Acting Chair Mrs. Whiting called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Welcome Center. Present: Acting Chair Sarah Whiting, George Livingston, Tom Sacha, Peter Gottfried, Randall Slocum and James Johnston. Absent: Chairman Drew Krecicki, and Robert Hahn. Staff: Planning Director Jeffrey Briggs, Building Official George Wiggins, Senior Planner Stacey Hectus, Planning Technician Caleena Shirley and Recording Secretary Lisa Smith.

Approval of minutes – April 3, 2012

Motion made by Mr. Gottfried, seconded by Mr. Sacha to approve the April 3, 2012, meeting minutes. Motion carried unanimously with a 6-0 vote.

LAKEFRONT SITE PLAN REVIEWS

REQUEST OF MR. ASTROUCK FOR: APPROVAL OF A NEW ONE-STORY HOME AT 1769 LAKE BERRY DRIVE ON LAKE BERRY.

Senior Planner Stacey Hectus presented the staff report. Mr. Astrouck is requesting approval for a new single-family home located in the Waterbridge Planned Unit Residential Development at 1769 Lake Berry Drive on Lake Berry. The existing home will be demolished to make way for this new 5,624 square foot one-story home, with a FAR of 25%, and impervious lot coverage of 46.6%. In addition to reviewing the issues of tree preservation, view from the lake and for the neighbors, storm water retention, she discussed a landscaping issue pertaining to this particular plan. She said that this home proposes almost 100% hardscape of concrete and gravel in the front yard. This does not come close to meeting that requirement of the residential zoning districts (R-1A, R-1AA, R-1AAA) require that front yards must be a minimum of 50% landscaped. She added that this is very inconsistent with the character of this neighborhood and neighborhoods across the City. The current home/yard has a brick paver driveway and a landscaped (with greenery) front yard. Additionally, parking in the front yard (in front of the 25’ front setback) is prohibited. Staff is not opposed to any home having a front circular driveway (that may or may not be used for parking) and if the applicant wants to revise the plan accordingly (and still meet the 50% rule), staff is fine with that. But as you see in this case, we have the entire front yard as concrete or gravel. This as mentioned before is either discouraged or prohibited by our Code. She noted that staff is willing to work out a compromise with the applicant in this regard. She responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Mark Nasrallah, 3920 Edgewater Drive, and Scott Redmon, 2455 Lake Wampi Drive, were present to respond to questions and concerns.

Motion made by Mr. Livingston, seconded by Mr. Sacha to approve the request with the caveat that the applicant work with staff to resolve the front yard green planting by at least 50%. This can be reviewed and approved by staff. Motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

Building Official George Wiggins summarized the changes as follows:

1. Special setback for smaller homes with less side wall height. Currently only 2 story homes with shorter side wall heights (11’ or less) can utilize a 10’ side setback to first floor wall. Change to allow one story homes & lots up to 110’ in width, and allow one story homes with a flat roof up to 13’ in height to utilize the 10’ side setback. Rationale: Allows smaller side setback for reduced height side walls & one story homes with less overall mass.

2. Provide more favorable side setback on one side of homes with garages in the rear to allow adequate drive width on the opposite side for narrow lots, 60’ or less in width. Change to allow a 6 foot side setback on the non-driveway side of the home & allow second floor setback of 10’. Rationale: Provide incentive to give adequate room to place parking toward the rear of the property on narrow lots while allowing adequate buildable area on the lot.

3. Provide methodology to measure the lot width on unusual shaped lots such as pie shaped lots by utilizing an average lot width. Change to allow utilizing an average lot width. Rationale: Provides fair method to determine the lot width on non-rectangular lots that provides a proportionally accurate way to calculate the required side setback.

4. Allow reducing rear setback to 10’ for properties that back up to the railroad & non-residential property. Currently, this requirement is in place for homes that back up to non-residentially zoned properties only. Rationale: The current code required setbacks of 25’ to the first floor and 35’ to the second floor need not apply if the residence is not backing up to another residential property.

