The meeting was called to order by Mr. Krecicki at 7:00 p.m. in the Commission Chambers of the Winter Park City Hall.

Present: Chairman Drew Krecicki, Michael Dick, Sarah Whiting and Carolyn Cooper. Vice-Chairman Rick Swisher was absent. Staff: Planning Director Jeffrey Briggs, Director of Building and Code Enforcement George Wiggins, Sr. Planner Stacey Scowden, Planning Technician Caleena Shirley, and Recording Secretary Lisa M. Smith.

SITE PLAN REVIEWS

SPR 7:09 Request of The Allens' for approval of a new 2-story home and pool at 2240 Venetian Way on Howell Creek, zoned R-1AA.

Assistant Planner Stacey Scowden presented the staff report. She reviewed the issues of floor area ratio, impervious coverage, views of the neighbors and the lake, storm water retention and tree preservation. Staff recommended approval. She responded to Board member questions and concerns.

John Gigliotti, represented the applicant and was available to respond to questions and concerns of the Board members. No one else wished to speak concerning the request. Public Hearing closed.

Motion made by Mr. Krecicki, seconded by Mr. Dick to approve the request subject to the following: (1) that staff verify that all impervious surfaces are accounted for prior to permitting; (2) no screen enclosure and (3) staff review final landscape plan prior to permitting. Motion carried unanimously with a 4-0 vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- REQUEST OF THE WINTER PARK TOWERS AT 1111 S. LAKEMONT AVENUE TO AMEND WITHIN CHAPTER 58, LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, ARTICLE I COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FUTURE LAND USE MAP ON 2.74 ACRES INTERNAL TO THE WINTER PARK TOWERS CAMPUS FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL TO HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AND TO AMEND TEXT AND POLICIES WITHIN THE FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW FOUR LEVEL, 383 SPACE PARKING GARAGE AND A NEW FIVE STORY, SIXTY UNIT RESIDENTIAL BUILDING.

- REQUEST OF THE WINTER PARK TOWERS AT 1111 S. LAKEMONT AVENUE TO AMEND WITHIN CHAPTER 58, LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, ARTICLE III, ZONING SO AS TO AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP ON 2.74 ACRES INTERNAL TO THE WINTER PARK TOWERS CAMPUS FROM PLANNED UNIT RESIDENTIAL (PURD) DISTRICT TO MULTI-FAMILY (HIGH DENSITY R-4) DISTRICT TO ALLOW THE
Planning Director Jeffrey Briggs presented the staff report. He explained that the Winter Park Towers located at 1111 South Lakemont Avenue is requesting approval to build a four-level, 383 space parking garage and a five-story, 60 unit residential retirement apartment building. He said that in order to accomplish that building program, in the locations proposed, the Winter Park Towers is requesting four items:

1. Amending the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan on 2.74 acres from low density residential to high density residential to permit rezoning.
2. Amending the Official Zoning Map on the same 2.74 acres from Planned Unit Residential (PURD) district to Multi-Family (high density R-4) district.
3. Amending in the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan, Policy 1-3.8.4 to permit the land use changes as requested above, and
4. Conditional use approval of the specific project for the 383 space, four level parking garage and 60 unit, five story retirement apartment building.

Mr. Briggs presented the history of the request. He said that this project represents the current phase of the Winter Park Towers Master Plan that they wish to pursue. Further, there is one other future phase, shown on their graphics which depicts a future two-story, 16-unit garden apartment building proposed for the western portion of their existing surface parking lot. He noted that the calculations on the proposed size of the parking garage reflect both the need for new parking for those new 16 units as well as the loss of the existing parking when that existing surface parking lot is reconfigured. He provided background information and information relating to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use change/rezoning, the Winter Park Towers Master Plan, a Concurrency Analysis, building height and proximity to Lake Berry, and the Comprehensive Plan Policy text change.

He stated that aside from the specific project requested there are three other issues to address:

1. Traffic Light at Lakemont Avenue: The City has heard frustrations for years from WP Towers residents and visitors about the difficulty and safety of left turns out of and into the WP Towers property. A traffic light has been studied and the major complication is the offset between the WP Towers entrance/exit and Strathaven Road on the opposite side of Lakemont Avenue.
2. Further expansion into Waterbridge: The WP Towers owns 23 attached villa units in the adjacent part of Waterbridge on Melissa Ct., Serena Dr. and Sara Ct. The proposed WP Towers Master Plan needs to have geographical limits to further expansions into Waterbridge which staff would suggest be limited to those three streets now utilized.
3. Further wall screening for Waterbridge: Waterbridge residents have requested additional wall screening both in height and length down toward the lake to better shield their homes from noise (AC compressors/vehicles) and lights. The WP Towers is agreeable to providing additional wall screening.

