Chair James Johnston called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. in the Commission Chambers of City Hall. Present: James Johnston, Peter Gottfried, Tom Sacha, Randall Slocum, Shelia De Ciccio, Peter Weldon and Ross Johnston. Absent: Robert Hahn. City Attorney: Dan Langley. Staff: Planning Manager, Jeff Briggs, Planner, Allison McGillis, and Recording Secretary, Lisa Smith.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

REQUEST OF THE CITY WINTER PARK COMMISSIONERS FOR: INPUT ON THE FUTURE OF THE CITY-OWNED PROGRESS POINT PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1150 NORTH ROANGE AVENUE.

Planning Manager, Jeffrey Briggs, explained that the City Commission requested this special meeting to get the thoughts of the P&Z Board as to “what they believe is the best fit for this corridor for the City’s Progress Point property”. Mr. Briggs stated that the City sent out notices to the core constituents of stakeholders surrounding the property in question, and presented the Staff’s summary of Progress Point and the Orange Avenue corridor.

Summary:

This property is essentially a raw-land redevelopment site, in the sense that the building presently located on the site is not worth saving and/or redeveloping. The property measures a total of approximately 3.73 acres (162,479-square feet) in size, and has frontages on Orange Avenue, Denning Drive, Palmetto Avenue and Cypress Avenue. The most recent appraisal for this property estimated the property value to be approximately $5.7 million with certain conditions (see attached).

The zoning is currently Office (O-1). The Orange Avenue corridor has a mix of Office (O-1) and Commercial (C-3) zoning. The future land use of the property is also Office, and the Orange Avenue corridor reflects the same mix of Office and Commercial future land uses. The current zoning of O-1 allows for a 45% Floor Area Ratio (FAR). This FAR allows for surface parking, but not generally a parking garage. The City previously has discussed this property becoming a commercially zoned property (C-3), which would not change allowable 45%.

Previously in 2009, the City designated areas within the City that were potential candidates for Planned Developments. The Progress Point property was one of those properties that was designated a potential property for a Planned Development with a PD-1 zoning. This means that this property could have a mix of uses including residential, office and commercial, with a density that would allow for parking garage with up to a FAR of 130%. Lastly, multifamily (R-3) zoning would be a possibility, which would allow for a 110% FAR.
Staff’s power point included pictures of the current conditions of the Progress Point property, the current conditions of the Orange Avenue corridor that is developed with one and two story buildings, and of the streetscape design characteristics.

Prior to the City owning Progress Point, there was discussion in 2008 on swapping this property with the CNL Heritage Park Office Park building at the intersection of Morse and Denning. The City questioned what we could do with the Progress Point property if we acquired it. To show what could be done with this property, three options were developed at the time. All three options included a mix of uses with one and two story buildings, and included the Palmetto Avenue right-of-way.

Prior to the City’s ownership of this property, a development was marketed by the previous owner of the property in 2007. This proposal also included the property to the north-northeast of Progress Point. The architect, ACi, proposed a three-story, mixed-use planned development with parking garages. Looking at only the part that the City owns today, the FAR for this proposed project was 207%, well above the allowable density for a planned development under the City’s code.

In closing, Staff presented P&Z with a framework for a discussion on Progress Point. This was to discuss Orange and Palmetto Avenue’s preferred height and type of uses. If Palmetto Avenue should be left as-is or incorporated into the design. Also, if a parking garage at this location was acceptable in their opinion, and who the garage would serve.

Public Comments:

Phil Anderson, ROC Seniors, who submitted a previous plan for this property for an assisted living/memory care use, spoke about his plan. He stated that he would like to have a flagship location in Winter Park for an upscale senior housing project that would be low density with one to two story buildings. He discussed that the Orange Avenue corner would be occupied by a destination restaurant, and some retail, with senior housing. Also, that they planned on rezoning the property to R-3. The City’s updated appraisal was above their previous price proposal. To make-up the difference, Mr. Anderson stated that he would need to add an additional 40 senior housing units and additional retail square-footage. Mr. Anderson stated that he hopes the City is in favor of senior housing, and that he can come back with a proposal for the P&Z Board that would be supported. He responded to questions and concerns of board members.

John Webb, 952 South Denning Drive, spoke concerning the request. He stated that this property currently has no drainage outfalls, and that this would need to be built. He spoke in favor of redeveloping Progress Point and the American Land Bank property together, and for a mixed use development.

