CP 2:09  AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 58 "LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE" ARTICLE I, "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN" SO AS TO ADOPT NEW PROCEDURES FOR AMENDMENTS AND ADDING A PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN.

This ordinance proposes to update the process and notification procedures in our Land Development Code for amendments to the Comprehensive Plan (last adopted in 1991) as well as updating the Public Participation Plan (last adopted in 1989).

There have been significant changes to the process and procedures for Zoning Code amendments (rezonings) since 1991. Specifically, on May 8, 2006 the City Commission adopted Ordinance 2668-06 which instituted new application requirements and new public notice requirements (such as the city-wide notice). These are codified in Section 58-85 of the Zoning Code. The amendment process and notification procedures for Comp. Plan text/map amendments need to track exactly the process and notice for zoning text/map amendments. That is what this ordinance does. It was cut and pasted directly from the Zoning Code. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended adoption of these procedures and notifications in April 2006, so staff assumes that P&Z is still OK with them.

The Public Participation Plan component updates how we notice and encourage public participation for amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. Basically, we still utilize our advisory board structure, undertake advertisements, etc. and use the website (which did not exist in 1989) to enhance the process.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS FOR APPROVAL
ORDINANCE NO. ________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK,
FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 58 "LAND
 DEVELOPMENT CODE" ARTICLE I, "COMPREHENSIVE
PLAN" SO AS TO ADOPT NEW PROCEDURES FOR
AMENDMENTS AND ADOPTING A PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
PLAN BY REFERENCE. (CP 2:09)

WHEREAS, the Winter Park City Commission adopted a new Comprehensive Plan on
February 23, 2009 and needs to update the process and process for amendments that
was established for the previous Comprehensive Plan that was adopted in 1991, and

WHEREAS, the public participation plan which was last adopted in 1989 also needs to
be updated to reflect current procedures and technology in accordance with the
requirements of state law and the procedures adopted for public participation in the
planning process.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF
WINTER PARK:

SECTION 1. That Chapter 58 "Land Development Code", Article I "Comprehensive
Plan" of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended and modified by repeal and
Section 58-6 "Amendments to the comprehensive plan" with a new Section 58-6 to read as
follows:

Sec. 58-6. Amendments to the comprehensive plan.

(a) Amendments to the comprehensive plan shall conform to the schedule and
notification requirements as specified within Florida Statutes Chapter 163, Part II "Local
Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act" (F.S
163.3191) and Rule 9-J5 Florida Administrative Code. In addition to the schedule and
public notice requirements outlined above the city shall also conform to the following notice
and procedural requirements:

(1) A comprehensive plan text or map amendment may be proposed by the city
commission or the planning and zoning commission or may be proposed by any individual,
corporation, partnership or other entity having a bona-fide interest in such property either
by ownership or by standing under a contract to purchase such land. All comprehensive
plan text or map amendments must be made by ordinance. Applications shall be submitted
on a standard application form accompanied by all pertinent information which may be
required for proper consideration of the matter, along with payment of fees and charges as
established by the city commission. Applicants shall include prospective plans indicating
the desired development scenario proposed as a result of an approval per the plan
submission requirements established for conditional uses. Applicants shall also indicate if
the proposed development includes a request for Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) funds, including the amount requested and the purpose of such funding.

(2) All proposed comprehensive plan text or map amendments shall be submitted to the planning and zoning commission for study and recommendation. The planning and zoning commission shall study such proposals to determine:
   a. The need and justification for the change;
   b. When pertaining to the rezoning of land, the effect of the change, if any, on the particular property and the surrounding properties;
   c. When pertaining to the rezoning of land, the amount of undeveloped land in the general area and in the city having the same classification as that requested; and
   d. The relationship of the proposed amendment to the goals, policies, and text of the city's comprehensive plan, with appropriate consideration as to whether the proposed change will further, or at least not be contrary to, the purpose of this zoning ordinance and the general planning program.

(3) No recommendation for amendment to the comprehensive plan shall be made by the planning and zoning commission until and unless a public hearing has been held. Before any public hearing is held by the planning and zoning commission under the provisions of this section, notice shall be provided based upon the type and size of the request as detailed below. In cases where requests are not specifically indicated in this section, the planning and community development director shall determine the most appropriate level of public notice. Regardless of the size of the project, when any proposed amendment to the official zoning map or conditional use involves a project that is requesting Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) funds, then a statement to that effect specifying the amount requested and the purpose shall be included in the notice required for the project.

   a. For any proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan affecting land of less than one acre notice of the hearing shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation within the city at least fifteen days in advance of the hearing; written notice of the time and place of such meeting and the proposed action to be taken shall be posted upon the property and mailed to all owners of record of property within 1,500 feet of the property requested for amendment at least 15 days prior to the public hearing. The public notice posted on the property shall be erected to be in full view of the general public on each street side of said land and shall be erected by the applicant.

   b. For any proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan affecting land of more than one acre notice of the hearing shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation within the city at least 30 days in advance of the hearing; written notice of the time and place of such meeting and the proposed action to be taken shall be posted upon the property and mailed to all households as determined from the listing of utility billing addresses within the entire city limits at least 30 days prior to the public hearing. The public notice posted on the property shall be erected to be in full view of the general public on each street side of said land and shall be erected by the applicant. Any public notice required after the initial public hearing by the planning and zoning commission due to tabling, continuance, postponement or any other action by the planning commission shall revert to the 15 day notice unless otherwise directed by the planning commission so as to
allow for requests to be heard at the next regular or special meeting of the planning and zoning commission.

c. Said postings of properties shall remain in place through the public hearing process. The city shall monitor this posting and provide replacements for any postings lost due to weather, vandalism, etc. However, the absence of a posting due to these conditions beyond the control of the city or the applicant shall not constitute a breach of this requirement provided a good faith effort is made to comply.

(4) The planning and zoning commission following their public hearing may recommend approval, approval with conditions, preliminary approval, denial or submit such request with no recommendation to the city commission in the case of a tie vote. However, if the planning and zoning commission makes no recommendation following two advertised public hearings from the date of the initial public notice, it shall be considered submitted to the city commission without recommendation on the proposed comprehensive plan text or map amendment. This provision shall not include any public hearing during which the applicant requests that their application be tabled, postponed or continued or any public hearing where the planning commission deems that the plans submitted do not meet the application submission requirements, notice is deemed insufficient or any other procedural deficiency.

(5) Upon the filing of the recommendations and report by the planning and zoning commission or upon failure to do so with respect to any proposed comprehensive plan text or map amendment, the city commission shall proceed to hold a public hearing in relation thereto, giving at least 15 days notice of time and place of such hearing, which notice shall first be published in a newspaper having a general circulation in the City of Winter Park, Florida.

(6) In case of a recommendation of denial by the planning and zoning commission, or if a protest against such proposed zoning text or map amendment shall be presented in writing to the city clerk, at least five working days prior to the public hearing, duly signed by the owners of 20 percent or more of either the area of the lots included in such proposed change, or those within a 500-foot radius of the subject property, such amendments shall not become effective except by the favorable vote of four members of the city commission. In cases when the planning and zoning commission recommends approval of a zoning map amendment on a lesser portion of the property than originally requested or imposes conditions upon or limitations upon a recommendation for approval reducing the intensity or density of use of said property, it shall require the favorable vote of four members of the city commission to adopt such zoning map amendment to a greater portion of the property or to increase the density or intensity of use of said property above that recommended by the planning and zoning commission.

(7) If a planning and zoning commission recommendation for change is not acted upon by the city commission within 90 days of the date of its receipt by the city commission, the petition upon which the recommendation is based shall be deemed to have been denied.

(8) Whenever the city commission has, by amendment, changed the comprehensive plan land use designation of property, the planning and zoning commission shall not consider
any petition for the further amendment of any part or all of the same property for a period of one year from the effective date of the amendatory ordinance. Whenever the planning and zoning commission has taken action to recommend the denial of a petition for the change in comprehensive plan land use designation of property and that recommendation has been approved by the city commission, or when the planning and zoning commission has recommended granting a petition for the rezoning of property and the city commission has reversed that recommendation and denied the petition, the planning and zoning commission shall not:

a. Consider any further petition for the same rezoning of any part or all of the same property for a period of one year from date of such action by the city commission;
b. Consider a petition for any other kind of rezoning on any part or all of the same property of a period of one year from the date of such action by the city commission.

The time limits of this subsection may be waived by the affirmative vote of four members of the city commission, when such action is deemed necessary to prevent injustice or to facilitate the proper development of the city.

(9) The decision of the planning and zoning commission and the city commission may be made to affirm or deny the original request of the applicant or it may modify the request to approve a portion of the request or alternative version of comprehensive plan text or map amendment. The planning and zoning commission may recommend and the city commission may impose conditions upon the approval of a comprehensive plan amendment. Such conditions may not restrict the range of permitted uses within a comprehensive plan designation but such conditions may restrict or impose requirements upon the development or use of such land such as limitations on building size, height, setbacks or other site design or building design or use features.