5. Side wall articulation. Unify the articulation requirement to 2 feet for all lot widths instead of requiring 3 feet for lots 80 feet wide and allow various alternate methods that accomplish architecturally breaking up the side wall of the home.
Rationale: Having various options gives more flexibility in the home design, and one of the
alternates addresses how existing homes undergoing remodeling may achieve articulation
without requiring a variance.

6. Remove “privacy view protection” provision.
   Rationale: This provision was found to be unneeded, not practical to enforce, and the new wider
   side setbacks address this concern without having this additional regulation.

7. Clarify the allowance to use the single family zoning standards within Windsong and Waterbridge
   subdivisions.
   Rationale: Currently, use of the new standards are permitted except where the Planned
   Development standards are more restrictive. The change allows use of the standards but only if
   used exclusively for the subject property without mixing provisions. New residents, designers
   and builders have found them useful on certain properties.

8. Adjust corner lot setback provision to allow an alternate 20’ street side setback instead of 25’ when
   using the normal required rear setbacks of 25’ to the first floor and 35’ to the second floor.
   Rationale: Previous zoning standards allowed the 20 foot setback, and this allows greater
design flexibility that may be needed due to the lot width by allowing either option.

9. Allow a unified 10’ side setback to air conditioning equipment and generators on lots over 75 feet wide.
   Rationale: The new zoning standards unintentionally removed this ability with the wider side
   setback requirements.

10. Allow greater design flexibility and options for front facing garages.
    Rationale: Designers have shown various ways to minimize the impact of a front facing garage,
and an alternate mechanism needs to be in place to allow garage conversions or additions onto
existing homes without requiring a variance.

11. Allow certain nonconforming walls or fences on corner lots to be repaired or replaced under certain
    conditions.
    Rationale: The rules on setbacks for corner lots have changed over time creating many non-
    conforming situations for fences and walls. The provision allows the owner a mechanism to
    replace the wall or fence without having to move it or obtain a variance.

12. Insert provisions into zoning code related to new Pain Management Clinic Ordinance.
    Rationale: The City Commission recently enacted a comprehensive pain management clinic
    ordinance modeled after Orange County’s Ordinance to be adopted in late June. Certain
    definitions, identification of the permitted zoning district and parking criteria needed to be added
to the zoning code to fit with the Pain Management Clinic Ordinance.

13. Insert specific provisions into the landscape ordinance addressing landscape and wall buffer
    requirements for vehicle use areas across the street from residential areas.
    Rationale: Instead of continually referring to the landscape street front buffer at the YMCA, the
    needed criteria is inserted into the City’s landscape ordinance when similar buffer requirements
    are needed.

He explained that staff has been working with the building and design community on this for some time, as well
as residents wanting to remodel their homes that have run into snags with the current ordinance. He said that
no ordinance is perfect, but staff is attempting to improve the current provisions for everyone’s benefit. Mr.
Wiggins responded to Board member questions and concerns.

The following citizens spoke concerning the proposed ordinance: Phil Kean, 229 Alexander Place; Jim Lucia,
1925 South Boulevard, Maitland; Steve Feller, 126 Park Avenue South; Jack Rogers, 1002 Temple Grove;
Peter Weldon, 700 Via Lombardy; Scott Redmon, 2455 Lake Wampi Drive; Charlie Clayton, 1230 North Park Avenue; Mark Squires, 400 Park Avenue South; Sally Flynn, 1400 Highland Road. No one else wished to speak concerning this item. Public Hearing closed.

The Board members briefly discussed the proposed ordinance. Consensus of the Board members was that the minor concerns of side wall articulation and articulation breaks can be resolved and continue to make tweaks to the ordinance as needed.

Motion made by Mr. Gottfried, seconded by Mr. Johnston to approve the proposed ordinance as written. Motion carried unanimously with a 6-0 vote.

NEW BUSINESS:

There were no items of new business.

There was no further business. Meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Smith,
Recording Secretary