. It was noted that the Committee wanted the Planning and Zoning Board and City Commission to be made aware that there was no consensus from the Committee on the future use of the Progress Point property.

Mr. Stephenson noted that language was added to the draft related to the road closure and vacation of the Palmetto Avenue right-of-way in Area C, as discussed at the October 30th meeting. A brief discussion ensued regarding the effect the road closure could have on businesses in Area C, public access and issues related to stormwater and drainage needs for the area.

Area D:

The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.

Area E:

The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.

Area F:

The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.

Area G:

The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.

Area H:

The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.

Area I:

The Committee reviewed draft language. The Committee briefly discussed changing the maximum height requirement to two-stories for the property on Area I. Committee member Bill Sullivan requested the Committee vote on the issue. By a show of hands, the motioned failed.

Area: J

The Committee reviewed draft language; no additional changes were made.

At the conclusion of the Orange Avenue Overlay Sub-Area & Standards review, Mr. Stephenson opened the floor for public comment:

The Committee heard public comment from:

Beth Hall, 516 Sylvan Drive, Winter Park, FL, addressed the Committee. Ms. Hall thanked the Committee for their time and effort with the process. She stated that she hoped the Committee would not give final approval of the Overlay draft as she felt they should be provided with more time and visuals of what the Overlay area would look like. Ms. Hall expressed concerns related to parking garage Floor Area Ratio and density transfer. Lastly, she noted that she felt the highest and best use of Progress Point would be to provide park land for the area, along with drainage, and a parking garage.

Phillip Anderson, 1621 Roundelay Lane, Winter Park, FL, addressed the Committee regarding the Progress Point property. He discussed parking and drainage issues in the area and stated that the City should use the property to benefit the residents of Winter Park by providing a low-density frontage with parking and drainage solutions for the commercial corridor without having to create a four to a five-story building.

Heather Alexander, 711 N. Orange Avenue, Winter Park, FL, addressed the Committee. She stated that she was the Executive Director of the Winter Park Playhouse, which is a 5013C non-profit charitable organization that has served the Winter Park community for over 17 years. Ms. Alexander stated that the Playhouse currently rents space on Orange Avenue in the Overlay District. She explained that while the Playhouse is a huge proponent of the Overlay, she had concerns that the Overlay was geared toward a commercial economic development aspect asked that the Committee ensure that the Arts were a key component in what makes Orange Avenue and the City special. Ms. Alexander added that the rent for at the Playhouse location had become unsustainable and stated that the Playhouse would be looking to move from Orange Avenue within the next two years because of unsustainable rent. Lastly, Ms. Alexander stated that the Playhouse did not want to move from the area, as the District was very special to them.

Jeffrey Blydenburg, 204 Genius Drive, Winter Park, FL, addressed the Committee. He stated he was representing the Winter Park Land Trust and wanted to read a draft statement sent to Planning Director Bronce Stephenson for the record. Mr. Blydenburgh read the following statement, "He stated that the Winter Park Land Trust believes that the plan shows a good concern for green space and park issues. We'd like to put forward these six recommendations:

1. That a park within Area C be constructed by the City as a conditional investment to encourage high-quality development.
2. Ensuring greenspace is required for the development of properties adjacent to Denning Drive. Corridors located contiguous to Denning Drive to reinforce the chance of biking and walking as opposed to the greenspace being located somewhere else and getting credit for it.
3. Designing bikeways and walkways that are part of the development so they connect to the longer-range bikeways and walkways extending to other parts of Winter Park and the City of Orlando.
4. Placing special emphasis on establishing a tree canopy and taking other measures to reduce temperatures something climate (the audio becomes unintelligible, the sentence is incomplete).
5. Seeking new and innovative opportunities to store (the audio becomes unintelligible, the sentence is incomplete)

6. Building a 3-dimensional computer-generated, interactive model so that the public can understand the plan.”

Donna Colado, 327 Beloit Avenue, Winter Park, FL, addressed the Committee and echoed public comments regarding building a computer-generated, interactive model of the area for the public to better understand building height calculations. In addition, she expressed issues related to density transfer and proposed floor area ratio calculations for the District.

Cynthia Hasenau, Executive Director of Mead Botanical Garden, 1300 S Denning Drive, Winter Park, FL addressed the Committee. She stated that the Garden was a non-profit that has partnered with the City and residents of Winter Park in a public/private partnership for almost 15 years. She stated that she was impressed with the thoughtfulness, research, and determination the Committee had put forth to make sure that there were no regrets with the process and appreciated the permanent easement for signage. She spoke about the need for continued greenspace, support of the businesses in the area and noted traffic impacts for the area should be taken into consideration.

Frank Hamner, 405 Balmoral Road, Winter Park, FL, addressed the Committee. Mr. Hamner discussed his experience with the process including attending public input meetings, Steering Committee meetings and the WalkShop. He stated that he was disappointed with public comment at the meeting could misconstrue that the process had not open and transparent to the public. He addressed public comments concerns related to parking garage floor area ratio and greenspace and explained that there had been multiple opportunities for the public to attend meetings so that these concerns could be addressed.

No one else from the public wished to speak. The public comment section was closed.

The Committee continued to discuss the draft language. Committee member Michael Dick stated that he had prepared a list of issues from the previous meeting that he wanted to discuss. His first concern was related to page two of the draft regarding the verbiage related to Vision Winter Park “q. Keep the traditional scale within the majority of the district”. He commented that he was not sure why the verbiage was in the document and stated the Committee had decided to embrace the concept of Vision Winter Park and its objectives. He stated that if the traditional scale was to be kept the majority of the time, it should be kept all of the time and recited the goal of Vision Winter Park.