(10) Whenever the secretary to the planning and zoning commission has received a written request for a continuation, delay or postponement of a public hearing from an applicant after such public hearing has been duly advertised, the planning and zoning commission may grant the applicant's request. The commission shall reschedule the public hearing to any future scheduled meeting within the following six months; such rescheduling shall meet with the approval of the applicant. The applicant shall pay a second filing fee for rezoning to cover necessary administration and other expenses. If, after the second public hearing has been duly advertised and the applicant again requests a delay, postponement or continuation, or if the applicant does not agree with the rescheduling of the public hearing within the six-month period, the planning and zoning commission shall duly act to deny the request of the applicant, and a new request for this property will not be accepted for a period of one year from the date of the second scheduled public hearing.

(11) A development agreement may be approved by the city commission coincident with the initial approval of a comprehensive plan amendment or may be done at a later time, following a subsequent public hearing. Development agreements may or may not be approved pursuant to F.S., Chapter 163. Development agreements shall be prepared by the City of Winter Park pursuant to the terms and conditions outlined by the planning and zoning commission and the city commission. Applicants shall be required to reimburse the city for actual city staff and city attorney expenses, and for any extraordinary costs, including but not limited to attorneys fees and costs incurred in litigation related to any approval or related to a denial if the city is the prevailing party.
(12) Whenever an applicant submits plans as required by this section, only the plans submitted to the planning commission members prior to the public hearing for their review together with a staff report analysis and other pertinent information shall be the basis for action by the planning and zoning commission. If those plans are substantially modified then such application shall be postponed and re-advertised for a subsequent meeting. Similarly, when the planning and zoning commission makes a recommendation on an application pursuant to specific plans, and those plans are substantially modified for submission to the city commission public hearing, then the modified plans shall first be reviewed by the planning and zoning commission for recommendation before they are considered by the city commission for approval. The city commission shall not act on any application containing modified plans but shall refer the modified plans back to the planning and zoning commission, for subsequent review and recommendation unless such changes are in response to specific conditions of approval made by the planning and zoning commission.

(13) Nothing in this section shall restrict and limit the ability of the city to adopt annexation ordinances pursuant to Chapter 171, Florida Statutes. When the comprehensive plan map is amended to reflect such annexations and the proposed land use designations are the same as currently reflected within the Orange County Comprehensive Plan, then the notice requirements outlined above shall not apply but shall only be governed by those general requirements of Chapter 166, Florida Statutes.


SECTION 3. This ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its final passage and adoption.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida, held in City Hall, Winter Park, on this _____ day of ______________, 2009.

_____________________________  Mayor

ATTEST:

_____________________________  City Clerk
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ORDINANCE NO. ________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 58 "LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE" ARTICLE III, "ZONING" SO AS TO AMEND WITHIN SECTION 58-81 “OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING REGULATIONS” SUBSECTION (3) (f) SO AS TO MODIFY AND AMEND THE PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR LIBRARIES AND COMMUNITY CENTERS.

(ZTA 4:09)

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK:

SECTION 1. That Chapter 58 “Land Development Code”, Article III "Zoning" of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended and modified by repealing within Section 58-81 “Off-street parking and loading regulations”, subsection (3) (f) and adopting a new subsection (3) (f) to read as follows:

Sec. 58-81. Off-street parking and loading regulations.

(3) Specific requirements for various uses and buildings.

(f) Community centers, libraries and post offices: For Community centers, one space for each 350 square feet of gross floor space and for libraries one space for each 375 square feet of gross floor space. These requirements may be fulfilled using on-site parking spaces as well as identified public parking spaces within 300 feet. For post offices, one space for each 250 square feet of gross floor space.

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its final passage and adoption.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida, held in City Hall, Winter Park, on this _____ day of __________________, 2009.

__________________________________________
Mayor

__________________________________________
City Clerk
Sec. 58-85. Zoning changes and amendments, public notice requirements and procedures for zoning amendments and conditional uses.

The regulations, restrictions, and district boundaries set out in this article may from time to time be amended, supplemented, changed or repealed. The procedure shall be as follows:

(1) A zoning text or map amendment may be proposed by the city commission or the planning and zoning commission. A zoning map amendment may be proposed by any individual, corporation, partnership or other entity having a bona-fide interest in such property either by ownership or by standing under a contract to purchase such land. All zoning text or map amendments must be made by ordinance. Applications shall be submitted on a standard application form accompanied by all pertinent information which may be required for proper consideration of the matter, along with payment of fees and charges as established by the city commission. Applicants shall include prospective plans indicating the desired development scenario proposed as a result of an approval per the plan submission requirements established for conditional uses. Applicants shall also indicate if the proposed development includes a request for Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) funds, including the amount requested and the purpose of such funding.

(2) All proposed zoning text or map amendments shall be submitted to the planning and zoning commission for study and recommendation. The commission shall study such proposals to determine:

a. The need and justification for the change;

b. When pertaining to the rezoning of land, the effect of the change, if any, on the particular property and the surrounding properties;

c. When pertaining to the rezoning of land, the amount of undeveloped land

in the general area and in the city having the same classification as that requested; and

d. The relationship of the proposed amendment to the goals, policies, and text of the city's comprehensive plan, with appropriate consideration as to whether the proposed change will further, or at least not be contrary to, the purpose of this zoning ordinance and the general planning program.

(3) No recommendation for amendment to this zoning ordinance shall be made by the planning and zoning commission until and unless a public hearing has been held. Before any public hearing is held by the planning and zoning commission under the provisions of this section for zoning map amendment or for review of any conditional use request, notice shall be provided based upon the type and size of the request as detailed below. In cases where requests are not specifically indicated in this section, the planning and community development director shall determine the most appropriate level of public notice. Regardless of the size of the project, when any proposed amendment to the official zoning map or conditional use involves a project that is requesting Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) funds, then a statement to that effect specifying the amount requested and the purpose shall be included in the notice required for the project.

a. For any proposed conditional uses involving drive-in business components, two-story buildings in the O-2 district of less than 10,000 gross square feet above grade, residential projects of three units or less, conditional use for restaurant or liquor licenses, new or used car sales, vehicle repair or service, parking lots or recreational facilities, said notice of the hearing shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation within the city at least 15 days in
advance of the hearing; written notice of the time and place of such meeting and the proposed action to be taken shall be posted upon the property and mailed to all owners of record of property within 500 feet of the property requested for rezoning at least 15 days prior to the public hearing. The public notice posted on the property shall be erected to be in full view of the general public on each street side of said land and shall be erected by the applicant.

b. For any proposed amendment to the official zoning map for land of less than one acre and for conditional uses involving church expansions residential projects of four to 25 units, buildings over 10,000 gross square feet and less than 25,000 gross square feet above grade, day care, nursing homes, said notice of the hearing shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation within the city at least 15 days in advance of the hearing; written notice of the time and place of such meeting and the proposed action to be taken shall be posted upon the property and mailed to all owners of record of property within 1,500 feet of the property requested for rezoning at least 15 days prior to the public hearing. The public notice posted on the property shall be erected to be in full view of the general public on each street side of said land and shall be erected by the applicant.

c. For any proposed amendment to the official zoning map for land of more than one acre and for conditional uses involving residential projects with over 25 units, buildings over 25,000 gross square feet above grade and third or fourth floor projects in the central business district, said notice of the hearing shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation within the city at least 30 days in advance of the hearing; written notice of the time and place of such meeting and the proposed action to be taken shall be posted upon the property and mailed to all households as determined from the listing of utility billing addresses within the entire city limits at least 30 days prior to the public hearing. The public notice posted on the property shall be erected to be in full view of the general public on each street side of said land and shall be erected by the applicant. Any public notice required after the initial public hearing by the planning and zoning commission due to tabling, continuance, postponement or any other action by the planning commission shall revert to the 15-day notice unless otherwise directed by the planning commission so as to allow for requests to be heard at the next regular or special meeting of the planning and zoning commission.

d. Any proposed zoning text amendment proposed by the planning and zoning commission or city commission shall include notice as deemed appropriate by that commission given the nature and character of the amendment.

e. Said postings of properties shall remain in place through the public hearing process. The city shall monitor this posting and provide replacements for any postings lost due to weather, vandalism, etc. However, the absence of a posting due to these conditions beyond the control of the city or the applicant shall not constitute a breach of this requirement provided a good faith effort is made to comply.

(5) The planning and zoning commission following their public hearing may recommend approval, approval with conditions, preliminary approval, denial or submit such request with no recommendation to...
the city commission in the case of a tie vote. However, if the planning and zoning commission makes no recommendation following two advertised public hearings from the date of the initial public notice, it shall be considered submitted to the city commission without recommendation on the proposed zoning text or map amendment. This provision shall not include any public hearing during which the applicant requests that their application be tabled, postponed or continued or any public hearing where the planning commission deems that the plans submitted do not meet the application submission requirements, notice is deemed insufficient or any other procedural deficiency.

