Meeting Called to Order

Invocation
Minister David Fitzgerald, First Christian Church

Pledge of Allegiance

Approval of Agenda

Mayor’s Report

a. Presentation - Painting of historic Kummer-Kilbourne House from Alan Keene, Keewin Real Property Company
b. Proclamation - “Day of Happiness”
c. Proclamation – 2016 General and Referendum Election

City Manager’s Report

Welcome

Welcome to the City of Winter Park City Commission meeting. The agenda for regularly scheduled Commission meetings is posted in City Hall the Tuesday before the meeting. Agendas and all backup material supporting each agenda item are available in the City Clerk’s office or on the city’s website at cityofwinterpark.org.

Meeting Procedures

Persons desiring to address the Commission MUST fill out and provide to the City Clerk a yellow “Request to Speak” form located by the door. After being recognized by the Mayor, persons are asked to come forward and speak from the podium, state their name and address, and direct all remarks to the Commission as a body and not to individual members of the Commission, staff or audience.

Citizen comments at 5 p.m. and each section of the agenda where public comment is allowed are limited to three (3) minutes. The yellow light indicator will remind you that you have one (1) minute left. Large groups are asked to name a spokesperson. This period of time is for comments and not for questions directed to the Commission or staff for immediate answer. Questions directed to the City Commission will be referred to staff and should be answered by staff within a reasonable period of time following the date of the meeting. Order and decorum will be preserved at all meetings. Personal, impertinent or slanderous remarks are not permitted. Thank you for participating in your city government.

Agenda

1 Meeting Called to Order

2 Invocation Minister David Fitzgerald, First Christian Church
Pledge of Allegiance

3 Approval of Agenda

4 Mayor’s Report

a. Presentation - Painting of historic Kummer-Kilbourne House from Alan Keene, Keewin Real Property Company
b. Proclamation - “Day of Happiness”
c. Proclamation – 2016 General and Referendum Election

*Projected Time
*Subject to change
6 City Attorney’s Report

7 Non-Action Items


8 Citizen Comments | 5 p.m. or soon thereafter
(if the meeting ends earlier than 5:00 p.m., the citizen comments will be at the end of the meeting) (Three (3) minutes are allowed for each speaker; not to exceed a total of 30 minutes for this portion of the meeting)

9 Consent Agenda

a. Approve the minutes of February 8, 2016.
b. Approve the following purchase and contracts:
   1. PR159432 to T.V. Diversified Inc. for Lift Station #28 Wet Well & Man Hole Repairs; $104,373
   2. Amendment 4 to CDM Smith, Inc. – RFQ-2-2012, Continuing Contracts for Professional, Architectural & Engineering Services (Storm Water Management & Design) and authorize the Mayor to execute the renewal.
   4. Amendment 4 to GAI Consultants, Inc. – RFQ-2-2012, Continuing Contracts for Professional, Architectural & Engineering Services (General Civil & Public Facility Engineering) and authorize the Mayor to execute the renewal.
   5. Amendment 4 to Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc. – RFQ-2-2012, Continuing Contracts for Professional, Architectural & Engineering Services (Transportation Planning & Engineering) and authorize the Mayor to execute the renewal.
   6. Amendment 1 to The Fishel Company – IFB-8-2014, Underground Utility Services and authorize the Mayor to execute the renewal.
   7. Amendment 1 to Infratech Corporation – IFB-8-2014, Underground Utility Services and authorize the Mayor to execute the renewal.
   8. Amendment 1 to HDD of Florida LLC – IFB-8-2014, Underground Utility Services and authorize the Mayor to execute the renewal.
   9. Amendment 1 to Young’s Communication Co., Inc. – IFB-8-2014, Underground Utility Services and authorize the Mayor to execute the renewal.
   10. Amendment 1 to Electricom LLC and Subsidiary – IFB-8-2014, Underground Utility Services and authorize the Mayor to execute the renewal.
11. Amendment 1 to Heart Utilities of Jacksonville – IFB-8-2014, Underground Utility Services and authorize the Mayor to execute the renewal.

10 Action Items Requiring Discussion

a. Funding options for acquisition of property at 1111 W. Fairbanks Avenue (former bowling alley)

11 Public Hearings

a. Resolution – Designating 118 West Comstock Avenue as a historic resource on the Winter Park Register of Historic Places

b. Resolution – Designating 1574 Sunset Drive as a historic resource on the Winter Park Register of Historic Places

c. Ordinance – Authorizing the issuance of not exceeding $21,000,000 Electric Refunding Revenue Bonds to finance the refunding of a portion of its outstanding Electric Refunding and Improvement Revenue Bonds, Series 2007 (1)

d. Request of Alfredas Sumanas for the property located at 1240 Fairview Avenue:
   - Ordinance – Amending the “Comprehensive Plan” Future Land Use Map to change from Office to a Commercial designation (1)
   - Ordinance – Amending the Official Zoning Map to change from Office (O-1) District zoning to Commercial (C-3) District (1)

e. Request of Winter Park Town Center Ltd:
   - Conditional use approval to demolish and rebuild approximately 25,000 square feet of retail building area within the Winter Park Village Shopping Center at 402 and 490 N. Orlando Avenue, zoned C-1.

f. Request of Z Properties:
   - Subdivision or lot split approval to divide the property at 360 Beloit Avenue, zoned R-1A, into two single family building lots.

12 City Commission Reports

a. Commissioner Seidel
b. Commissioner Sprinkel
c. Commissioner Cooper
d. Commissioner McMacken
e. Mayor Leary
appeals & assistance

“If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the Commission with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he/she will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, he/she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.” (F. S. 286.0105).