Committee member Bill Sullivan asked Mr. Dick how he would define traditional scale in the process. In-depth discussion ensued. Topics discussed were traditional scale definition, building height, public input, public perception, issues of property owners in the area, (including drainage and parking), and what the word “majority” meant in relation to the draft language.

Mr. Dick’s next issue was related to public notice requirements on page 20 of the draft language. He expressed concern that eliminating the public notice requirement for certain development in the area, could be viewed in a negative manner by the public.

Mr. Dick made a motion to eliminate the verbiage “q. Keep the traditional scale within the majority of the district” on page 2 from the draft language. The motion failed for a lack of a second.

Mr. Dick made a motion to keep the citywide notice requirement for development within the Orange Avenue Overlay District. Ms. Sally Flynn seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued regarding public notice requirements for the area and what conditions would constitute citywide notice.

Motion failed with an 8-2 vote (Mr. Dick and Ms. Flynn voted in favor of keeping the notice requirement.

When the public notice motion failed, Mr. Stephenson asked the Committee if they would consider a motion to keep public notice requirements for projects that meet the current citywide notice threshold limited to noticing the entire District plus a 1,000-foot radius in order to provide proper notice to the area for larger projects. The consensus of the Committee was to move forward with district-wide public notice plus 1,000 feet for the area.

Mr. Dick's last issue related to Area C, the Progress Point property. He discussed concerns with not having 3D-models for the property and Floor Area Ratio calculations that would show what proposed structures would look like on Progress Point.

Mr. Dick presented images to the Committee of structures in Maitland ("the big 5") that he felt might determine what certain floor area ratios could look like on the Progress Point site. He discussed the floor area ratio and square footages of the properties in Maitland and noted that they did not match the traditional scale for Winter Park. He expressed concern that the three large properties in Orange Avenue Overlay District could be built at the same scale. Mr. Stephenson clarified that none of the structures in the images presented by Mr. Dick could be built per the standards proposed for the District. The Committee discussed at length floor area ratio, building height and mass, meaningful green space requirements and setback and stepback requirements outlined in the draft language. The consensus of the Committee was that the types of structures presented by Mr. Dick did not provide a proper depiction of what types of structures could be developed in the District. Mr. Dick explained that he presented the images as a concern for what he thought could be built on the Holler, Demetree and Progress Point properties, as no models were presented to the Committee of what different scales could look like on those sites.

Mr. Stephenson reminded the Committee of the 3D models presented at the last meeting that showed different scales for the Progress Point and Bank of the Ozark properties, and brought up these images again on the power point presentation to show the Committee. The Committee then discussed and reviewed the images and discussed the square footage, floor area ratio and scale of the properties.

Mr. Stephenson moved on to discuss the changes to the Orange Avenue Overlay District Enhancement Menu in Appendix A. changes were made to the following areas of the menu:

- Sustainability
The Committee reviewed draft language; there was no further discussion.
- Infrastructure & Stormwater
The Committee reviewed the draft language; there was no further discussion.
- Parking
The Committee reviewed the draft language and decided to remove murals from the list of items in Screening of Parking Structures (P.2).
- Connectivity & Transportation
The Committee reviewed draft language to the draft language to the draft language and decided to remove line item for Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge Over 17-92 (CT.1) due to not having enough information for construction on this item and didn't want a future developer to count on this entitlement.
- Meaningful Open Space
The Committee reviewed draft language. Earlier in the meeting, the Committee decided to modify the line item for Open Space Beyond Minimums (OS.1) to increase the percentage per acre to 25%. A brief discussion followed regarding enhancement bonus percentages for Open Space Beyond Minimums (OS.1) and Shade Tree Planting (OS.2), and Mead Garden Improvements (OS.4). No other changes were made.

The Committee moved on to continue the discussion of the Jewett properties. The Committee reviewed a map outlining the location of the Jewett properties and made a request to make the Jewett properties their own Sub Area (K). Mr. Stephenson suggested the Committee consider creating Sub Area K for the Jewett properties subject to the development minimum base and maximum achievable FAR similar to Area E, but at a maximum height of three-stories.

Motion made by Bill Segal seconded by Laura Turner to create Sub Area K for the outlined Jewett properties that would allow them to have the base and maximum Floor Area Ratio outlined in Area E, with a maximum height of three-stories, but would be required to provide the sidewalk along Orange Avenue as required in Area A.

Motion carried unanimously with a 10-0 vote.

Action Item:

Steering Committee Vote on Recommendation of the Orange Avenue Overlay District Draft Language

The Committee moved on to discuss the final recommendation. Mr. Stephenson noted that any recommendation would include a request that the Planning and Zoning Board and City Commission regarding Area C, Progress Point, should hold additional discussion. It was noted that there was no clear consensus from the board related to greenspace, development or maximum height requirements for the site.

Motion made by Laura Turner, seconded by Bill Segal, for the Committee to make a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Board and City Commission to accept the Orange Avenue Overlay District Draft Language as presented and discussed herein, with the creation of Sub Area K for Jewett Properties, 25% mixed-use component and a footnote for Area C (Progress Point) noting that there was no clear decision from the Committee on its future land use.

Motion carried with an 8-2 vote. (Mr. Michael Dick and Mrs. Sheila De Ciccio voted against the recommendation)

The meeting was adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Breland, Recording Secretary