



CITY OF WINTER PARK Planning & Zoning Board

**Regular Meeting
City Hall, Commission Chambers**

**March 4, 2014
6:00 p.m.**

MINUTES

Chairman James Johnston called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Commission Chambers of City Hall. Present: James Johnston, Chairman, Randall Slocum, Peter Gottfried, Shelia De Ciccio, Ross Johnston, Tom Sacha, Peter Weldon, and Robert Hahn. Staff: Planning Manager Jeffrey Briggs and Recording Secretary Lisa Smith.

Approval of minutes – February 4, 2014

Motion made by Mr. Sacha, seconded by Mrs. DeCiccio to approve the February 4, 2014, meeting minutes. Motion carried unanimously with a 6-0 vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

REQUEST OF LAKESIDE WINTER PARK LLC TO: AMEND THE CONDITIONAL USE SITE PLAN APPROVAL AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR THE LAKESIDE WINTER PARK PROJECT AT 111 N. ORLANDO AVENUE, ZONED C-3, TO SUBSTITUTE THE 4,500 SQ. FT. RETAIL/OFFICE BUILDING APPROVED IN THE SOUTHEAST PORTION OF THE SITE FOR A 7,000 SQ. FT. MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING AND REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO LOCATE THE ADDITIONAL NEEDED PARKING OFFSITE AT 271 SOUTH ORLANDO AVENUE WHICH IS 487 FEET FROM THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IN LIEU OF THE REQUIRED 300 FEET.

Mr. J. Johnston and Mr. Slocum explained that they would not be participating in the discussion or voting on this item as their firms had done work for the applicant in the past. (Form 8B, Memorandum of Voting Conflict was completed by both and is attached to these minutes).

Planning Manager Jeffrey Briggs gave the staff report and explained that on the January 7th agenda for the P&Z Board, was the request of Lakeside Winter Park LLC (Unicorp USA) to “amend” their conditional use approval for the Lakeside project at 111 N. Orlando Avenue to revise the site plan substituting a 7,000 sq. ft. medical office building for the 4,500 sq. ft. general retail/office building previously approved and requesting a parking variance of 18 spaces. He explained that The Planning Board recommended denial and on January 27th, the City Commission was on the verge of denial when the applicant withdrew the request. He said that in both public hearings, the applicant understood from the discussion, that if off-site parking could be found for employees, then there may be some opportunity for the request to be approved if it were submitted without a parking variance attached. There are two components to this request, the site plan change and the alternative off-site parking arrangement. He noted that everything else stays as originally approved. The Board members were provided with copies of the proposed change to the site plan. He explained that the change from the 4,500 sq. ft. building to the 7,000 sq. ft. building results in the loss of five parking spaces but the circulation around the building is maintained for traffic flow. Public Works/Traffic Engineering has reviewed the revised site plan and it is acceptable to them.

Mr. Briggs reviewed the proposed parking requirements. He said that the two changes to the parking requirements are the switch in uses from general office (one space for each 250 sq. ft.) to the proposed

medical use (one space for each 200 sq. ft.) and the increase in the building size from 4,500 sq. ft. to 7,000 sq. ft. Then we need to factor in the loss of five spaces from the site plan change. That results in the need for 22 more parking spaces. Mr. Briggs explained that in order to solve this shortfall, the applicant has under contract, the small motel property at 271 S. Orlando Avenue; and that he proposes to tear down the motel building and convert the property to an off-site employee parking lot. Per the site plan provided, this property can hold 20-21 parking spaces. (21 shown and 20 labeled). Probably one more space could be added. The variance issue is that our Zoning Code requires off-site parking to be within 300 feet of the main property. This off-site parking lot is 487 feet away. In staff's opinion this is still close enough to be readily used by employees. He noted that the Development Agreement executed for this project will need to be amended (pending approval by the City Attorney) to incorporate the approvals granted and the variance as well as any new conditions of approval such as a binding lot agreement so this off-site property may not be subsequently conveyed without the approval of the City. That work will result from the decision on this request.