“Persons with disabilities needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact the City Clerk’s Office (407-599-3277) at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.”
Below are issues of interest to the Commission and community that are currently being worked on by staff, but do not currently require action on the Commission agenda. These items are being tracked to provide the Commission and community the most up to date information regarding the status of the various issues. The City Manager will be happy to answer questions or provide additional updates at the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>issue</th>
<th>update</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad crossing update</td>
<td>Four of Winter Park’s street crossings are included in FDOT’s CIP for installing concrete panels.</td>
<td>FDOT is expected to complete the work in June 2016. The City and FDOT are working in cooperation to complete the improvements at Lyman/New York Avenues in February 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visioning Steering Committee</td>
<td>Inviting community to participate at <a href="http://www.visionwinterpark.org">www.visionwinterpark.org</a>.</td>
<td>Setting up neighborhood meetings for April.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope Baptist Church Project</td>
<td>The exterior of the buildings, accessible restrooms, landscaping, parking and drainage have been completed and approved. The Pastor has agreed to obtain assistance of a designer to improve the architectural appearance of the buildings to include the area at the base of the structures. Awaiting response from Pastor.</td>
<td>Tabled at the October 26 Commission meeting to come back to the Commission at a later date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Point property</td>
<td>Attorney to review process and report back to the Commission.</td>
<td>To be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Park restrooms</td>
<td>Design is complete on two new restrooms by the new soccer fields and adjacent to the existing restrooms at the Little League fields.</td>
<td>Bid will be released by the week ending February 26.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once projects have been resolved, they will remain on the list for one additional meeting to share the resolution with the public and then be removed.
General Fund

One quarter of the way into the fiscal year General Fund revenues appear to be on track with annual budget projections. A few items of note include:

1. The largest portion of property tax revenues are received in the December – February timeframe.
2. Business taxes are renewed each October 1. Some additional revenue will be realized over the remainder of the fiscal year but the largest amount has already been received.
3. Building permit revenues are not quite as strong as they were last year but are on track with the budget.
4. Miscellaneous revenue is largely made up of investment earnings which reflect market value swings in the City’s investment portfolio. Values increased nicely this past fiscal year and dropped in the first quarter of the current year followed by a strong rebound in January. The City follows a buy and hold investment strategy in which the swings neither benefit nor harm the City as the Treasury and Agency securities invested in are paid off at par when the investment matures.

Departmental expenditures for the first quarter are in line with budgetary expectations. Operating transfers out include the City’s transfer to the CRA for tax increment revenue. This payment is required to be made by December 31. Transfers out will be exactly equal to the budget at the end of the fiscal year.

Community Redevelopment Agency Fund
The CRA was credited with the annual tax increment revenue from both the City and County in December. The County portion is on the Intergovernmental revenue line item and the City portion is reflected in the Operating Transfers In.

Charges for services revenue is primarily associated with the ice rink.

Water and Sewer Fund

The bottom line reflects a positive $481,684 and debt service coverage is projected to be a strong 2.07 for the fiscal year.
**Electric Services Fund**

Electric kWh sales for the first quarter of the fiscal year are ahead of forecast.

We over recovered on fuel costs by about $400,000 for the first quarter. Fuel cost recovery rates were reduced November 1 and again on February 1 in an effort to return some of that to the customers. Our target for the fiscal year is to bring the balance of the fuel cost stabilization fund to about $1,500,000. This will involve an under recovery for fiscal 2016 of about $200,000. This is built into the FY '16 Annualized column of the report.

Crews working on undergounding were scaled back in the last few months of FY 2015 as we had been getting ahead of budget. Spending on undergounding will pick up in the next few months.

The bottom line for the first quarter of $1,028,009 is higher than anticipated for the fiscal year as we plan to under recover on fuel costs and more is invested in undergounding.

Debt service coverage is forecast at 2.56.

**Investment Report**

This two page report summarizes the City’s cash and investment holdings as of December 31, 2015. The overall portfolio has a blended rate of return of 1.38% and the average maturity of the long-term investment securities held was 5.00 years. All investment holdings were within the parameters of the City’s current Investment Policy as of December 31, 2015 with the exception of the total amount invested in federal instrumentalities. The investment policy allows a total of 80% of the portfolio and 81.29% was invested in federal instrumentalities at that date. As further property tax revenue is received the portfolio will be rebalanced to meet this requirement.
## Fiscal YTD December 31, 2015 and 2014

### General Fund

#### 25% of the Fiscal Year Lapsed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues:</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Prorated Adj. Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Tax</strong></td>
<td>$10,685,314</td>
<td>238%</td>
<td>$17,927,507 $4,122,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Franchise Fees</strong></td>
<td>271,043</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1,181,603 280,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Taxes</strong></td>
<td>1,619,725</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>6,680,726 6,322,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Taxes</strong></td>
<td>433,623</td>
<td>350%</td>
<td>494,975 120,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Permits</strong></td>
<td>463,406</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>1,181,603 280,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Licenses &amp; Permits</strong></td>
<td>8,070</td>
<td>129%</td>
<td>25,000 24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergovernmental</strong></td>
<td>1,730,310</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>7,145,937 1,689,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charges for Services</strong></td>
<td>1,421,087</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>5,604,608 1,349,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td>38,164</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>710,700 41,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,513,284 1,513,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>16,973,335</td>
<td>152%</td>
<td>44,140,137 6,479,018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures:</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Prorated Adj. Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Commission</strong></td>
<td>6,723</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>26,432 21,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Services - City Attorney</strong></td>
<td>12,146</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>301,000 278,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Services - Other</strong></td>
<td>18,419</td>
<td>123%</td>
<td>301,000 278,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lobbyists</strong></td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>118,000 108,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Management</strong></td>
<td>136,144</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>685,051 546,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget and Performance Measurement</strong></td>
<td>33,335</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>160,998 127,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Clerk</strong></td>
<td>29,703</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>301,000 271,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communications Dept.</strong></td>
<td>116,008</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>301,000 184,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Technology Services</strong></td>
<td>378,740</td>
<td>108%</td>
<td>1,405,288 362,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
<td>196,342</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>886,496 694,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resources</strong></td>
<td>87,575</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>332,059 244,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchasing</strong></td>
<td>77,084</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>279,527 202,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning &amp; Community Development</strong></td>
<td>216,288</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>679,373 462,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building</strong></td>
<td>272,771</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>1,212,538 939,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Works</strong></td>
<td>1,770,135</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>7,042,811 6,272,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police</strong></td>
<td>2,994,853</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>13,389,918 12,495,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire</strong></td>
<td>2,929,108</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>11,814,511 9,885,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parks &amp; Recreation</strong></td>
<td>1,692,269</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7,315,293 5,623,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization Support</strong></td>
<td>355,618</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,422,472 1,066,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Departmental</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>255,000 255,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>11,342,809</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>48,107,211 46,761,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variances