(6) Upon the filing of the recommendations and report by the planning and zoning commission or upon failure to do so with respect to any proposed zoning text of map, the city commission shall proceed to hold a public hearing in relation thereto, giving at least 15 days notice of time and place of such hearing, which notice shall first be published in a newspaper having a general circulation in the City of Winter Park, Florida.

(7) In case of a recommendation of denial by the planning and zoning commission, or if a protest against such proposed zoning text or map amendment shall be presented in writing to the city clerk, at least five working days prior to the public hearing, duly signed by the owners of 20 percent or more of either the area of the lots included in such proposed change, or those within a 500-foot radius of the subject property, such amendments shall not become effective except by the favorable vote of four members of the city commission. In cases when the planning and zoning commission recommends approval of a zoning map amendment on a lesser portion of the property than originally requested or imposes conditions upon or limitations upon a recommendation for approval reducing the intensity or density of use of said property, it shall require the favorable vote of four members of the city commission to adopt such zoning map amendment to a greater portion of the property or to increase the density or intensity of use of said property above that recommended by the planning and zoning commission.

(8) If a planning and zoning commission recommendation for change is not acted upon by the city commission within 90 days of the date of its receipt by the city commission, the petition upon which the recommendation is based shall be deemed to have been denied.

(9) Whenever the city commission has, by amendment, changed the zoning classification of property, the planning and zoning commission shall not consider any petition for the rezoning of any part or all of the same property for a period of one year from the effective date of the amending ordinance.

Whenever the planning and zoning commission has taken action to recommend the denial of a petition for the rezoning of property and that recommendation has been approved by the city commission, or when the planning and zoning commission has recommended granting a petition for the rezoning of property and the city commission has reversed that recommendation and denied the petition, the planning and zoning commission shall not:

a. Consider any further petition for the same rezoning of any part or all of the same property for a period of one year from date of such action by the city commission;

b. Consider a petition for any other kind of rezoning on any part or all of the same property of a period of one year from the date of such action by the city commission.

The time limits of this subsection may be waived by the affirmative vote of four members of the city commission, when
such action is deemed necessary to prevent injustice or to facilitate the proper development of the city.

(10) The decision of the planning and zoning commission and the city commission may be made to affirm or deny the original request of the applicant or it may modify the request to approve a portion of the request or alternative version of the zoning text or map amendment. The planning and zoning commission may recommend and the city commission may impose conditions upon the approval of a zoning amendment. Such conditions may not restrict the range of permitted uses within a zoning district but such conditions may restrict or impose requirements upon the development or use of such land such as limitations on building size, height, setbacks or other site design or building design or use features.

(11) Whenever the secretary to the planning and zoning commission has received a written request for a continuation, delay or postponement of a public hearing from an applicant after such public hearing has been duly advertised, the planning and zoning commission may grant the applicant's request. The commission shall reschedule the public hearing to any future scheduled meeting within the following six months; such rescheduling shall meet with the approval of the applicant. The applicant shall pay a second filing fee for rezoning to cover necessary administration and other expenses. If, after the second public hearing has been duly advertised and the applicant again requests a delay, postponement or continuation, or if the applicant does not agree with the rescheduling of the public hearing within the six-month period, the planning and zoning commission shall duly act to deny the request of the applicant, and a new request for rezoning of this property will not be accepted for a period of one year from the date of the second scheduled public hearing.

(12) Preliminary approvals may be recommended by the planning and zoning commission and may be approved by the city commission. Preliminary approvals are the first step of a two-step approval process. The second step requires the resubmission of additional plan documents or other relevant materials as may be deemed necessary to the planning and zoning commission and city commission for subsequent public hearing review and recommendation by the planning commission and action by the city commission in addition to any other requirements established by this code, applicable law, or as requested by the city commission. The city commission may at its choosing delegate the subsequent review and approval authority to the planning and zoning commission. The initial preliminary approvals establish a contractual obligation for the city to issue development orders and building permits for the development of projects that are consistent with the terms and conditions proposed for the rezoning or conditional use request and with the size, height, character and parameters of the types of uses detailed in the plan documents accompanying the zoning amendment or as part of a conditional use request. Preliminary approvals and the accompanying development agreements do not fix the cost of projects as the subsequent approval of additional plan submittals and documents by the planning and zoning commission and/or the city commission may alter costs associated with the exterior architectural facades of buildings, storm water retention facilities, service facilities, landscaping, signage, walls or fences, etc. The development agreement incorporates the plan submissions, written application materials and verbal representations of the applicant as well as including any special conditions and restrictions imposed by the city commission, upon which the approval may be based. A development agreement may be approved by the city commission coincident with the initial approval of the rezoning or
conditional use or may be done at a later time, following a subsequent public hearing. Development agreements may or may not be approved pursuant to F.S. ch. 163.

(13) In cases where preliminary approvals are granted for amendments to the zoning text or official map, the effective date of such ordinance shall be upon the date of execution of a development agreement following the subsequent review and approval by the city commission, following recommendation from the planning and zoning commission of the additional plan documents or other relevant materials as may be deemed necessary as exhibits for the development agreement.

(14) Development agreements shall be prepared by the City of Winter Park pursuant to the terms and conditions outlined by the planning and zoning commission and the city commission. Applicants shall be required to reimburse the city for actual city staff and city attorney expenses, and any extraordinary costs, including but not limited to attorneys' fees and costs incurred in litigation related to any approval or related to a denial if the city is the prevailing party.

(15) Whenever an applicant submits plans as required by this code, only the plans submitted to the planning commission members prior to the public hearing for their review together with a staff report analysis and other pertinent information shall be the basis for action by the planning and zoning commission. If those plans are substantially modified, then such application shall be postponed and re-advertised for a subsequent meeting. Similarly, when the planning and zoning commission makes a recommendation on an application pursuant to specific plans, and those plans are substantially modified for submission to the city commission public hearing, then the modified plans shall first be reviewed by the planning and zoning commission for recommendation before they are considered by the city commission for approval. The city commission shall not act on any application containing modified plans but shall refer the modified plans back to the planning and zoning commission, for subsequent review and recommendation unless such changes are in response to specific conditions of approval made by the planning and zoning commission.

(16) Whenever an applicant requests a work session or pre-application meeting before the planning and zoning commission or city commission or both combined commissions, such plans shall be submitted at least two weeks prior to such meeting and the planning staff shall prepare for review by such commissions, a preliminary report outlining the extent of the zoning variances and other issues that such application will entail.

(17) Significant changes to buildings or approved plans. There are two times when plan documents are reviewed following a preliminary approval or following a final approval with respect to a determination of significant change. The first time is following a preliminary approval when plan documents are submitted for final approval as required by this code. The second time is when plan documents are submitted for site development and building permits. In the first situation, the planning staff, based upon the criteria set forth below shall make a staff recommendation indicating the facts and conditions as they understand them to be. The planning and zoning commission shall then, following the required public hearing and based upon the criteria set forth below, make a recommendation either that:

- a. No significant changes have been made, or
- b. That significant changes have been made but those changes are acceptable to the planning and zoning commission or
- c. That significant changes have been made which are not acceptable to the planning and zoning commission.
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Introduction

This Public Participation Plan (2009) supplements and updates the Public Participation Plan adopted in 1989. In the preparation, notice and public participation process for all Comprehensive Plan amendments and updates, the City has conducted its public participation efforts pursuant to the 1989 plan. However, as new programs and procedures have been developed and utilized since that time this plan provides an update incorporating past, present and future actions at insuring broad public notification and participation.

Background Information

As mandated by the State of Florida Comprehensive Planning Regulation Act, Chapter 163 Florida Statutes and Rule 9J-5 Florida Administrative Code, the State Legislature has encouraged the fullest public participation in comprehensive planning efforts by local governments. The intent is defined in section 163.3181, "Public Participation in the comprehensive planning process" that “the procedures shall provide for broad dissemination of the proposals and alternatives, opportunity for written comments, public hearings as provided herein, provisions for open discussion, communications programs, information services, and consideration of and response to public comments.”

The City will follow the procedures set forth in Florida Administrative Code section 9J-5.004 Public Participation:

(a) Provisions to assure that real property owners are put on notice, through advertisement in a newspaper of general circulation in the area or other method adopted by the local government, of official actions that will affect the use of their property;

(b) Provisions for notice to keep the general public informed;

(c) Provisions to assure that there are opportunities for the public to provide written comments;

(d) Provisions to assure that the required public hearings are held; and

(e) Provisions to assure the consideration of and response to public comments.
Purpose

In addition to satisfying a requirement of the Florida Comprehensive Planning Law, this public participation plan is intended to serve two purposes. First, it will ensure that information about the plan and planning process will be widely distributed to the community. The public will become aware of the comprehensive plan, the elements contained within it, and the proposed goals and policies through the array of techniques identified herein.