Lamont Garber, 1280 North Orange Avenue, spoke about the lack of parking for the businesses along the corridor, and gave photographs of the cars parked at the Progress Point property to the board members. He stated the business owners along Orange Avenue support a mixed use development with a parking garage. He responded to questions of board members.

Peter Gardner, 1270 North Orange Avenue, spoke concerning the request. He stated that he supports senior housing, but does not support a senior housing element at this location. He stated that he supports a mixed-use, restaurant and retail uses, and to add vibrancy to this location. Also, that this location is an important gateway for this city. He responded to questions of board members.
Charles May, Jewett Orthopedic, spoke concerning the request. He stated that Jewett has contributed money to improving the Orange Avenue corridor. He also stated that parking is a big issue at his location, and is looking for additional parking. He stated that Jewett would be interested in buying the portion of the property between Palmetto Avenue and the railroad tracks for parking. He also stated that Jewett could be a financial partner if a parking garage were to be built. He responded to questions of board members.

Peter Lemieux, 1185 Orange Avenue, stated that he is excited to see this area develop, and is a fan of progress. However, he doesn’t have a preference as far as use for this property. His issues with this area have to deal with parking and storm water. He stated that he would support extra parking at this site. Also, that the underground storm water drainage system for this area is outdated, and his office has flooded several times.

Rebecca Wilson, on behalf of ROC Seniors, spoke concerning this request. She stated that ROC Seniors would be happy to look at possible parking configurations for this property, and allow for public-private parking. She stated that Palmetto is not a gateway for the City, but agrees that Orange Avenue is a gateway and ROC Seniors plans to make this portion of the property a gateway with a mix of uses.

Mark Briars, 522 South Park Avenue, spoke concerning this request. He stated that he favors a mixed use, planned development, project for this property, but achieving the allowable FAR is going to be difficult. He supports giving a developer leniency on this property because of the issues it faces.

No one else wished to speak concerning the request. Public Hearing was then closed.

**Planning and Zoning Board Discussion:**

The P&Z board members discussed the request. Mr. Gottfried stated that he likes the planned development concept for this project, and that is suits this area. He stated that the 45% FAR is slim for this property. Mr. Weldon stated that the City needs to move backwards on this property, and questioned why other proposals besides ROC Seniors were not brought forward. Mr. Gottfried stated that the City isn’t in a rush to sell this property; they should rezone it to PD-1 and keep it for sale. Mr. Weldon stated that PD-1 isn’t anything but an opportunity, and that FAR doesn’t have to be maxed out. Mr. Johnston stated that the City needs to explore the public-private parking idea for this property, and questioned how many spaces would be needed. Mr. Weldon stated that he would like to see the City evaluate the possibilities of a mix of uses at this property, and that nobody is in a hurry to sell this property. Ms. De Ciccio stated that the ROC Seniors’ proposal is missing very key aspects such as parking and storm water drainage. Mr. Slocum stated that he supports a PD-1 zoning change, and that Orange Avenue should remain at frontage of commercial/retail/office uses with parking in the rear. Mr. Weldon stated that ROC Seniors should use the PD-1 zoning to change their plan. Mr. Gottfried stated that ROC Seniors can look at having a public-private parking arrangement like Lakeside did. Mr. Weldon stated that he believes the consensus is that there needs to be some form of a parking structure on this property to accommodate the area. Mr. Weldon stated that the City could send this property out for bid, inviting PD-1 developments without changing the zoning. Mr. Slocum stated that since the property is more than one parcel and includes the Palmetto Avenue right-of-way that, that the two independent parcels could become PD-1 zoned with a right-of-way abandonment on Palmetto, or they could be sold separately.
In summary, the P&Z Board heard from people who said that a mixed-use of retail, restaurant, and office would be good for the site. They heard from others who said assisted living is needed, and could fit on the site as well. They heard that parking is an issue for this corridor, and the City should pursue a public-private partnership on a parking garage. P&Z found merit in all those suggestions, so their action was to recommend that a “planned development” be implemented. P&Z did not provide any specific recommendation on what the “planned development” was to include or exclude. P&Z did not provide any specific recommendation on building heights, mixes of uses or densities.

**Motion made by Mr. Weldon, seconded by Mr. Gottfried to recommend to the City Commission to put the Progress Point property back out on the market with an invitation for bidders to look at the property as if it were a zoned PD-1, meaning that any bidders would also have to apply for a zoning change for their project to move forward.**

**Motion carried with 6-1 vote (Mr. James Johnston voted no).**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

There was no further business regarding the special meeting. Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Allison McGillis
Planner I