Mr. Briggs summarized by saying that the staff, neighbors and P&Z members were justifiably concerned about the previous parking variance. The direction that was verbalized during those meetings was to go and find some off-site parking which the applicant has done. The staff welcomes the demolition of the motel building at 271 S. Orlando and replacement by this parking lot. The property immediately to the north is now being used as an off-site parking lot for employees of the Hillstone restaurant. There is still the distance variance (487 feet versus 300 feet) but staff believes this location is close enough to be usable by employees. Staff recommended approval of the request. Mr. Briggs responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Chuck Witthall, 7940 Via Dellagio Way, represented Unicorp. He provided the Board with details of the parking for the Blue Cross/Blue Shield building. He stated that he also plans to meet with Hillstone to work out a joint parking lot for employees and customers. Mr. Woodall responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Sara Whitaker, 1028 West New Hampshire, represented the Lake Killarney Association. She expressed great concern with the possibility of Lake Killarney parking being utilized instead of the area designated for parking when staff just wants the convenience of closer parking.

No one else wished to speak concerning this issue. Public Hearing closed.

The Board members discussed the parking distance variance and were in agreement that the distance was not prohibitive. However, there were comments related to the look and appearance of this remote parking lot and the need to upgrade the adjacent Hillstone off-site parking area. Mr. Gottfried and Mr. Hahn stressed pedestrian connectivity and the need to make the walk inviting.

Mr. Witthall responded that the long range goal is to acquire other parking in the area and preferably structured parking so that these spaces could be incorporated and then this becomes a developable property. He committed to significant landscaping and buffer walls adjacent to Orlando Avenue.

The Board members further discussed the Development Agreement and the need to modify it to reflect these changing circumstances. Other discussion centered on the type of medical practice and the parking demands for it, the methods of making employees park off-site and aesthetic concerns.

Motion made by Mr. Sacha, seconded by Mrs. De Ciccio to approve the request as recommended by staff. Motion carried unanimously with a 6-0 vote. (Messrs. Johnston and Slocum abstained.)

REQUEST OF DAVID WEEKLY HOMES FOR: APPROVAL OF TWO NEW SINGLE FAMILY HOMES AT 331 AND 341 EAST KINGS WAY.

Planning Manager Jeffrey Briggs presented the staff report and explained that in August 2001, the City of Winter Park granted approval for a lot split to allow the property at 341 East Kings Way to be subdivided or split into two single family lots (331 & 341 E. Kings Way). There were two conditions of approval. One was that the new homes not have front facing garages. The second condition was that the preliminary plans for the two new homes be approved by the Planning and Zoning Board and the City Commission. A copy of the recorded development agreement was provided to the Board members as a part of their packet. He explained that David Weekly Homes has purchased the property and has submitted the attached plans for approval by the City. Notices were sent to the surrounding neighbors along with a copy of the plans to let them know of this public hearing. He said that no issues or concerns have been received from surrounding neighbors. Further, from the staff's perspective, these two homes have been designed to be in keeping with the character of the street. They also are respectful to the adjacent neighbors by placing the two story components of the homes toward the interior of the lots and thus setback further away from the adjacent neighbors both on the sides and the rear than the code would otherwise permit. Also no variances were requested. Staff recommended approval of the request. Mr. Briggs responded to Board member questions and concerns.

The applicant was present to respond to Board member questions and concerns; however, he did not address the Board. No one wished to speak concerning this request. Public Hearing closed.

Motion made by Mr. Sacha, seconded by Mr. R. Johnston to approve two new single-family homes at 331 and 341 East Kings Way. Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.

NEW BUSINESS:

- Approval to advertise Comprehensive Plan amendments for 1st Cycle 2014

Mr. Briggs requested permission to advertise and bring back to the Board at the April meeting the three Comprehensive Plan amendments that were discussed at the work session.

No one wished to speak concerning this item. Public Hearing closed.

Motion made by Mr. Sacha, seconded by Mr. Slocum to allow staff to advertise the Comprehensive plan amendments for the first cycle of 2014. Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.

Mr. Briggs noted that the April meeting is being moved to Tuesday, April 8th versus Tuesday, April 1st. The Board members did not express any objection to the date change.

Date of Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, April 8, 2014 @ 6:00 p.m.

Date of Next Work Session Meeting: Tuesday, March 25, 2014 at 12:00 Noon.

There was no further business. Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Smith
Recording Secretary