MINUTES

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

Approval of minutes – June 2, 2015

Motion made by Mr. Sacha, seconded by Mr. Gottfried to approve the June 2, 2015, meeting minutes. Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

REQUEST OF DR. RANDALL LOY FOR: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 58 “LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE” ARTICLE I, “COMPREHENSIVE PLAN” SO AS TO CHANGE THE FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF INSTITUTIONAL TO OFFICE AND PROFESSIONAL FUTURE LAND USE ON THE PROPERTY AT 1500 S. ORLANDO AVENUE.

REQUEST OF DR. RANDALL LOY FOR: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 58 “LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE” ARTICLE III, “ZONING” AND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP SO AS TO CHANGE THE ZONING OF SINGLE FAMILY (R-1A) DISTRICT TO OFFICE (O-1) DISTRICT ON THE PROPERTY AT 1500 S. ORLANDO AVENUE.

REQUEST OF DR. RANDALL LOY FOR: CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO REDEVELOP THE ST. JOHN’S LUTHERAN CHURCH PARKING LOT AT 1500 S. ORLANDO AVENUE WITH A TWO STORY, 15,000 SQUARE FOOT MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING, PURSUANT TO THE REQUESTED O-1 ZONING.

Planning Manager Jeffrey Briggs presented the staff report and stated that this public hearing is at the request of Dr. Randall Loy (Center for Reproductive Medicine) involving rezoning and redevelopment of the St. John Lutheran Church parking lot at 1500 S. Orlando Avenue. He noted that it does not include the two adjacent Church properties at 1010 Garden Drive and 1021 Camellia Avenue. He explained that the applicants are requesting to change the Comprehensive Plan future land use map from institutional to office & professional and a companion rezoning from single family (R-1A) to office (O-1). In addition there is a Conditional Use request for the proposed two-story, 15,000 square foot medical building. Mr. Briggs reviewed the history of the subject property, project statistics, parking requirements, tree preservation, Comprehensive Plan policies and requested exceptions, Zoning Code requirements and requested exceptions, the details of the traffic Study, and site design and compatibility. He discussed the differences between the proposed project versus the previous Sentio request.

Mr. Briggs summarized by stating that the planning staff has not been opposed to the sale and redevelopment of this property. In the December 2014 staff report, it said “One more compatible option would be to sell for a use, such as an office, that is more compatible with the adjacent single family residential neighborhoods. If redeveloped as an office building, then with office zoning and the 45% maximum FAR, it would be the virtually the same size as the current single family zoning would permit with its maximum 43% FAR. This is also an
attractive scenario because typically the office building parking lot would be inactive at nights and on weekends and available for the Church to use on Sundays.”

Staff recommended approval of the request for office and professional future land use and office (O-1) zoning; and approval of the Preliminary Conditional Use with the following conditions:

1. That the civil site plan complies with a 25 foot setback from the oak trees in the northern portion of the site before grading/digging begins for the storm water retention area. The applicant may maximize retention with a vertical wall (to increase retention capacity) on the sides away from the trees, but may not utilize more than a 6:1 side slope for the retention area on the eastern side, near the trees due to the impacts on the root systems and survivability of those trees.

2. That the proposed sidewalk adjacent to those live oak trees be removed due to the construction impacts of digging the sidewalk so close to those trees and tree root systems.

Mr. Briggs responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Rebecca Wilson, 215 North Eola Drive, represented the applicant. She introduced the members of the development team and background information on the applicant’s practice. She said that the applicant intends to relocate their Orlando location to Winter Park. Mrs. Wilson noted that a community meeting was held on June 9 in an effort to address as many neighborhood concerns as possible prior to the public hearing. She agreed with staff recommendations concerning comprehensive plan amendment and rezoning; however requested that tonight they be granted a final conditional use. She expressed that they have submitted all of the necessary information to staff for final conditional use approval. She explained that the timing of the closing is sensitive and does not allow for the applicant to go thru an additional approval step. She used a power point to present the details of the site plan. She discussed parking requirements and the contents of the traffic report. Mrs. Wilson responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Wendy Anderson, Attorney representing St. John’s Lutheran Church, commented that the church’s Board whole-heartedly supports the project and would like to see this project move forward. She further explained the Church parking situation, the options to increase parking and the ability to move to two services.