Secondly, it will ensure that there are ample opportunities for involvement and input from the public. This public participation process is designed to actively engage city residents, business owners, and community groups in shaping the comprehensive plan.

Public Participation Efforts – Outreach and Public Input

Ongoing public participation efforts are proposed to take place throughout the comprehensive planning process. These outreach efforts are designed to provide information to the public of the comprehensive plan requirements, progress/status of the plan, background information and drafts of the plan’s goals, objectives and policies. They will include:

Notice of All Comprehensive Plan Meetings. All meetings regarding the comprehensive plan update will be publicly noticed, with advertisements placed on quarter-page ads in the Orlando Sentinel. Notices are also posted on the city web site and at City Hall and the Winter Park Public Library.

Web site Posting. Information regarding comprehensive plan progress and upcoming meetings or other public participation opportunities will be posted and maintained on the city’s Web site. Drafts of the individual elements, as well as other pertinent information, will be posted and updated as progress is made on the plan. The web address is www.cityofwinterpark.org. Public access to the Internet is available at the Winter Park Public Library and Orange County Public Library for those residents without internet access.

Hard-Copy Posting. A hard copy of the draft and eventually the adopted document can be found in the Planning Department at 401 Park Avenue South, Winter Park, FL 32789 and at the Winter Park Public Library in the reference section.
Updates Included in the “City Update”. The city distributes to all its residents a bi-monthly update that summarizes projects and other “happenings” in the city. This is a great tool that will be used to inform the citizenry of comprehensive planning updates and meetings (information being placed is dependant on the print schedule of the “Update”).

City of Winter Park Board and Commission Participation. The following boards and commissions participate in the comprehensive planning process. Staff takes the pertinent sections of the plan to each of the boards and commissions and solicits comments from each of them. These boards and commissions are all made up of Winter Park residents.

- Community Redevelopment Advisory Board
- Environmental Review Board
- Historic Preservation Commission
- Lakes and Waterways Board
- Parks and Recreation Board
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Board
- Planning and Zoning Commission (local planning agency)

Staff Presentations to the Community. Many of the other civic organizations request public presentations on the comprehensive planning process by staff. Some of the presentations done in the past were at the Rotary, Winter Park Chamber of Commerce and other civic organizations.

Audio Broadcasts of Public Meetings. All Planning and Zoning Commission meetings and City Commission meetings are broadcast through the Internet to anyone at home or work that are interested in the public meetings.

Public Notices. Mailed public notices shall be sent to owners of property pursuant to the notification requirements of the Land Development Code, Article I, “Comprehensive Plan”, Section 58-6 “Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan”.

**Winter Park’s Formal Adoption Process**

The city will follow the guidelines mandated by the State in Chapter 163.3184 *Process for adoption of comprehensive plan or plan amendment*. The notification requirements as summarized by the DCA from their website at:

[http://www.dca.state.fl.us/fdcp/dcp/Procedures/index.cfm#comp](http://www.dca.state.fl.us/fdcp/dcp/Procedures/index.cfm#comp)
This ordinance proposes to update our Zoning Code as it relates to the parking requirements for the Library and Community Center. The existing zoning code contains a parking requirement of one space for each 250 square feet of building area. That requirement is first seen in our 1963 Zoning Code. No one knows the logic for that requirement and neither the existing Library nor the existing Community Center meets that parking requirement.

Library Parking Analysis

Attached is a parking study, from Walker Parking Consultants that was authorized by the City Commission. It was intended to look at the “realistic” parking needs to be anticipated from the proposed expansion of the Library and to examine the potential of a joint parking venture with the now defunct JW Marriott Hotel project.

The existing three story Library is 32,908 square feet in size and has 68 parking spaces (one space for each 484 square feet). The current parking requirement of one space for each 250 square feet would generate a parking requirement of 132 parking spaces.

The original two story Library was completed in 1979 and had the same 68 parking spaces (one space per 327 sq. ft. at the time). In 1994, the Library applied for a Federal Economic Development grant to add the third floor. The City/Library got the grant and had 60 days to accept. The City chose to accept the grant but did not provide any new parking. The existing parking is not sufficient. Currently 20-23 employees are parking on the vacant hotel site next door. Under that arrangement, parking for library patrons is adequate at all times. So the provision of one parking space for each 360 square feet is adequate to meet the current Library’s needs. (68 spaces plus 23 offsite)

The Walker parking study examines future parking needs in two ways. One is that a doubling of the size would more or less lead to a doubling of the needed parking or a total of 173 spaces (page 11). This is the same one space per 364 square feet that currently exists. Bob Melanson however, believes that while the patron increase may be close to double, the staff will not increase significantly. The second method in the Walker parking study is a time analysis that measures the actual usage of the Library and the number of staff at that time. That analysis shows almost a doubling of the patrons (68 to 120) and an increase in staff (23 to 30) for a total requirement of 150
parking spaces (page 16). That translates into a parking requirement of one space for each 419 square feet.

So we have our "real world" experience that says one space per 360 sq. ft. works and we have the parking study that says one space per 419 sq. ft. will work. Somewhere in the middle is likely the correct number. To be conservative, staff would recommend one parking space for each 375 sq. ft.

Community Center Parking Analysis

The existing Community Center, built in 1971 is 22,000 square feet in size and has approximately 55 parking spaces (paved in front on New England and in the dirt parking lot). This translates into one space for each 400 square feet. Of course, additional parking owned by the City is available off-site.

The Moore and Assoc. parking study for the Community Center looks at the ITE parking rates recommended for community centers which distinguishes between suburban community centers where everyone is coming by car versus urban community centers where some patrons come by car but most either walk, bike or use transit. That ranges from one space for each 296 square feet for the suburban model to one space for each 869 square feet for an urban community center (page 15). They believe our Community Center shares the attributes of both models. While closer to a suburban mode it does get significant usage by neighborhood children who walk or bike to the Community Center. Their recommendation (page 17) is a parking requirement of one space for each 339 square feet.

The Community Center parking study also looks at five other existing community centers and their actual parking scenarios. The average of those five community centers is one space for each 423 square feet (page 18). Their study also looks at the peak time usage (5:00-6:00 pm) and the ability of other nearby public parking spaces to assist with those peak times.

Their recommendation is one space for each 339 square feet. This requirement may be fulfilled using on-site parking spaces as well as identified public parking spaces within 300 feet. Staff would suggest rounding it off to one parking space for each 350 sq. ft. The 300 foot distance for remote parking is already in our zoning code.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS FOR APPROVAL of the parking code changes based upon the consultant’s studies: one space for each 375 sq. ft. for the Library and one space for each 350 sq. ft. for the Community Center.
ORDINANCE NO. ______

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 58 "LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE" ARTICLE III, "ZONING" SO AS TO AMEND WITHIN SECTION 58-81 "OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING REGULATIONS" SUBSECTION (3) (f) SO AS TO MODIFY AND AMEND THE PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR LIBRARIES AND COMMUNITY CENTERS.

(ZTA 4:09)

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK:

SECTION 1. That Chapter 58 "Land Development Code", Article III "Zoning" of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended and modified by repealing within Section 58-81 "Off-street parking and loading regulations", subsection (3) (f) and adopting a new subsection (3) (f) to read as follows:

Sec. 58-81. Off-street parking and loading regulations.

(3) Specific requirements for various uses and buildings.

(f) Community centers, libraries and post offices: For Community centers, one space for each 350 square feet of gross floor space and for libraries one space for each 375 square feet of gross floor space. These requirements may be fulfilled using on-site parking spaces as well as identified public parking spaces within 300 feet. For post offices, one space for each 250 square feet of gross floor space.

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its final passage and adoption.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida, held in City Hall, Winter Park, on this _____ day of ______________, 2009.

______________________________________
Mayor

_____________________________________
City Clerk
PARKING PROGRAMMING ANALYSIS
FINAL REPORT

WINTER PARK LIBRARY EXPANSION
WINTER PARK, FLORIDA

Prepared for:
City of Winter Park
January 26, 2009

Mr. Jeffrey Briggs, Director  
Planning & Community Development Department  
City of Winter Park  
401 Park Avenue South  
Winter Park, Florida 32789-7386

Re: Parking Programming Analysis Final Report  
Library Expansion  
Winter Park, Florida  
Project No. 15-1783.00

Dear Mr. Briggs:

Walker Parking Consultants is pleased to submit the final report regarding the parking programming study prepared for the Winter Park Library. This report presents our analysis and conclusions, and is intended to assist the Library in evaluating various issues associated with the parking program of the downtown branch.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you and Library.

Sincerely,

WALKER PARKING CONSULTANTS

John S. Kowalchik, CPP  
Parking Consultant

JSK/mm  
Enclosure

cc: Robert G. Melanson, Director, Winter Park Public Library/Email: rmelanson@wppl.org  
Bill Johnson, Assistant Director, Winter Parking Public Library/Email: bjohnson@wppl.org
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This executive summary is provided to assist the reader in understanding some of this report's key points. However, the executive summary should not be read in lieu of the entire report, rather, the report should be read in its entirety to more completely understand the assumptions, analysis, and conclusions contained within this document.