He explained that the proposed Development Agreement contains the exhibits and representations for the current request, it establishes this approval as comprising an approval of the WP Towers Master Plan (including the future phase of the 16 units subject to conditional use review), it places limits and restrictions upon further density expansions, it limits expansion into Waterbridge to the three streets (Melissa, Serena and Sara) and requires those units to remain on the tax rolls, it requires the further buffer wall screening to Waterbridge as has been discussed and it provides for a cost sharing (2/3rd by the Towers/1/3rd by City) for any future approval of a new traffic light on Lakemont Avenue.
Staff recommended approval subject to a development agreement including one of the two options stated. He detailed the options as follows:

OPTION #1: Approval of the Comp. Plan text/map amendments, rezoning and conceptual plans (as submitted at a 98 foot setback) but limited and restricted to R-3 zoning (which has a three story, 35 foot height limit) and resubmission for conditional use approval of those revised plans.

OPTION #2: Approval of the Comp. Plan text/map amendments, rezoning and conceptual plans (as submitted from the design charrette) but limited and restricted to a four-story, 45-foot height limit) and resubmission for conditional use approval of those revised plans.

He noted that both options allow additional units along northern face to reach 60 unit total.

Rebecca Furman, Lowndes Drostdick, was the attorney representing the Winter Park Towers in this request, introduced the members of her development team. They used a Power Point presentation to provide an overview of the redevelopment proposal. She entered a petition with approximately 168 signatures from Winter Park Towers residents in favor of the project.

The Board members disclosed ex-parte communications that they have had concerning this project.

Both Mr. Krecicki and Mr. Dick inquired whether the lakefront building height could be reduced by shifting some of the units to the future proposed building in the existing parking lot near the south property line as that proposed two story building allows another floor. The applicant stated that wasn’t possible as all the units needed to be built at the same time to provide funding for the parking garage.

The following people addressed the Board concerning the request: James Book represented the First Christian Church, 1140 South Lakemont Avenue, Tommy Cullens, 1274 Serena Drive, Joe Terranova, 700 Melrose Avenue, Art Freeman, 1814 Jill Court, Susan Kuhn, 1842 Jessica Court, Steve Breitbeil 1947 Gunn Road, Michael Smith, BB&T Bank, Frank Shepherd, 1647 Joeline Court, Captain Floyd Petiprin, 1085 Lakemont Court; Allen Gordon, 1261 Sara Court, Joan Cason, 1915 Woodcrest Drive, Sunit Sanghrajka, 1799 Lake Berry Berry Drive, Bernadette Rogers, 1081 Lakemont Court, Jeffrey Blydenburg, 204 Genius Drive, Arlene Freeman, 1814 Jill Court, Paul Hutsko, 1111 South Lakemont Avenue, #432, John Webb, 697 Balmoral Road, Jim Bogner, 1009 Tuscan Place, Douglas Palmer, 1301 College Point, Allen Trevillion, 271 West Horatio Avenue, Maitland, Richard Sturm, 1840 Winchester Drive.

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

Ms. Furman was allowed to provide a summation. She reiterated that a considerable amount of thought has gone into this project for the last three years. She expressed why the project was moved to the interior of the property as well as a Development Agreement, as well as how the project will be staged for minimal disruption. She responded to Board member questions.

The Board discussed the pros/cons of this request at length. Mr. Krecicki stated that he feels that the project is a good balance between the needs of the lakefront residences and the needs of the senior citizens. He said that he is comfortable with the comprehensive plan amendment as requested and also with the 98 foot requested Lake Berry setback. He encouraged the applicants to give the stormwater run-off further consideration. He said that he is very much in favor of including these items in a development agreement.

He stated other items that he wants to be included in the future development agreement. Mrs. Whiting stated her concerns regarding the proposed comprehensive plan text amendment. She stated that she is very much in support of the project and feels that the applicant has done a very good job incorporating previous concerns indicated by the Board and further that the impact on Lakemont will be minimal and that they have made efforts to minimize the impact on Lake Berry. Mr. Dick expressed concern with the proposed setback distance of 98 feet versus 80 feet. He said that he feels that the 80 feet will protect the interior trees and further discussed his concerns with regard to the height of the building facing the lakefront. Mrs. Cooper stated that she feels that the project is necessary and that she supports the parking garage and the addition of the 60 units. Her main
concern was the height of the building on the lakefront and with R-4 zoning on the lake. She expressed her concerns with regard to the installation of a traffic light as well as the comprehensive plan text amendment.

With regard to building height and proximity to Lake Berry, the Board discussed various options. One being the staff and planning commission suggestions of how the residential buildings can be reconfigured at three stories and still comprise the 60 units desired with units built further along the northern side of the parking garage, and another option was to reduce the lakefront building to three stories and again extend the building along the northern side of the parking garage to recoup the lost units. The majority of the Board agreed with the plans submitted by the Winter Park Towers although they recommended reducing the building height by five feet from 55-feet to 50-feet in height.

With regard to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, consensus of the Board was that a zoning change to R-4 was acceptable if it was internal to the large parcel. If there was a transition in density as you moved toward adjacent properties and there was some appropriate separation distance that the R-4 would stay away from other property owners who would be low density (R-2) or single family (R-1A). (Note: The staff and City Attorney will draft the revised policy text to accomplish the Planning Commission’s intended goal.