- **Revenues Over/(Under) Expenditures**: $5,630,526 (-568%)
- **Operating transfers in**: $2,203,577 (99%)
- **Operating transfers out**: $(2,313,813) (189%)

### Variance from Prorated Adj. Annual

- **Fiscal YTD December 31, 2015**
  - $11,047,476 $4,481,877 $6,565,609 $2,313,813 (189%)
- **Fiscal YTD December 31, 2014**
  - $11,047,476 $4,481,877 $6,565,609 $2,313,813 (189%)

* As adjusted through December 31, 2015
## The City of Winter Park, Florida
### Monthly Financial Report - Budget vs. Actual
#### Community Redevelopment Fund
#### Fiscal YTD December 31, 2015 and 2014
#### 25% of the Fiscal Year Lapsed

### Community Redevelopment Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues:</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>YTD %</td>
<td>Original Adjusted Prorated Prorated YTD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
<td>YTD %</td>
<td>Original Adjusted Prorated Prorated YTD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$1,550,866</td>
<td>412%</td>
<td>$1,506,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>$126,998</td>
<td>226%</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
<td>192%</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$806,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$1,706,664</td>
<td>199%</td>
<td>$2,598,021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures:

#### YTD % | Original Adjusted Prorated Prorated YTD |  | Adjusted Prorated Prorated YTD |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
<td>YTD %</td>
<td>Original Adjusted Prorated Prorated YTD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$1,550,866</td>
<td>412%</td>
<td>$1,506,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>$126,998</td>
<td>226%</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
<td>192%</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$806,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$1,706,664</td>
<td>199%</td>
<td>$2,598,021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating transfers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating transfers in</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YTD %</td>
<td>Original Adjusted Prorated Prorated YTD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Prorated Prorated YTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
<td>YTD %</td>
<td>Original Adjusted Prorated Prorated YTD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>$1,550,866</td>
<td>412%</td>
<td>$1,506,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>$126,998</td>
<td>226%</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
<td>192%</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$806,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$1,706,664</td>
<td>199%</td>
<td>$2,598,021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* As adjusted through December 31, 2015
### Operating Performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water and Irrigation Sales (in thousands of gallons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer - inside city limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - inside city limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation - Inside City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - outside city limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation - Outside City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating revenues:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sewer - inside city limits</td>
<td>$1,574,624</td>
<td>$6,298,496</td>
<td>$6,061,843</td>
<td>$236,653</td>
<td>$1,501,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,666,224</td>
<td>6,664,896</td>
<td>6,658,009</td>
<td>6,887</td>
<td>1,581,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - inside city limits</td>
<td>2,176,317</td>
<td>8,705,268</td>
<td>8,471,951</td>
<td>233,317</td>
<td>2,167,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water - outside city limits</td>
<td>1,380,559</td>
<td>5,522,236</td>
<td>5,743,337</td>
<td>(221,101)</td>
<td>1,443,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td>308,760</td>
<td>1,235,040</td>
<td>1,295,668</td>
<td>(60,628)</td>
<td>305,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating revenues</strong></td>
<td>7,106,484</td>
<td>28,425,936</td>
<td>28,230,808</td>
<td>195,128</td>
<td>6,999,063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating expenses:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General and administration</td>
<td>351,064</td>
<td>1,404,256</td>
<td>2,049,203</td>
<td>644,947</td>
<td>330,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>2,694,802</td>
<td>10,779,208</td>
<td>12,298,975</td>
<td>1,519,767</td>
<td>2,551,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor costs capitalized</td>
<td>109,959</td>
<td>439,836</td>
<td>439,836</td>
<td>(80,611)</td>
<td>80,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater treatment by other agencies</td>
<td>987,562</td>
<td>3,950,248</td>
<td>3,958,280</td>
<td>8,032</td>
<td>875,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating expenses</strong></td>
<td>4,143,387</td>
<td>16,573,548</td>
<td>18,746,294</td>
<td>2,172,746</td>
<td>3,838,338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Operating income (loss)     | 2,963,097   | 11,852,388          | 9,484,514      | 2,367,874                     | 3,160,725       |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other sources (uses):</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment earnings</td>
<td>(519)</td>
<td>(2,076)</td>
<td>198,700</td>
<td>(200,776)</td>
<td>72,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous revenue</td>
<td>6,698</td>
<td>6,698</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Renewal and Replacement Fund</td>
<td>(418,175)</td>
<td>(1,672,700)</td>
<td>(1,672,701)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(411,984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to General Fund</td>
<td>(548,259)</td>
<td>(2,193,036)</td>
<td>(2,193,038)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(521,725)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer for Organizational Support</td>
<td>(16,725)</td>
<td>(66,900)</td>
<td>(66,905)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(15,211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Capital Projects Fund</td>
<td>(23,751)</td>
<td>(95,004)</td>
<td>(95,000)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(140,738)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service sinking fund deposits</td>
<td>(1,480,682)</td>
<td>(5,924,930)</td>
<td>(5,827,930)</td>
<td>(97,000)</td>
<td>(1,480,499)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other sources (uses)</strong></td>
<td>(2,481,413)</td>
<td>(9,947,948)</td>
<td>(9,655,874)</td>
<td>(296,074)</td>
<td>(2,497,976)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net increase (decrease) in funds | $481,684 | $1,904,440 | $ (167,360) | $2,071,800 | $662,749 |