Walker Parking Consultants was retained to provide a professional parking study for the Winter Park Library. This includes a review of the current parking supply, evaluation of current and future parking demand and parking supply, and provides an evaluation of alternatives to increase the future parking supply to meet any anticipated future parking space shortfall for the library.

Although the current parking supply of 68 on-site parking spaces is not sufficient to meet the design day parking demand of 91 vehicles, the use of the unimproved parking lot west of the library (by the library staff) allows the visitors to have adequate parking.

The future parking supply is anticipated to be as follows:

- Library parking lot
- Hotel parking garage
- Total Parking Inventory
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library parking lot</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel parking garage</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking Inventory</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walker researched the Winter Park, Florida parking code requirements. Utilizing the information in the Winter Park Code of Ordinance, Walker established the following parking requirements for the combined library and hotel developments.

### Winter Park Parking Code Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>62,908/Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1/250 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa</td>
<td>11,638/Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1/250 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>250/Rooms</td>
<td>1/room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/Lounge</td>
<td>4,395/Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1/50 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banquet/Meeting</td>
<td>14,583/Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1/250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Requirement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the Walker’s interpretation of the Winter Park Code of Ordinance, the expanded library would require approximately 252 parking spaces. The hotel (including rooms, spa, restaurant, and banquet/meeting rooms) would require approximately 372 parking spaces.

It appears that the projected hotel parking supply of 436 spaces will meet the code requirements. With the expansion, the library will not meet the City code requirements.

Walker prepared a shared parking model that projects a peak parking demand for the combined library and hotel development of $512 \pm$ spaces on weekday late afternoon. The peak weekend parking demand is projected to be $490 \pm$ parking spaces.

The following table summarizes the projected future parking adequacy for peak weekday conditions. Future supply is projected to be inadequate to meet the future demand. We are projecting a future parking deficit of 22 spaces during the peak weekday hour of operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>SUPPLY</th>
<th>DEMAND</th>
<th>ADEQUACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>(96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The parking concept of the expanded library of 54 parking spaces does not meet the City parking code requirement. However, a shared parking arrangement involving the expanded library and potential hotel improves the parking scenario for the expanded library.

At the Request of the City, Walker developed a parking concept design for a structure on the All Saints Episcopal site. After reviewing the site plan and pdf drawings provided by the City and considering several options, Walker developed two concept designs for a structure on the site.

Since the completion of this assignment, it has come to our attention that it may not be possible to enter into a shared parking arrangement with the potential hotel, if or when the development comes to fruition. Under these circumstances, Walker has review several addition options for alternative parking for the Winter Park Library.
At the Request of the City, Walker developed a parking concept design for a structure on the All Saints Episcopal site. After reviewing the site plan and pdf drawings provided by the City and considering several options, Walker developed two concept designs for a structure on the site.

The first concept is for a three level single thread structure with 90 degree parking and 8’9” wide parking stalls. The structure would have approximately 175 total spaces with an efficiency of approximately 400 s.f./stall. The projected construction cost could be in the $18,000 - $20,000 range per parking space. This concept would have flat bays facing Lyman Avenue. The concept drawings for the Church Site – Parking Option 1 can be found at the end of this report.

The second concept is for a four level double thread structure with 60 degree angled parking and 8’9” wide parking stalls. The structure would have approximately 206 total spaces with an efficiency of approximately 377 s.f./stall. The projected construction cost could be in the $18,000 to $20,000 range per parking space. This concept would require excavation of half level below grade. The concept drawing for the Church Site – Parking Option 2 can be found at the end of this report.
BACKGROUND

The City of Winter Park is proposing an expansion project of its Library that will double the size of the facility. The existing Library is a 3-story building of approximately 32,900 square feet and the proposed horizontal addition is approximately 30,000 square feet. This addition will be constructed on the south side of the existing building and will consume approximately 14 of the existing 68 surface parking spaces. Immediately to the west of the Library, it is proposed that a JW Marriott 250± room hotel will be constructed with a parking structure situated between the two facilities.
Figure 1: Outline of Library Expansion and Potential Hotel

Source Data: Google Earth, 2008
The purpose of this parking consulting analysis is to ascertain the number of parking spaces that will be needed by each of the projects as well as the feasibility of shared parking. The end result will be to determine the number of spaces that will be necessary to serve both facilities under normal operating conditions. Walker Parking Consultants will conduct this analysis in a similar manner to that in which we have conducted Library studies for many clients throughout the United States. We use this past experience on similar projects as well as analyzing your unique circumstances to provide a final analysis.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

TASK 1 - SUPPLY/DEMAND PROGRAMMING ANALYSIS

1. Meet with representatives of the City of Winter Park, including Public Library representatives, to further clarify study objectives, define study area, review the work plan and update the schedule.

2. In conjunction with Winter Park Public Library representatives, determine present and proposed site utilization, pedestrian and vehicular traffic circulation patterns, present and proposed buildings, and land uses connected with the facility.

3. Obtain from Library staff data concerning number of visitors, number of employees, shift schedules, delivery schedules, etc.

4. Inventory the existing public and private parking supply, including breakdown of restrictions on use, and hourly, daily, or monthly parking fees.

5. Meet with representatives to determine space requirements for the proposed Library expansion.

6. Collect field data, including parking counts.

TASK 2 – SHARED PARKING ANALYSIS

1. Meet with representatives of the City of Winter Park, the Library and the hotel development team to clarify study objectives, define the project area, review the work plan and update the schedule.
2. Obtain additional background from the above mentioned representatives which will include, but not necessarily limited to the following:
   a. Program data for the proposed land uses such as square footage, types of uses, and tenant mix.
   b. Site plans (to scale) and aerial photography (if available).
   c. Copies of any construction and phasing plans for the proposed improvements.
   d. Any parking restrictions such as reserved parking.

3. Obtain and review the City of Winter Park’s zoning ordinance. Determine the parking requirements for the subject development per this zoning ordinance.

4. Prepare a shared parking analysis employing the Urban Land Institute’s Shared Parking methodology to project future parking space requirements of the subject development. This analysis will include a stratification of parking demand by:
   a. Hour of day
   b. Month of year
   c. Weekday vs. Saturday

5. Develop a shared parking model to project parking demand characteristics of the subject development in the future.

6. Prepare a draft report and submit four original copies and an Adobe PDF copy to Winter Park representatives for their review and comments. For any recommended solutions that will require capital expenditures, Walker will provide an estimate based upon its experience of implementing similar solutions.

7. Obtain comments from Winter Park representatives and if necessary, revise the draft one time. Issue four original copies of the final report plus one Adobe PDF electronic copy of report suitable for reproduction and distribution.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions are provided to help clarify some of the parking terms that are used throughout this report. Note that some of these definitions are abbreviated versions. More complete and detailed discussions are provided throughout the report, as necessary.
- Demand generator – any building, structure, business, or event that brings individuals into the study area, thereby increasing parking demand and occupancy.

- Design day – this day represents parking conditions that the parking system must be able to support.

- Inventory – the total number of parking spaces counted during the survey day observations within the study area.

- Parking adequacy – a figure expressing the number of parking spaces remaining when demand is subtracted from the supply.

- Parking demand – the number of parking spaces required by various user groups and visitors to the area on a design day at the peak hour.

- Patron or User – any individual parking in the study area

- Peak hour – the peak hour represents the busiest hour of the parking demand.

- Transient – a short-term parking patron, usually parking less than six hours, and typically a visitor.

STUDY METHODOLOGY

An important concept in a parking analysis is the selection of an appropriate assessment period. It is not practical to design the parking system for the peak accumulation of vehicles that might conceivably occur and have a substantial number of spaces sit vacant for the more than 3,000 remaining hours of operation per year. At the same time, it is not appropriate to design to an average condition and have an insufficient supply for half of the hours in a year. Analogous to this thought is the fact that traffic engineers do not design street systems to handle the peak volumes that will ever occur. Walker’s database utilizes the 85th percentile as an appropriate design standard, based on our knowledge base and experience.
The methodology used in this study consists of: 1) reviewing background information and prospective data provided by the library administration; 2) observing current conditions and utilizing library administrative observations of peak conditions; 3) assessing the master plan concepts and potential area development documents (JW Marriott Hotel) to evaluate parking conditions.

It is important to define the conditions upon which a parking system should be designed. Some organizations intend to provide adequate parking for every potential parking facility user, every day of the year. Consequently, a substantial number of parking spaces are vacant throughout most of the year. Then benefit of such a parking system is that parkers, whether they are employees or visitors, always have adequate parking. As is commonly the case, most organizations would rather have fewer of their assets utilized as parking; therefore, these organizations plan for a parking system that meets the needs of its parking patrons most days of the year, but less than every day of the year. The disadvantage of this type of parking system is that from time to time, parking demand may exceed the parking supply. This could become critical when a large event is scheduled at times when parking demand is expected, under normal conditions, to be at its highest.