Motion #1: Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment to Policy 3.1-8.4

Motion made by Mr. Krecicki, seconded by Mr. Dick to approve the comprehensive plan text amendment with specific language to be worked out by the city attorney along the lines as discussed by the planning commission with a greater minimum acreage site requirement and internal location requirement with transition to less density at the perimeter so the R-4 doesn’t negatively affect adjacent properties. Motion carried unanimously with a 4-0 vote.

Motion #2: Comprehensive Plan FLU Map Amendment

Motion made by Mr. Krecicki, seconded by Mr. Dick to approve the Comprehensive Plan future land use map amendment from low density residential to high density residential. Motion carried unanimously with a 4-0 vote.

Motion #3: Rezoning

Motion made by Mr. Krecicki, seconded by Mr. Dick to approve the rezoning request from PURD to R-4 on the 2.74 acres internal to the campus. Motion carried unanimously with a 4-0 vote.

Motion #4: Conditional Use Approval

Motion made by Mr. Krecicki to provide a preliminary approval of the conditional use request as follows: That a development agreement needs to be completed at a future date prior to final approval to include the following:

1. A cap on the WP Towers expansion into Waterbridge. The number and area can be determined later.
2. To review and approve the final master plan which would also place a cap on any future buildings and density.
3. The consideration of the traffic light with staff recommendation of a 2/3 to 1/3 funding split.
4. On the Western perimeter wall where it abuts other Waterbridge neighbors to increase the height or integrity of the wall so that it abates noise from mechanical units, trash, lighting or other service traffic in that location.
5. That the storm water review be done thoroughly.
6. That if any of the existing mature trees along the lakefront are damaged or destroyed either during construction or a period of six months after construction; they will be replaced at their current size.
The motion was amended as follows: Tree replacement is limited to those designated on the tree survey as presented. Compensation is to be determined by the Tree Preservation Board or the City Arborist and, future use of the facility is restricted to elderly housing, nursing or assisted living facility.

Conditional Use – Height of the project

The motion was amended by Mr. Krecicki, seconded by Mrs. Whiting to include as follows: The lakefront building with a 98 foot setback and 5-story 55 foot height along with the suggested developer’s agreement. The motion failed with 2-2 vote. (Mr. Krecicki and Mrs. Whiting voted yes. Mr. Dick and Mrs. Cooper voted no.)

Motion made by Mr. Krecicki, seconded by Mrs. Whiting to amend as follows: for the lakefront building a 98 foot setback and 5 stories but limited to a 50 foot height with roof slope design to be approved with the final conditional use approval at a later date. The motion carried with a 3-1 vote. (Mr. Krecicki, Mrs. Whiting and Mrs. Cooper voted yes. Mr. Dick voted no.)

Chairman Krecicki called a brief recess at 11:00 p.m., and reconvened the meeting at 11:05 p.m. (Note: Mrs. Whiting left the meeting.)

- REQUEST OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK TO AMEND CHAPTER 58 “LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE” ARTICLE III, "ZONING REGULATIONS" SO AS TO ADOPT IN THE R-1AAA LAKEFRONT DISTRICT; IN THE R-1AA AND R-1A DISTRICTS; IN THE PLANNED UNIT RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT “PURD” DISTRICT; IN “GENERAL PROVISIONS,” AND IN DEFINITIONS; NEW SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING AND ACCESSORY BUILDING REGULATIONS AND DEFINITIONS.

Building Official George Wiggins provided the Board with a detailed overview of the residential code revisions to date. He said that the proposed zoning requirements include two basic areas of change: (1) building setbacks and impervious coverage limits, which addresses open space and (2) prescriptive requirements which addresses a variety of issues including mass and scale of the main dwelling and accessory buildings. He detailed the standards of the current code as well as proposed. He proposed a transition period of 60 days for implementing new code requirements and plans that were previously approved through a Board for one year. He presented a letter from the property owner at 1369 Canterbury Road, supporting the porte cocheres.

Phil Kean, 1011 McKean Circle, is please with the document to this point, likes the detached garage incentives. He said that he feels that helps to reduce the mass of the main structure. He said that he feels if the porte cocheres will encourage more people to do them, then please keep that language in and lastly he agreed with the 60 day transition period.

Steve Feller, 126 South Park Avenue, said that he feels that the proposed code is a good code and gave further insight as to what he feels are workable provisions of the code. He also expressed that he feels that more attention should be given to front setbacks.

Bob Kinglsand, 555 Sylvan Drive, also addressed the Board concerning the proposed changes.

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

Motion made by Mr. Dick, seconded by Mrs. Cooper to approve the ordinance as amended. Motion carried unanimously with a 3-0 vote.
Motion made by Mr. Krecicki, seconded by Mr. Dick to table the conditional use ordinance until the February public hearing. Motion carried unanimously with a 3-0 vote.

There was no further business. Meeting adjourned at 12:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Smith
Recording Secretary