| Debt service coverage | 2.07 | 1.97 |
## WINTER PARK ELECTRIC UTILITY METRICS
### December 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY'16 YTD</th>
<th>FY'16 Annualized</th>
<th>FY'16 Budget</th>
<th>Variance from Budget</th>
<th>FY'15</th>
<th>FY'14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Sales (kWh)</td>
<td>108,597,634</td>
<td>444,889,939</td>
<td>426,504,060</td>
<td>18,385,879</td>
<td>428,482,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Revenue/kWh</td>
<td>0.1079</td>
<td>0.1060</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.1135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Power Purchased (kWh)</td>
<td>104,602,712</td>
<td>460,601,989</td>
<td>448,951,642</td>
<td>11,650,347</td>
<td>447,757,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Power Cost/kWh</td>
<td>0.0517</td>
<td>0.0517</td>
<td>0.0522</td>
<td>0.0572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross margin</td>
<td>0.0561</td>
<td>0.0543</td>
<td>0.0571</td>
<td>0.0563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAIDI (rolling 12 month sum)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.01</td>
<td>62.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIFI (rolling 12 month sum)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold vs. Purchased kWh Ratio</td>
<td>103.82%</td>
<td>96.59%</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
<td>95.70%</td>
<td>95.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income Statement

#### Electric Sales:
- Fuel: 3,866,757 | 15,029,961 | 15,197,553 | (167,592) | 16,112,377 | 17,715,492 |
- Non-Fuel: 7,845,992 | 32,142,532 | 31,105,642 | 1,036,890 | 30,719,848 | 30,554,862 |

#### Other Operating Revenues:
- Fuel: 51,483 | 205,932 | 357,000 | (151,068) | 466,831 | 248,010 |

#### Total Operating Revenues:

#### Operating Expenses:
- General and Administrative: 239,432 | 957,728 | 1,176,351 | 218,623 | 1,217,200 | 1,135,782 |
- Operating Expenses: 1,625,182 | 6,500,728 | 6,876,749 | 376,021 | 6,751,202 | 7,216,805 |
- Fuel: 3,458,724 | 15,229,961 | 15,197,553 | (32,408) | 15,003,619 | 17,753,988 |
- Non-Fuel: 1,952,598 | 8,597,965 | 8,348,952 | (249,013) | 8,381,995 | 7,745,014 |

#### Total Operating Expenses:
8,138,228 | 34,735,550 | 34,945,187 | 209,637 | 34,608,757 | 36,576,381 |

#### Operating Income (Loss):
3,626,004 | 12,642,875 | 11,715,008 | 927,867 | 12,690,299 | 11,941,983 |

#### Nonoperating Revenues (Expenses):
- State Funding for Fairbanks Distribution Lines: 3,077,000 | 3,077,000 |
- Undergrounding Fairbanks Distribution Lines: (3,077,000) | (3,077,000) |
- Investment Earnings (net of interest paid on interfund borrowings): (1,243) | (4,972) | 41,950 | (46,922) | 53,483 | 58,589 |
- Principal on Debt: (517,500) | (2,070,000) | (2,070,000) | - | (1,735,000) | (1,765,000) |
- Interest on Debt: (822,712) | (2,858,204) | (2,858,204) | - | (2,956,693) | (2,767,440) |
- Miscellaneous Revenue: 14,348 | 14,348 | - | 14,348 | 220,733 | 684,689 |
- Proceeds from Sale of Assets: 10,936 | 43,744 | - | 43,744 | 55,717 | 25,817 |
- Routine Capital: (456,727) | (1,600) | (16,000) | (14,400) | 17,200 | 73,050 |
- Contributions in Aid of Construction: 33,746 | 134,984 | - | 134,984 | 35,131 | 63,960 |

#### Total Nonoperating Revenues (Expenses):
(1,879,658) | (8,788,360) | (9,234,442) | 446,082 | (10,220,235) | (9,438,973) |
## WINTER PARK ELECTRIC UTILITY METRICS
### December 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY'16</th>
<th>FY'16</th>
<th>FY'16</th>
<th>Variance from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>Annualized</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>FY'15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (Loss) Before Operating Transfers</td>
<td>1,746,346</td>
<td>3,854,515</td>
<td>2,480,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Transfers In**

- **Transfers to General Fund**
  - (645,445) (2,644,183) (2,639,000) (5,183) (2,582,126) (2,652,117)
- **Transfers for organizational support**
  - (29,199) (116,796) (116,795) (1) (109,604) -
- **Transfers to capital projects (primarily electric warehouse construction)**
  - (43,693) (174,772) (174,771) (1) (1,187,271) (37,500)

**Total Operating Transfers**

- (718,337) (2,935,751) (2,930,566) (5,185) (3,879,001) (2,689,617)

**Net Change in Working Capital**

- 1,028,009 918,764 (450,000) 1,368,764 (1,408,937) (186,607)