Sara Brady, 929 Garden Drive, explained that she lives in the Mead Garden neighborhood. She said that the neighbors are not opposed to redevelopment but support smart and compatible redevelopment. She expressed concern that no one from the church has ever reached out to the residential community in a neighborly fashion and discussed the state of the two residential properties owned by the Church. She stated that the neighborhood is opposed to the demolition of houses for more Church parking and feels that the Church has been unresponsive to the concerns of the neighborhood.

Woody Woodall, 328 North Park Avenue, stated that he opposes the change in zoning and comprehensive plan amendment.

Richard Kessler, explained that he is church member. He stated that the Church has worked closely with the team to bring the project to this point. He said that the sale of this property will allow the church to pay off the mortgage and hire the pastor that the church needs. He echoed the concerns raised by Attorney Wilson with regard to the time sensitivity.

Kim Ruffier, 3039 Middlesex Road, expressed concern with transparency thru the process and supported the statements made by other neighbors.

Marilyn Money, stated that she is a past resident of the neighborhood and a long-time church member. She spoke in favor of the request.

Genean Newman, 941 Camelia Avenue, agreed with the comments made by Ms. Ruffier concerning process.

Attorney Anderson responded to concerns raised with regard to the Counseling Center, youth house and parsonage. She explained that there are 13 spaces at the counseling center site and 7 spaces at the youth
and parsonage house. She said that the youth house is no longer in use and the church is in the process of evicting the tenant in the parsonage house.

Attorney Wilson clarified that the applicant is not requesting any variances. She noted that although the property is zoned R-1A, residential could not be developed on the site due to the current future land use designation of institutional. With regard to landscaping on 17/92, she noted that the landscaping and sidewalks for this project will be similar to that of the Women’s Center as this is the same developer. Attorney Wilson reiterated the need for the Conditional Use to be a “final” approval versus a “preliminary” approval. She responded to Board member questions and concerns.

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

Chairman Johnston asked Mr. Briggs if this could be a “final” CU approval per the applicant’s request. Mr. Briggs responded that we do not yet have a landscape plan, storm water plan or lighting plan but if P&Z did not feel it necessary to review those then the action could delegate that authority to the staff. Mr. Gottfried expressed that he was fine with that scenario but asked that staff look at ways to make the project more pedestrian friendly on the Orlando Avenue frontage.

Mr. Weldon discussed with the Board the option for O-2 zoning and a height exception versus O-1 zoning since it would permit redevelopment many years from now for a 4 story building. He suggested that it would be a good idea not to create entitlements for future redevelopment. The Board discussed this matter and the consensus of the Board members was to allow the O-1 as requested by the applicant and to delegate to staff the approval of the final plans for the conditional use. They had no objections to granting the final approval for the conditional use.

The Board members then individually expressed their appreciation to the neighborhood for their participation in this process and that the eventual outcome appeared to be much better for all involved.

Motion made by Mr. Sacha, seconded by Mr. Gottfried to approve the ordinance amending Chapter 58 “Land Development Code” Article I, “Comprehensive Plan” so as to change the Future Land Use designation of Institutional to Office and Professional Future Land Use on the property at 1500 S. Orlando Avenue.
Motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

Motion made by Mr. Sacha, seconded by Mr. Gottfried to approve the ordinance amending Chapter 58 “Land Development Code” Article III, “Zoning” and the official zoning map so as to change the zoning of Single Family (R-1A) district to Office (O-1) district on the property at 1500 S. Orlando Avenue.
Motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

