MINUTES

1. Call to order. Chairman Randall Glidden reconvened the meeting at 9:00 a.m.

Present: Chairman Randall Glidden Christie Underwood, Patrick Doyle, Rebecca Talbert, Genean MacKinnon and Billy Wilson, Candace Chemtob. Staff: Sr. Planner Lindsey Hayes and Recording Secretary Lisa Smith.

2. Approval of Minutes:

Motion made by Ms. Talbert, seconded by Mrs. Underwood to approve the October 10, 2012 meeting minutes. A roll call vote was taken and all Board members voted yes. Motion carried unanimously with a 6-0 vote.


COR 13-001 Request of Rollins College on behalf of Holt Properties LLC to demolish the duplex at their property located at 483 Holt Avenue. The property is a contributing resource in the College Quarter Historic District; Zoned R-2. Parcel ID #05-22-30-9400-89-161.

Senior Planner Lindsey Hayes gave the staff report. She used a Power Point presentation that showed the details of the subject property. She explained that the residential property located at 483 Holt Avenue is a contributing historic building in the College Quarter Historic District by virtue of its age and association with the final period of development in the College Quarter. The adjacent vacant commercial property to the west (former Ahik’s Garage site) and north of 483 Holt Avenue is not in the historic district and is currently used as a staging site for campus construction. She provided historical details of the property. The duplex has been vacant for many years. The current owner, Rollins College as Holt Properties LLC, does not plan to activate the duplex as living space and the empty building has attracted vandalism. Rollins is requesting to demolish the duplex with plans to fence the yard and add some landscaping. This would resolve the issues with vandalism and foot traffic cutting across the property. The property would then be maintained in an open park-like condition until Rollins College decides to build a residential unit or sell the lot to someone who could build. She explained that the historic district residents have long been concerned about the vacant commercial property and un-lived in duplex. To allay some longstanding neighborhood concerns, any future use of the lot other than what is permitted in an R-2 district such as a single-family home or duplex would require rezoning. Stormwater retention would only be allowed for permitted district uses; not for adjacent commercial properties. A commercial parking lot is not permitted in R-2. If demolition is approved, any future residential
redevelopment would require approval by the HPB at a public hearing. In addition, the following Comprehensive Plan Policy addresses a concern: She reviewed the comprehensive plan policies in this regard. She said that staff has no objection to approving the demolition subject to HPB review, with a condition that an appropriate fence and landscaping be installed and maintained. The owner should be encouraged to redevelop the property with a residential unit in a timely manner.

Mrs. MacKinnon entered the meeting at 9:20 a.m.

Scott Bitikofer, Facilities Management Director, was present representing Rollins College at 1000 Holt Avenue. He discussed the history and issues relating to the subject property. He explained that the College’s plan is to demolish the existing structure, fence around the perimeter of the property and segregate it from the neighborhood. Mr. Bitikofer responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Nancy Shaw, 479 Holt Avenue, spoke concerning the request. She explained that she has already written two letters to City officials concerning the subject property. She stated that she has no issues with the existing structure on the property. She wanted to go on record as being opposed to the structure being demolished. She said that she is very disturbed that there is no fence, wall or any appropriate barrier. She said that she feels that a masonry wall would be better.

Ken Merbler stated that he is also opposed to demolishing the structure. He expressed frustration in the way the property has been used, and said that he is very concerned that the property could be rezoned and worsen the situation. He said that he feels that would destroy the integrity of the residential neighborhood.

Pam Coutant, 905 Lakeview Drive, stated that she agrees to the comments made by Ms. Shaw. She said that she is opposed to demolishing the structure and agrees with the comments regarding constructing a masonry wall as a more appropriate barrier.

Public hearing closed.

Mrs. Chemtob disclosed that she had been contacted by Ms. Shaw. She explained that at the time, she was not aware of what the issues were concerning the property and that she did drive-by the property.

Mrs. Underwood suggested that if the Board decides to approve the demolition with conditions, that the request be tabled and require the applicant to come back with some options for the Board to consider with regard to fencing (to include details on the type of fencing and a survey showing how it will be erected on the property, setbacks and fill-in for landscaping and a long-term plan for landscape maintenance). Mr. Doyle agreed. Mr. Glidden stated that he is concerned he would like to see some assurance and methods of landscaping. Additionally, maybe a picket type fenced running along the existing fence line and a schedule of demolition and improvements. Mrs. Chemtob majority of the neighbors are not in support of demolishing the building as it provides some form of barrier. She said that she does not see the urgency in tearing the building down when there are no immediate plans for redevelopment. Ms. Talbert agreed with Mrs. Chemtob and said that she was extremely concerned that the structure is not being maintained. She viewed it as a health, safety and welfare issue.

Motion made by Ms. Underwood, seconded by Mr. Doyle to table the request and postpone a decision on the demolition of the existing structure. The applicant was directed to bring back to the Board for
consideration details on the type of fencing and a survey showing how it will be erected on the property, setbacks and fill-in for landscaping and a long-term plan for landscape maintenance. A roll call vote was taken and all Board members voted yes. Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.

- Downtown Historic District Sign Options

Senior Planner Lindsey Hayes explained that the City Commission is interested in a sign package to define the Downtown Historic District. Staff will be recommending a classic plaque type sign executed in a bronze finish on cast aluminum which can be mounted on the existing decorative light poles at the boundaries of the district in most cases. She noted that the Communications Department has created an initial draft. She said that at the November work session the board members present thought that a date on the signs could become a bone of contention; date of Chase and Chapman plating, first property sale, train station construction, incorporation? The city also has the National Register of Historic Places Interlachen Historic District as well as the local College Quarter and Virginia Heights East districts so including the name “Downtown” on the plaques was recommended. She said that based on the comments, two more drafts are presented for HPB review. Further, the designer, Theresa Broman of the City’s Communications Department, pointed out that with option 3, the text “downtown” could more easily be replaced with the name of another district while the peacock logo and text “Historic District” could stay the same. Staff recommendation is for no date and to use “Downtown Historic District” on the plaques. She noted that the signs are a work in progress. She received Board input concerning the options.

4. Other Business – Informational

Ms. Hayes provided the Board members with an update on the Planning and Zoning Commission recommendation regarding Grant Chapel and the renovations to the Winter Park Country Club.

5. Adjournment. There was no further business. The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Smith,
Recording Secretary