### Other Financial Parameters

|                | FY'16 | FY'16       | FY'16       | FY'15         | FY'14         |
|----------------|-------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| Debt Service Coverage | 2.70  | 2.56        | 2.72        | 2.85          |
| Fixed Rate Bonds Outstanding | 67,010,000 | 69,065,000 | 64,750,000 |
| Auction Rate Bonds Outstanding | 1,205,000 | 1,220,000 | 7,445,000 |
| Total Bonds Outstanding | 68,215,000 | 70,285,000 | 72,195,000 |
| Principal Retired | 2,070,000 | 2,070,000 | 1,735,000 | 1,765,000 |
| Balance Owed on Advance from General Fund | - | - | - | - |
| Cash Balance | 2,151,773 | (916,075) | 3,530,562 |

### Notes
- Fiscal Years run from October to September; FY'15 is 10/1/14 to 9/30/15
- SAIDI is System Average Interruption Duration Index (12-month rolling sum)
- MAIFI is Momentary Average Interruption Frequency Index (12-month rolling sum)
The meeting of the Winter Park City Commission was called to order by Mayor Steve Leary, at 3:30 p.m. in the Commission Chambers, 401 Park Avenue South, Winter Park, Florida. The invocation was provided by Pastor Jeff Arp, Calvary Assembly of God, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Members present:  
Mayor Steve Leary  
Commissioner Greg Seidel  
Commissioner Sarah Sprinkel  
Commissioner Tom McMacken  
Commissioner Carolyn Cooper  

Also present:  
Assistant City Manager Michelle Neuner  
City Attorney Kurt Ardaman  
City Clerk Cynthia Bonham  

Approval of the agenda

Motion made by Commissioner McMacken to approve the agenda; seconded by Commissioner Sprinkel and carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

Mayor’s Report

a. Visioning Game Night and Game Box Update

Planning Director Dori Stone introduced Liam and Claire Goodowens, 1722 N. Park Avenue (Founders of the Game Exchange) who spoke about the success of Game Night at the Community Center in January and their efforts to provide game boxes throughout the community filled with games in an effort to promote bringing people and families together.

City Manager’s Report

Commissioner McMacken spoke about the Winter Park Day Nursery who provided a thank you card from the children in appreciation for the City’s support.

Assistant City Manager Neuner provided an updated work schedule for the railroad crossing work and New York and Lyman Avenues (February 20).

City Attorney’s Report – No report.

Non-Action Item

a. Visioning update

Planning Director Dori Stone provided an update on the visioning efforts. After providing the background with meetings with the Visioning Steering Committee over the last six months, the two major community events, and the numerous small group and individual sessions with residents and stakeholders, she addressed the next steps in the process. Ms. Stone spoke about the community being further
engaged by asking them their thoughts on the themes provided by the steering committee, through focus groups and neighborhood meetings, allowing the community to offer suggestions and strategies about the themes that will be scheduled to begin in mid to late March.

The themes will include the following: 1) To retain our extraordinary village to live, work and play; 2) To plan our future growth based on a mix of neighborhood, village and urban character; 3) To improve our means to get around; 4) To connect to nature; 5) To increase our generational appeal; 6) To enhance learning through collaboration and social interactions; 7) To embrace wellness for all ages; 8) To invest for our future; and 9) To promote, expand and continually improve community engagement.

Visioning Steering Committee members Chairman and Vice-Chairman John Gill and Jeffrey Blydenburgh spoke about their past and future efforts. Mayor Leary thanked the committee members for their hard work.

In conclusion, Ms. Stone addressed the establishment of neighborhood meetings in April, the complementary focus group meetings with stakeholders, and that they anticipate review of the themes and strategies in late April/May. Ms. Stone spoke about the visioning final document that will come forward that should be the Commission’s step into the next comprehensive plan update which is beginning this year. She added that the document should be guiding the Commission into the 15 and 20 year comprehensive planning process so the vision should be broad enough that you work the vision themes into the comprehensive plan so the vision is implemented.

b) Progress Point property update

Planning Manager Jeff Briggs provided an update on the Progress Point property. He summarized what has taken place since the September 2015 Commission meeting and with the Planning and Zoning Board meeting in November and joint work session held with the Economic Development Advisory Board (EDAB) and the Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Board. Mr. Briggs addressed the public notice provided for the P&Z meeting on November 3, the details of the property site (frontages on Orange Avenue, Denning Drive, Palmetto Avenue and Cypress Avenue; is about 3.73 acres in size; and is appraised at about $5.7 million ($35 per square feet)). He spoke about the current zoning and the future land use of the Orange Avenue corridor, and the zoning possibilities for the site. Mr. Briggs provided proposed options for the site (Option #1: Multi-family/office; Option #2: Memory care/assisted living/office and retail; and Option #3: Office/retail).

Mr. Briggs addressed the November 2015 Planning and Zoning Board meeting whereby the ROC Seniors assisted living/memory care proposal was presented. He stated that people preferred to have a continuation of the current character along Orange Avenue and that a number of people came to discuss the parking problem in the area. He spoke about the large number of vehicles utilizing the Progress
Point City parking lot. He stated that Jewett Clinic asked the P&Z Board to include them in trying to work out a public/private parking partnership when the property is redeveloped. P&Z’s recommendation at the November meeting was to continue the retail/restaurant/designer row on Orange Avenue frontages, two stories on Orange Avenue and three stories on Palmetto Avenue, would be acceptable to have either office/senior assistant living or apartments in the back but encouraged the City to try and work with the other surrounding owners to determine if there is a scenario to help with the parking deficit that exists in the area.

Mr. Briggs commented that subsequent to the P&Z meeting they received a letter from ROC Seniors who told the P&Z that they should step back from their proposal because they need to decide what is going to be done with parking before a site plan can be done; received an unsolicited letter from Jewett Clinic who is looking at their current and growth parking needs who submitted an offer to buy the property between Palmetto and the railroad for $25 per square foot to improve the property as a parking lot (would give the City back an easement so the City can use the property on nights and weekends to help other businesses in the area). He stated the City cannot act on that offer because the ROC Seniors proposal is still on the table and we need to decide where we are going with that.