Motion made by Mr. Sacha, seconded by Mr. Gottfried to APPROVE the “Final” Conditional Use request to redevelop the St. John’s Lutheran Church parking lot at 1500 S. Orlando Avenue with a two story, 15,000 square foot medical office building, subject to the staff conditions as follows:
1. That the civil site plan complies with a 25 foot setback from the oak trees in the northern portion of the site before grading/digging begins for the storm water retention area. The applicant may maximize retention with a vertical wall (to increase retention capacity) on the sides away from the trees, but may not utilize more than a 6:1 side slope for the retention area on the eastern side, near the trees due to the impacts on the root systems and survivability of those trees.
2. That the proposed sidewalk adjacent to those live oak trees be removed due to the construction impacts of digging the sidewalk so close to those trees and tree root systems.
Motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.
REQUEST OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK FOR: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 58 “LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS”, ARTICLE III, “ZONING” SECTIONS 58-71 AND 58-84 SO AS TO ADOPT PARKING GARAGE DESIGN GUIDELINES GOVERNING THE CONSTRUCTION OF PARKING GARAGES WITHIN THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, PROVIDING FOR REVIEW PROCEDURES; APPEAL PROCEDURES AND FOR RESOLUTION OF INTERPRETATIONS REGARDING SUCH GUIDELINES.

REQUEST OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK FOR: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK ADOPTING PARKING GARAGE DESIGN GUIDELINES PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 58-71 AND 58-84 OF THE ZONING REGULATIONS SO AS TO ESTABLISH DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF PARKING GARAGES WITHIN THE CITY OF WINTER PARK.

Planning Manager Jeffrey Briggs presented the staff report and explained this public hearing is to consider an Ordinance, requested by the City Commission, to add to the Zoning Code, new design guidelines for future parking garages within the City. He explained that the City has previously adopted two other sets of Design Guidelines which apply to the 1) Park Avenue/Central Business District, and 2) Morse Blvd/New England Avenue area. These design guidelines establish expectations as to the appearance of buildings within the geographical area or in this case for the appearance of future parking garages. The plan approval process is the same as currently utilized. It starts with staff review and then the staff decisions can be appealed to P&Z and ultimately to the City Commission. However, in almost every situation, any future parking garage would be part of a Conditional Use for a Large Building project (over 10,000 sq. ft.). It is theoretically possible to have a stand-alone project of a parking garage that is less than 10,000 square feet in size, (50 spaces), but the building that it serves would be larger than 10,000 square feet and then still be part of the Conditional Use. So in virtually every case, the parking garage plans and elevations would be coming to P&Z and City Commission for the ultimate decision. However, the City would now have guidelines to provide direction to the developer and to the City staff, P&Z Board and City Commission. Staff Recommendation is for Approval.

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

The Planning Board members expressed support for these design guidelines to provide some expectations from the City as to the look of future parking garages. The Board discussion also emphasized that these were guidelines and ultimately the P&Z Board and City Commission would make the final decisions together with the Conditional Use.

Motion made by Mr. Sacha, seconded by Mr. Gottfried to approve the ordinance amending Chapter 58 “Land Development Regulations”, Article III, “Zoning” Sections 58-71 and 58-84 so as to adopt parking garage design guidelines governing the construction of parking garages within the City of Winter Park, providing for review procedures; appeal procedures and for resolution of interpretations regarding such guidelines. Motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

Motion made by Mr. Sacha, seconded by Mr. Gottfried to approve the Resolution of the City of Winter Park adopting parking garage design guidelines pursuant to Sections 58-71 and 58-84 of the zoning regulations so as to establish design guidelines for the construction of parking garages within the City of Winter Park. Motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

NEW BUSINESS:

Date of Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, August 4, 2015 at 6:00 p.m.
Date of Next Work Session Meeting: July 28, 2015 at 12:00 noon
There was no further business. Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Smith
Recording Secretary