The level at which parking demand should be accommodated is a policy decision that must be made by the client. For the purposes of this analysis, adequate parking conditions are defined as those that satisfy the design statistics recommended for this study.

Typically it is impossible for Walker to identify, in advance, a day that will perfectly represent the design day on which to collect parking occupancy data. For the methodology of this study, the process for estimating parking consists of observing occupancy during site visits and utilizing current parking condition observations provided by library administration.

This information, along with client provided master plan concepts and area development concepts, are used to project future parking demand.
PROJECT SITE

A review of the area immediately surrounding the Winter Parking Library reveals that current and future parking demand will be generated by the library and the potential hotel to be located west of the library.

The following figure provides the reader with a visual representation of the study area.
Figure 2: Study Area

Source data: Google Earth, 2008
CURRENT PARKING SUPPLY

The current parking supply on the library lot is 68 spaces. In addition, the library is using the unimproved lot to the west, the site of the potential hotel parking structure. The library staff parks in the unimproved lot; approximately 25 to 30 vehicles.

CURRENT PARKING OCCUPANCY

Walker’s demand analysis examined the parking demand generated on Tuesday, August 26, 2008. During that peak hour, as described by library staff, there were several spaces available in the library’s parking lot while staff and several additional vehicles parked on the unimproved lot. Based on our observations, library staff’s observations, and daily people counts at the library, we were able to determine that the existing parking inventory is sufficient to handle the visitor parking requirements most days of the year. However, if the staff were unable to park on the unimproved lot to the west of the library, the library parking lot would probably not be sufficient to handle the demand on busy days.

Walker created a parking model using our database of library information and the information listed above to project the following library parking demand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>WEEKDAY</th>
<th>WEEKEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>32,908 GLA</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The current projected occupancy model appears to confirm Walker’s occupancy counts during our site visit, and the Library Staff’s observations.
CURRENT PARKING ADEQUACY

Parking adequacy is determined by the ability of the parking supply to accommodate the parking demand. A positive or negative remainder indicates that either a parking surplus or parking deficit exists. By comparing the current parking demand to the existing parking supply, the current adequacy of the existing parking system can be estimated. The study area currently has a parking shortage of approximately 23 spaces. The following table summarizes the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>PARKING SUPPLY</th>
<th>WEEKDAY DEMAND</th>
<th>PARKING ADEQUACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although the current parking supply of 68 on-site parking spaces is not sufficient to meet the design day parking demand of 91 vehicles, the use of the unimproved parking lot west of the library (by the library staff) allows the visitors to have adequate parking.
FUTURE DEMAND GENERATORS

The parking demand for the study area is projected to arise from existing and planned improvements and developments within the immediate area of the library; specifically, the library expansion and the potential hotel.

The Winter Parking Library has a conceptual plan to expand horizontally south into their existing parking lot. The library is contemplating a 30,000 square foot expansion. Although the size of the library will almost double, from 32,908 square feet to 62,908 square feet, the library staff is expected to increase minimally. This information was provided by the library staff.

Walker used its database of library parking studies, the current parking conditions at the library, and client provided information to project the future parking demand. The following table summarizes the projected peak parking demand for parking for the potential 62,908 square foot library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>WEEKDAY</th>
<th>WEEKEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>62,908 GLA</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Walker Parking Consultants, 2008*

In November 2007 Langford CP, LLC presented the Winter Park City Commission with a development plan for The Langford Hotel to be located on the vacant site just west of the Winter Park Library. The following information concerning the potential hotel is taken from that presentation and used to generate the parking demand.

- Hotel: 250 rooms
- Restaurant/lounge: 4,395 square feet
- Meeting/Banquet space: 14,583 square feet
- Spa: 11,638 square feet
Walker prepared a parking demand model for the potential hotel using the Urban Land Institute’s (ULI) parking methodology, Walker’s database of hotel studies, and the above listed hotel criteria, to project the future parking demand. The following table summarizes the projected parking demand for parking for the potential hotel development.

Table 4: Projected Unadjusted Parking Demand - Hotel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>WEEKDAY</th>
<th>WEEKEND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spa</td>
<td>11,638 GLA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>250 rooms</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/Lounge</td>
<td>4,395 GLA</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting/Banquet</td>
<td>14,583 GLA</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>250 rooms</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>861</strong></td>
<td><strong>818</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The hotel parking demand represented in the above table represents the unadjusted parking demand. That is, the parking demand generated by each user group during their individual peak hour of operation.

The following table summarizes the hotel parking demand for the overall hotel peak hour of operation, the adjusted parking demand.

Table 5: Projected Adjusted Parking Demand - Hotel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>UNADJUSTED DEMAND</th>
<th>ADJUSTED DEMAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spa</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/Lounge</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting/Banquet</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Customer/Guest Spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>770</strong></td>
<td><strong>382</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Employee Spaces</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Parking Spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>818</strong></td>
<td><strong>403</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SHARED PARKING ANALYSIS

In order to calculate the parking adequacy for the combined library expansion and the potential hotel development, Walker prepared a shared parking analysis.

The following figure provides the reader with a visual concept of the projected future parking used in the shared parking analysis.
Figure 3: Represents A General Concept Of The Library Expansion, Library Parking Lot, And Hotel Parking Structure

Library Site
B’-RetaIn as Library
Expand to 60,000 sf
Joint Parking W/ The Langford Hotel

Source data: ZHA, 2008
Walker prepared a Shared Parking Analysis employing the Urban Land Institute’s (ULI) shared parking methodology to determine the operational parking space demand for the combined library expansion and hotel development. The shared parking methodology developed by the Urban Land Institute is designed to determine the peak accumulation of vehicles for the specific mix of uses proposed for a development. Walker utilized the following development data to build a shared parking model for this assignment.

- Library 62,908 square feet
- Hotel 250 rooms
- Restaurant/Lounge 4,395 square feet
- Meeting/Banquet space 14,583 square feet
- Spa 11,638 square feet

Based on the information listed above, Walker developed a shared parking model for the combined developments that shows a projected peak parking demand of approximately 512 should occur on a weekday late afternoon (5:00 pm) in June. Walker made adjustments to the shared parking model to reflect the peak library activity according to the daily and monthly people counts provided by the library. Walker adjusted the drive and non-captive ratios to reflect the uniqueness of the combined library and hotel developments.

The drive ratio is the percentage of parkers driving, as opposed to walking, taking public transportation, etc., to a particular land use and generating parking demand. The non-captive ratio is the percentage of parkers who are not already counted as being parked. Generally, we try to count vehicles as being generated by the land use that was the primary trip purpose or generated the longest patron parking duration.

Our shared parking model suggests the need for 512± parking spaces on weekday late afternoon (5:00 pm) in June. The peak hour was generated automatically by the shared parking model which assumed above average occupancies in most user groups during this period. The peak weekend parking demand is projected to be 490± parking spaces. This peak demand occurs late afternoon (5:00 pm) in July. The following tables summarize the peak parking demand under a shared parking analysis for the weekdays and weekends, respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>UNADJ DEMAND</th>
<th>MONTH ADJ JUN</th>
<th>PK HR ADJ 5:00 PM</th>
<th>NON CAPTIVE DAYTIME</th>
<th>DRIVE RATIO DAYTIME</th>
<th>DEMAND 5:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/Lounge</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting/Banquet</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Customer/Guest Spaces</td>
<td>921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Employee Spaces</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Parking Spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,034</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% reduction</td>
<td><strong>512</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Projected Weekend Parking Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>UNADJ DEMAND</th>
<th>MONTH ADJ JUL</th>
<th>PK HR ADJ 5:00 PM</th>
<th>NON CAPTIVE DAYTIME</th>
<th>DRIVE RATIO DAYTIME</th>
<th>DEMAND 5:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/Lounge</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting/Banquet</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Customer/Guest Spaces</td>
<td>849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Employee Spaces</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Parking Spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>944</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% reduction</td>
<td><strong>490</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By utilizing the shared parking approach, we show a 50 percent reduction in the need for parking on weekdays and a 48 percent reduction for weekends, versus stand alone facilities for the library, hotel, restaurant, lounge, meeting/banquet facilities, and spa.

FUTURE PARKING SUPPLY

The future parking supply is anticipated to be as follows:

- Library Parking Lot 54 spaces
- Hotel Parking Garage 436 spaces
- Total Parking Inventory 490 spaces

The 54 library lot parking spaces at grade are based upon a client provided concept drawing dated June 16, 2008. The 54 parking spaces would be located west of the existing and expanded library and east of the projected hotel parking garage (see Figure No. 3).

The 436 hotel parking spaces are based on the revised November 26, 2007 plans presented to the Winter Park City Commission.