Mr. Briggs also spoke about the joint work session with EDAB/P&Z on January 19, 2016 who provided the following recommendations: 1) that the City should pursue a public/private parking scenario (outreach to property owners along Orange Avenue, to find out their need and commitment; Jewett parking partnership; and options of a parking garage at Palmetto/cypress corner which is costly); 2) that a broker should assist in the sale versus staff using a notice of disposal; and 3) that the City prepare desired development options to enable the broker to market development options and that the City prepare traffic impact analysis on the desired development options.

Ms. Stone reminded the Commission that they have a proposal on the table at this time that they need to decide what to do with before working through other scenarios. Mayor Leary asked what happens now because the application has been modified since they last saw it in September and is completely different. Attorney Ardaman stated the Commission needs to decide how to proceed and what the Commission wants to see on that property and if certain criteria will be part of a deal. He stated the Commission does not have to accept the ROC Seniors proposal but they need to proceed in whatever action the Commission decides to pursue. He advised the Commission to provide their priorities or preferences to staff who can come back and advise the Commission how they can achieve their objectives.

Upon further discussion, Mayor Leary summarized that the P&Z/EDAB has asked for some type of traffic study to help them determine the impact of whatever zoning they are going to consider. Ms. Stone stated the bidder has already provided traffic numbers but if the Commission wants other numbers outside of that, staff will work with our traffic consultant and see what we can come up with. Mayor Leary stated we need to deliver that to the EDAB/P&Z per their request.
After discussion, there was a consensus for the City Attorney to review the RFP and bring back a recommendation to the next meeting as to where we stand, what the Commission can expect, what the applicant has already submitted and that staff recall the EDAB/P&Z group to see where they stand based on traffic numbers that staff provides them. After the two boards meet again, staff will come back to the Commission with a recommendation, they will maintain the current applicant’s application unless they decide to pull it, and the City Attorney will make sure that if we continue with the current applicant without opening it up to others that we are within our rights; or if the City approves the sale and then pulls it back because it does not get rezoned, to determine if we are in jeopardy.

Commissioner Seidel asked that a concrete number of parking spaces be provided for the existing development on Orange Avenue when providing the traffic study analysis to include how many spaces the developer would need to add to accommodate the other businesses. There was a consensus that staff provides this.

Public Comments (items not on the agenda):

Mary Daniels, 650 Canton Avenue, asked that the City’s videos show more of a diversity of Winter Park residents.

Lurline Fletcher, 811 English Court, asked that the Pineywood Cemetery be better maintained.

Lamont (Unknown), 1280 Orange Avenue, asked about the ingress/egress out to Cypress Avenue. Mayor Leary stated this will be addressed when discussing the Progress Point property.

Martha Hall McHenry, 331 W. Lyman Avenue, spoke about concerns with destroying the Westside with commercial development and the rezoning of residential property.

Consent Agenda

a. Approve the minutes of January 25, 2016.
b. Approve the following purchase and contracts:
   1. Task Order 2015-02 for the Water Distribution System Model Update and Water Quality Evaluation to CH2M Hill and approval of all subsequent purchase orders related to project; $128,002
Hurley Charvat Peacock, Inc. (HHCP), and authorize the Mayor to execute Amendment 4.

**Motion made by Commissioner McMacken to approve the Consent Agenda; seconded by Commissioner Sprinkel.** No public comments were made. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

**Action Items Requiring Discussion**

a. “Support our Scholars” proposal

Susan Johnson, Founder of Support our Scholars, spoke about the need to help needy students in our community and asked that the City and Support our Scholars partner together so the entire community can think about how we can ensure that our children graduate from high school and college. She proposed that the month of May 2016 be “Support our Scholars Winter Park Graduation Month.” She asked for the City’s partnership and approval to place signs from May 1-31 in front of Central Park and City Hall, to allow signs in residential yards for the entire month, that a proclamation be provided to make May ‘Education Month’, and to allow a kickoff event in Central Park where colleges will be present to talk to students and application fees will be waived.

There was Commission consensus to support a proclamation, and to allow signs in residential yards and at City Hall regardless of the number of signs. The signs in Central Park and the fee waiver will go to the Parks Board for approval. There was a consensus for staff to provide a recommendation for future requests to include criteria for these types of requests.

b. Solid Waste RFP

No discussion or action.

**Public Hearings:**

a. **ORDINANCE NO. 3030-16:** AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 58 “LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, ARTICLE III, “ZONING” AMENDING SECTION 58-65 & 58-66 “RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS “R-1AAA, R-1AA & R-1A,” TO REMOVE AN UNNECESSARY DEED RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT TO STREAMLINE THE PERMITTING PROCESS, AMENDING SECTION 58-71 GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS SO AS TO ESTABLISH REAR SETBACKS FOR SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES WITH SHORT LOT DEPTHS, AMENDING SECTION 58-67 “LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-2) DISTRICT” TO CORRECT A SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING COVERAGE ERROR AND MODIFY CERTAIN MISCELLANEOUS RESIDENTIAL PROVISIONS IN SECTIONS 58-65, 58-66 & 58-71; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE. **Second Reading**

City Attorney Ardaman read the ordinance by title.
Motion made by Commissioner Cooper to approve option 2 (to delete the 105’ lots and leave the 75’ lots). Motion failed for lack of a second.

Motion made by Mayor Leary to adopt the ordinance; seconded by Commissioner Sprinkel. No public comments were made. Commissioner Cooper summarized her opposition to the ordinance (she believed it encourages street facing garages, it infringes upon our privacy, and that it does not allow enough contiguous green space for trees). Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Sprinkel, and McMacken voted yes. Commissioner Cooper voted no. The motion carried with a 4-1 vote.