PARKING CODE REQUIREMENTS

Walker researched the Winter Park, Florida parking code requirements. Utilizing the information in the Winter Park Code of Ordinance, Walker established the following parking requirements for the combined library and hotel developments.

| Table 8: Winter Park Parking Code Requirement |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| USE                         | RATIO          | REQUIREMENT    |
| Library                     | 62,908/Sq. Ft. | 1/250 sf       | 252 |
| Spa                         | 11,638/Sq. Ft. | 1/250 sf       | 47  |
| Hotel                       | 250 /Rooms     | 1/room         | 250 |
| Restaurant/Lounge           | 4,395/Sq. Ft.  | 1/50 sf        | 18  |
| Banquet/Meeting             | 14,583/Sq. Ft. | 1/250          | 58  |
| Total Requirement           |                |                | 624 |

According to Walker’s interpretation of the Winter Park Code of Ordinance, the expanded library would require approximately 252 parking spaces. The hotel (including rooms, spa, restaurant, and banquet/meeting rooms) would require approximately 372 parking spaces.

It appears that the projected hotel parking supply of 436 spaces will meet the code requirements of 372 parking spaces. With the expansion, the library has a 54 space parking lot and will not meet the City code requirement of 252 parking spaces.

Over all, the combination of library and hotel parking inventory of 490 spaces does not meet the City code requirement of 624 parking spaces.

**FUTURE PARKING ADEQUACY**

The following table summarizes the projected future parking adequacy for peak weekday conditions using the figure previously mentioned, future projected demand and future supply. Future supply is projected to be inadequate to meet the future demand. We are projecting a future parking deficit of 22 spaces during the peak weekday hour of operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>SUPPLY</th>
<th>DEMAND</th>
<th>ADEQUACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the concept plans for both the library expansion and the hotel development, we are projecting a small parking deficit of approximately 22 spaces during the peak hour of operation.

In addition, the parking concept of the expanded library of 54 parking spaces does not meet the City parking code requirement for libraries of 252 spaces.

However, a shared parking arrangement involving the expanded library and potential hotel improves the parking scenario for the expanded library.
INTRODUCTION

Since the completion of this assignment, it has come to our attention that it may not be possible to enter into a shared parking arrangement with the potential hotel, if or when the development comes to fruition. Under these circumstances, Walker has review several additional options for alternative parking for the Winter Park Library. Of the options, Walker considered the following appear to have at least some merit.

- Create a parking structure on the All Saints Episcopal site.
- Keep the existing parking in force by expanding the library above the existing parking lot to the south of the library.
- Expand the library to west instead of the south. This may allow enough area south of the library to build a parking structure on site.
- Lease or purchase the adjoining land next to the library that is part of the potential hotel site. Improved surface parking on this site could eliminate the current parking deficit, and could potentially handle the future parking demand depending on the actual expansion of the library.

CONCLUSION

At the Request of the City, Walker developed a parking concept design for a structure on the All Saints Episcopal site. After reviewing the site plan and pdf drawings provided by the City and considering several options, Walker developed two concept designs for a structure on the site.

The first concept is for a three level single thread structure with 90 degree parking and 8'-9" wide parking stalls. The structure would have approximately 175 total spaces with an efficiency of approximately 400 s.f./stall. The projected construction cost could be in the $18,000 - $20,000 range per parking space. This concept would have flat bays facing Lyman Avenue. See the following Church Site – Parking Option 1 drawings for a visual concept.
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INTRODUCTION

Background

The City of Winter Park, Florida, has engaged Walter P. Moore and Associates, Inc., to prepare the following parking demand analysis for the proposed development of a new Community Center. The purpose of this parking study is to determine the future parking requirements associated with the new Community Center and to ensure that the parking needs will successfully be addressed during the planning and design stages.

The report includes the following primary areas of study:

- Evaluation of the specific building characteristics of the proposed Community Center including various programming requirements and uses.
- Forecast of parking demand for the proposed Center, isolating the peak conditions which illustrates the period in which parking demand is at the highest.
- Evaluation of the proposed parking supply currently planned for the new Community Center and the surrounding area.
- Recommendations on an adequate supply of parking that will contribute to the overall success of the proposed Community Center.
Project Summary

The proposed Winter Park Community Center (the Center) will provide a world class fitness and recreational facility designed for citizens of all ages. The Center will include multifunctional swimming pools; senior center and teen room; exercise facilities and game rooms; computer labs and study rooms; multipurpose and community space; and an approximate 11,700 sq. ft. gymnasium. The Center is surrounded by a park facility that includes playground equipment, a water “spray” park and an exterior stage.

The new Center will offer approximately 38,200 sq. ft. of usable (conditioned) space, nearly doubling the existing facility which has an estimated 20,000 sq. ft.

Specific building components include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>11,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Rooms</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness Room</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Room</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game Room</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Room</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Center</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to these itemized building components, the Center will include a computer center, youth room, administrative offices, locker and restrooms, kitchen facility and the necessary MEP/Storage area. The following image displays the current floor plan for the new Community Center.

**Fig. 1 – Floor Plan**

Figure 2 illustrates the current floor plan for the pool building.

**Fig. 2 – Pool Building Floor Plan**
Outdoor Amenities and Pool Room

In addition to the proposed building components, the Community Center will include the following outdoor amenities:

- Multipurpose Swimming Pool
- Pool Room – 3,200 sq. ft. Will include locker facilities as well as an equipment room and storage.
- Park and Playground
- Water “Spray” Park (Existing)
- Community Garden

Figure 4 illustrates the current site plan for the proposed Center.

Figure 4- Site Plan
Project Location

The new Community Center will be centrally located in Winter Park utilizing the site of the existing center. The site location is bounded by New England Avenue between Pennsylvania Avenue and Capen Avenue.

Figure 4 depicts the location of the new Center.
Current Parking Design

The new facility has been designed to provide a total of 100 parking spaces. This supply includes 95 off-street parking spaces located on a surface lot directly behind (to the north) of the Community Center and Swimming Pool facility. The 95 spaces include 84 spaces located in the surface lot off of Capen Avenue and 11 spaces located on Welborne Court. Of the 95 spaces, 5 will be ADA accessible handicap spaces. The parking area will be accessed from both Capen and Pennsylvania Avenue.

In addition to the on-site parking lot, there are 5 on-street parking spaces located in front of the Community Center on New England Avenue as well as a designated on-street loading area for buses and passenger vehicles.

Figure 5 depicts the on-site parking.

Fig. 5 – On-site parking
Additional Parking Supply

There is additional surface parking available on municipal (public) property located adjacent to the planned Community Center with a capacity of 111 spaces.

Figure 5 - Site Plan (Additional Parking Supply)
Figure 6 – Site Plan (Municipal Parking)

This public parking is well within acceptable walking distances of 300 feet and should be considered as viable parking supply for the Community Center.

Total Parking Supply

The following tables summarize the available parking supply of 211 spaces that are either on-site or immediately adjacent and within a convenient walking distance of less than 300 feet to the Center:

On Site Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Space</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Municipal Lot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Space</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Parking Supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Space</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>211</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective Parking Supply

The current plans include 100 spaces that are on-site and dedicated to the Community Center. In addition, the adjacent municipal lot will provide 111 public parking spaces which are within a very convenient and safe walking distance of less than 300 feet.

The additional parking area is designated as a Municipal Lot and open for public use and has recently been expanded from 52 to 111 spaces. Occupancy counts were performed prior to the completion of the lot expansion during busiest weekday time periods. At that
time, it was determined that there is always available parking with as much as 40% being vacant during the 2 PM to 3 PM weekday hour. Greater percentages of vacancy will occur with the expansion of the lot, especially during evening hours when the adjacent businesses experience less activity and the Community Center is experiencing its peak activity.

Therefore, it is determined that a "shared parking" approach for the Municipal Lots could be applied for the Community Center effective parking supply. It is recommended that a conservative 30% of the Municipal Lot spaces would be vacant during peak weekdays and experience even greater vacancy nights and weekends.

The effective supply is summarized in table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Space</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Site</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% Vacancy of Municipal Lot</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective supply is 134 spaces.

Definitions

Several terms used in this report have unique meanings when used within this type of analysis. To help clarify these terms and enhance understanding by the reader, definitions for some of these terms are presented below:

- GFS – Gross Floor Space.
- Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) – The international educational and scientific association of transportation professionals who facilitate the application of technology and scientific principles to research, planning, functional design, implementation, operation, policy development and management for any mode of transportation.

- Modal Split – The percentage of travelers to the development using a particular mode of transportation. In the case of this study, a 100% modal split indicates only cars being used to access the development, and a 0% modal split indicates only public transportation and/or walking being used to access the development.

- Occupancy – The number of parking spaces occupied by vehicles. This information is gathered by performing parked vehicle counts in each sub-area located within the study area.

- Parking Demand – The number of spaces required by various user groups and visitors to the subject property.

- Peak Hour – The peak hour represents the busiest hour of the day for parking demand.

- Synergy Reduction – The reduction of required parking caused by the effects of applying the modal split.