City Commission Reports:

a. Commissioner Seidel – Asked if information can be posted on the website concerning the location of the library and a link to take you to the library website. Communications Director Clarissa Howard stated there is information on the site under Elections regarding the location, size, cost, etc. and will add the link to the agenda item where this was proposed.

Commissioner Seidel spoke about the need to add traffic engineers to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Board to oversee transportation and traffic. Mayor Leary stated he hopes to address this at the time of board appointments.

b. Commissioner Sprinkel – Reported attending the ribbon cutting of the new surgery center and the Chili for Charity event. She spoke about the two City zip cars at the train station, and Lacrosse at Rollins starting again.

c. Commissioner Cooper - No report.

d. Commissioner McMacken – Spoke about the open house at the Winter Park Day Nursery that he attended.

e. Mayor Leary – Spoke about the ‘Side by Side’ celebration at the Knowles Chapel. He thanked staff for their work to help put this together.

The meeting adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

Mayor Steve Leary

ATTEST:

City Clerk Cynthia S. Bonham, MMC
### Purchases over $75,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vendor</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>background</th>
<th>fiscal impact</th>
<th>motion</th>
<th>recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. T.V. Diversified Inc.</td>
<td>PR159432 for Lift Station #28 – Wet Well &amp; Manhole Repairs</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY16 budget. Amount: $104,373</td>
<td>Commission approve PR159432 to T.V. Diversified Inc. for Lift Station #28 Wet Well &amp; Manhole Repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This purchase will be made utilizing piggyback contract with Boca Raton.

### Contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vendor</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>background</th>
<th>fiscal impact</th>
<th>motion</th>
<th>recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. CDM Smith, Inc.</td>
<td>Amendment 4 – RFQ-2-2012 Continuing Contracts for Professional, Architectural &amp; Engineering Services (Storm Water Management &amp; Design)</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td>Commission approve Amendment No. 4 to CDM Smith, Inc. and authorize the Mayor to execute renewal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City utilized a formal solicitation process to award this contract. The contract term was for a period of one (1) year with a total of four (4) one year renewal options, not to exceed five (5) years in total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vendor</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>background</th>
<th>fiscal impact</th>
<th>motion</th>
<th>recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Geosyntec Consultants</td>
<td>Amendment 4 – RFQ-2-2012 Continuing Contracts for Professional, Architectural &amp; Engineering Services (Storm Water Management &amp; Design)</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td>Commission approve Amendment No. 4 to Geosyntec Consultants and authorize the Mayor to execute renewal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City utilized a formal solicitation process to award this contract. The contract term was for a period of one (1) year with a total of four (4) one year renewal options, not to exceed five (5) years in total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vendor</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>background</th>
<th>fiscal impact</th>
<th>motion</th>
<th>recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. GAI Consultants, Inc.</td>
<td>Amendment 4 – RFQ-2-2012 Continuing Contracts for Professional, Architectural &amp; Engineering Services (General Civil &amp; Public Facility Engineering)</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td>Commission approve Amendment No. 4 to GAI Consultants, Inc. and authorize the Mayor to execute renewal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City utilized a formal solicitation process to award this contract. The contract term was for a period of one (1) year with a total of four (4) one year renewal options, not to exceed five (5) years in total.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vendor</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>background</th>
<th>fiscal impact</th>
<th>motion</th>
<th>recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment 4 – RFQ-2-2012 Continuing Contracts for Professional, Architectural &amp; Engineering Services (Transportation Planning &amp; Engineering)</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission approve Amendment No. 4 to Comprehensive Engineering Services, Inc. and authorize the Mayor to execute renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Fishel Company</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment 1 – IFB-8-2014 Underground Utility Services</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission approve Amendment No. 1 to The Fishel Company and authorize the Mayor to execute renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Infratech Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment 1 – IFB-8-2014 Underground Utility Services</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission approve Amendment No. 1 to Infratech Corporation and authorize the Mayor to execute renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HDD of Florida LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment 1 – IFB-8-2014 Underground Utility Services</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission approve Amendment No. 1 to HDD of Florida LLC and authorize the Mayor to execute renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Young’s Communication Co., Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment 1 – IFB-8-2014 Underground Utility Services</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission approve Amendment No. 1 to Young’s Communication Co., Inc. and authorize the Mayor to execute renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Electricom LLC and Subsidiary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment 1 – IFB-8-2014 Underground Utility Services</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission approve Amendment No. 1 to Electricom LLC and Subsidiary and authorize the Mayor to execute renewal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Heart Utilities of Jacksonville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment 1 – IFB-8-2014 Underground Utility Services</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission approve Amendment No. 1 to Heart Utilities of Jacksonville and authorize the Mayor to execute renewal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City utilized a formal solicitation process to award this contract. The contract term was for a period of one (1) year with a total of four (4) one year renewal options, not to exceed five (5) years in total.

Approval of contract shall constitute approval for all subsequent purchase orders made against contract...
Funding options for acquisition of property at 1111 W. Fairbanks Avenue (former bowling alley)

Approve funding option for acquisition of 1111 W. Fairbanks Avenue.

At the January 25, 2016 Commission Meeting the Commission approved the acquisition of 1111 W. Fairbanks Avenue for $2.9 million but the final determination of where the funding would come from was not made.

A CRA meeting is scheduled for February 22, 2016 at 2:00 p.m. (immediately preceding this Commission meeting) to discuss funding a portion of the purchase using CRA funds. Staff is recommending that the CIP is reprioritized to unencumber $1 million in this fiscal year to apply to the overall purchase price.