Methodology

This study includes a supply and demand analysis for the proposed Community Center. The main focus of the study is to evaluate the proposed building characteristics and program requirements that
will establish the basis for future parking demand at the Center. The study will evaluate the existing municipal code requirements and benchmark facilities with similar size and characteristics.

Scope of Services

The following summarizes the Scope of Services that have been established for this study:

The Parking Consultant will:

1. Work with the City and other Design Consultants to ascertain the requirements for the work, will attend necessary meetings, will be available for general consultation, will review and provide input necessary and documentation, and will make appropriate recommendations.

2. Perform the work in a manner, sequence and timing to allow coordination with those of the other consultants for the Project.

Parking Demand Study

1. Hold initial meeting with the City to finalize scope of services and understanding of deliverables, discuss expectations of study and identify variables and sources of the City and other consultant supplied information.

2. Provide detailed estimate of parking demands by modeling of the Project’s land use parking generators as a cumulative total for peak demands for weekdays and weekends. Factors used in calculations shall include, peak hour
accumulations, shared trip synergy and propensity for walk-in and mass transit activities.

3. Estimates shall incorporate published design criteria, i.e., ITE and ULI’s Shared Parking shall be used, but also Parking Consultant’s own empirical data as well as field survey collected data and consideration for local influences that affect parking demand.

4. Prepare report of the results of parking demand estimates calculated using peak hour accumulations, shared trip synergies and alternate methods of transportation. Report shall define concepts of shared parking demand and provide documentation of all assumptions used.

5. Hold meeting (or conference call) with the City to review report findings.

6. Modify report to reflect revisions as provided by the City if conditions or assumptions should change.
ITE Projected Parking Demand

The baseline estimated parking needs for the planned development of the Community Center have been calculated using design standards for parking demand ratios as established by the Institute of Transportation Engineers Publication *Parking Generation 3rd Edition*. These standards for parking demand are for land uses in a both a suburban and urban setting and therefore, are the basis for establishing the maximum parking demand and more realistic parking demands for which discounts for “urban environment” transportation synergies shall be applied. The design parking demand ratios provided by this professional organization are summarized in the Table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Peak Demand Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Community Center</td>
<td>3.38 Spces per 1,000 sf GFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Community Center</td>
<td>1.15 Spaces per 1,000 sf of GFS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this analysis we are assuming a GSF of 40,000 square feet for the proposed Community Center. This should be considered a conservative estimate as the program area or conditioned area is estimated at 38,200 square feet.

Based on these ratios, the maximum parking demand required would be (40,000 GFS / 296 GFS = 135.14) **135** spaces for a suburban community center and a maximum parking demand of (40,000 GFS / 869 GFS = 46.03) **46** spaces for an urban community center.
ITE projects a wide variation (135 spaces vs. 46 spaces) in their parking demand based on the location and surrounding environment. The two classifications are either being the 100% auto dependant suburbs or location with more transportation alternatives of the urban city environment.

With the creation of 100 spaces at the new Center and the existing capacity at the municipal lot, the effective parking supply totals 134 spaces. This effective supply is consistent with the higher ITE parking demand for a suburban community center.

Walter P Moore Projected Parking Demand

It is the opinion of Walter P Moore that the Community Center is located in what would not be described as suburban setting (with 100% dependency on automobiles) nor is it located in a neighborhood with the criteria meeting a dense urban setting.

The City of Winter Park and the location of the Community Center do meet the parameters for a mixed-use, pedestrian, bicycle and bus transit friendly neighborhood. The City is a great example of Smart Growth wherein development (and more importantly redevelopment) is encouraged in areas where infrastructure such as streets, utilities and public transportation already exist. Therefore, the range for the parking demand should be somewhere in between the high and low range (1/296 GFS vs. 1/869 GFS) as provided by ITE. The more accurate ratio for this project would reflect a 25% Synergy Reduction from a 100% auto dependant suburban model as reported by ITE. This reduction reflects the City of Winter Park’s ability to walk and bicycle safely, good access to public transit and the likelihood of a number of user’s of the Community Center being dropped-off or brought by shuttle.
Based on these findings, our recommendation is that there is a peak demand of 118 spaces with a parking ratio of 1/339 GFS. This peak occurs between 5 PM and 6 PM Monday – Friday. There will be higher peak parking demands that occur nights and weekends, however, the Municipal Lot should have higher vacancy to absorb the higher demand.

Parking Requirements per Municipal Code

The proposed site is currently zoned as Public and Quasi-Public (PQP) district. As defined by the Winter Park Land Development Code - Supplement #29, the parking requirements for the proposed site are as follows:

Sec. 58-81 Off-street parking and loading regulations item (3) f. Community centers, libraries, post offices, etc: One space for each 250 square feet of gross floor space.

Based on a Gross Floor Space (GFS) of 40,000, the zoning parking calculation (40,000 GFS / 250 GFS = 160.00) would require 160 parking spaces.

Proposed Amendment to the Parking Code

Based on the current plans to provide 100 parking spaces (85 off-street, 10 Welborne Court and 5 on-street spaces) the current provided parking ratio is 1 space/400 GSF. The variation is -60 spaces from the requirements of Sec. 58-81 (3) f. of the Winter Park Land Development Code.

However, assuming there are a minimum 30% of the spaces (111 x .30 = 34) at the adjacent Municipal Lot that are vacant, the provided
parking supply is 134 spaces and the resulting ratio is 1 space/298. This variation is -26 spaces from the requirements of Sec. 58-81 (3) f. of the Winter Park Land Development Code.

Parking Supply and Demand at Existing Building

The existing Community Center located at the proposed site includes 32 surface parking spaces that support the 20,000 sq. ft. Center. This amounts to a parking ration of 1 space per 625 square feet of GFS.

Our surveys indicate that the existing parking supply adequately supports the existing Center. Of the 32 spaces, only 20 spaces were occupied, equating to a utilization of approximately 62.5%.

Comparative Parking Demand

The following Community Centers have been selected for comparison to the parking ratio proposed for the Winter Park Community Center:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Center Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Building GFS</th>
<th>Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Parking Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter Park Community Center</td>
<td>Winter Park, Florida</td>
<td>40,000 sf</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1/298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood Community Center</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Florida</td>
<td>34,000 sf</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1/653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Greenwood Community Center and Aquatics Complex</td>
<td>Clearwater, Florida</td>
<td>28,000 sf</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1/509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Harbor Community Center</td>
<td>Safety Harbor, Florida</td>
<td>22,200 sf</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1/322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Forest Park Recreation Center</td>
<td>Oldsmar, Florida</td>
<td>10,000 sf</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1/333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1/423</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking Management Strategies

In an effort to better manage the parking supply supporting the proposed Community Center, the City may consider implementing the following parking management strategies. These strategies would be intended to maintain an adequate supply of short-term parking for the users of the Center.

- **Time Restriction** – Time restrictions could be applied to both on-street and off-street spaces providing a balanced parking supply for the various users.

- **Off-Site Employee Parking** – The primary parking lot at the Center should be reserved for visitors of the Center. Therefore, employee parking should be designated on the municipal lot or other secondary location.

- **Maximize On-Street Parking** – Evaluate neighboring streets to determine if additional on-street parking could be designated. Consider angled parking to maximize on-street spaces.

- **Mass Transit Incentive** – Develop incentives for both employees and visitors to use existing mass transit.

- **Additional Shuttle Services** – Consider alternative shuttle systems possibly partnering with nearby residential or commercial developments.
SUMMARY

The data presented in this report is based on design information and documented case studies of similar Community Centers. The recommendations for parking supply specified will allow for sufficient parking so as to allow for safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian traffic flows both outside and interior to the parking facilities. The recommended supply is designed to meet the peak parking demand that will only be experienced during a few hours of the year and all other times there will be an abundance of parking available.

Based on these findings, our recommendation is that there is a peak demand of **118 spaces** with a parking ratio of 1/339 GFS. This peak occurs between 5 PM and 6 PM Monday – Friday. There will be higher peak parking demands that occur nights and weekends, however, the Municipal Lot should have higher vacancy to absorb the higher demand.

The parking code should be amended to reduce the parking requirement for Community Centers from the current 1 space/250 GFS to 1 space/339 GFS, which is consistent with the actual peak demand of the Center. Furthermore, the code amendment should include additional reductions and/or considerations for the available public parking supply located adjacent to the Center.

Sample Amendment:

*Parking and loading regulations* **Community Centers:** One space for each 339 square feet of gross floor space shall be required. This requirement may be fulfilled using on-site parking spaces as well as identified available public parking spaces within 300 feet of the Center.
The code amendment can be justified as follows:

A) Community Center generates less demand than the current Code Requirement.

B) There is available parking supply with a very convenient and safe walking distance of less than 300 feet.

C) The required additional parking of 60 spaces would require an additional asphalt parking area of nearly 30,000 SF with additional costs of $3,000 to $5,000 per space and excess storm drainage impacts where the study demonstrates that the parking is not needed.
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