Assuming the CRA funding is approved that leaves $1.9 million (plus closing costs) to be funded from other sources. Staff recommends using $394,985 of the Parks Acquisition Funds and $646,367 of the Parks Impact Fee Funds toward the purchase with the remainder (approximately $858,648 plus closing costs) to come from reserves.
alternatives | other considerations

The City can decline the purchase and work with Rollins and the future owner to acquire just the amount of property needed to expand the turn lanes.

If the commission does not want to use the parks funds the entire $1.9 million could come from reserves.

fiscal impact

See above.
Subject:

John Skolfield III on behalf of Skolfield Properties LLC has requested the listing of the property at 118 West Comstock Avenue as a historic resource on the Winter Park Register of Historic Places.

Motion | Recommendation:

The Historic Preservation Board voted unanimously on February 10, 2016 to recommend listing 118 West Comstock Avenue as a historic resource on the Winter Park Register of Historic Places. The listing is finalized by resolution of the City Commission (attached).

Background:

118 West Comstock Avenue was built in 1935 and is associated with the development of downtown Winter Park during the post Florida Land Boom and Great Depression years. It is a good example of frame vernacular architecture with a pyramidal roof. It is a contributing building in the National Register of Historic Places Downtown Winter Park Historic District.

Alternatives | Other Considerations:

Fiscal Impact:

None
RESOLUTION NO._______

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, DESIGNATING 118 WEST COMSTOCK AVENUE, WINTER PARK, FLORIDA AS A HISTORIC RESOURCE ON THE WINTER PARK REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES.

WHEREAS, there are located within the City of Winter Park historic sites, areas, structures, buildings, improvements and appurtenances, both public and private, both on individual properties and in groupings, that serve as reminders of past eras, events, and persons important in local, state and national history; or that provide significant examples of past architectural styles and development patterns and that constitute unique and irreplaceable assets to the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission recognizes that the sites and properties of historical, cultural, archaeological, aesthetic and architectural merit contribute to the public health, welfare, economic well-being and quality of life of the citizens of Winter Park; and

WHEREAS, there is the desire to foster awareness of and civic pride in the accomplishments of the past; and

WHEREAS, the Winter Park Historic Preservation Board determined that 118 West Comstock Avenue meets the criterion for historic resource status through its association with the development of downtown Winter Park during the post Florida Land Boom and Great Depression period, and as an example of frame vernacular architecture in Winter Park.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida that:

The City Commission of the City of Winter Park hereby supports and endorses the designation of 118 West Comstock Avenue as a historic resource on the Winter Park Register of Historic Places.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park held in City Hall, Winter Park on this 22nd day of February 2016.

ATTEST:

_______________________________
Steve Leary, Mayor

_______________________________
City Clerk Cynthia S. Bonham

**Background.** The Skolfield Homes Frame Vernacular building at 118 West Comstock Avenue is a contributing historic building in the Downtown Winter Park National Register Historic District was built about 1935 during the Great Depression following the collapse of the Florida Land Boom. It is currently in use as the offices of Skolfield Homes on the second floor and as residential on the first floor. This designation requested is paired with a Certificate of Review request.

**Description.** 118 West Comstock Avenue is a two-story, wood frame building set back from the street. To the east is an alley that serves the commercial buildings on Park Avenue. The alley turns behind the property and serves the commercial buildings on Fairbanks. Miller's Hardware to the west has a two-story building and outdoor storage. The composite shingle roof is low pitched and pyramidal. The house plan is square and the foundation is raised. The building is clad in horizontal wood siding. The fenestration is primarily six-over one sashes.

The first floor paneled entry door is flanked by sidelights and is located under a front gabled entry porch. The porch has square columns. An open porch also extends across the front and west side to create an access point to exterior stairs to the second floor offices. The entrance is flanked by pairs of six-over one sash windows with inoperable shutters. The second floor of the façade has two bands of two-over-one windows. A small six-over-six window has been added to this elevation.

The east side elevation abuts an alley way and has a brick exterior chimney. The rear elevation also directly abuts an alley way. The west side elevation features non-original exterior stairs to the second floor offices of Skolfield Homes. The stairs have wood railing and simple balusters compatible with the house.

The building underwent restoration about thirty years ago and has been kept in excellent condition.
Architecture. 118 West Comstock Avenue is a Frame Vernacular mixed use building. This has been the predominant type of wood frame architecture from Florida’s Territorial Period to the present. Vernacular building traditions result from the builder’s experience, available resources and responses to the local environment. After 1910, platform framing was introduced. With this method, each floor was constructed separately and was both simpler and more rigid than the balloon framing system it replaced.

Horizontal wood siding was the most typical common with shingles and board and batten less common. Windows are double sash and the size of the panes generally increased over the years. Details were simple and would have included jig-sawn woodwork on porches and eaves, depending on the builder’s skills.

Winter Park builders had access to locally milled lumber including old growth cypress and pine. The railroad also supplied building materials. Contractors of the era had access to architectural pattern books so builders had both inspiration and materials to add stylish details to simple buildings.

Significance. 118 West Comstock is associated with the development of downtown Winter Park during the post Florida Land Boom and Great Depression years. It is a good example of Frame Vernacular architecture and representative of residential life of the period. It is a contributing historic building in the Downtown Winter Park National Register of Historic Places Historic District and is in excellent condition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend approval for listing as a historic resource on the Winter Park Register of Historic Places.
City of Winter Park Historic Designation Application

1. 118 West Comstock Ave.
   Building address
   Skofield Property
   Owner’s name(s)  John Skofield
   Address  118 W Comstock Ave
   Telephone  321-228
   N/A

   Applicant’s name (if different from above)
   Address
   Telephone

2. I, John T. Skofield III, as owner of the property described above, do hereby authorize the filing of this application for historic designation for that property.

   Owner’s Signature
   Date  12-18-15

Historic Preservation Board Office Use

Criteria for Designation

✓ A. Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history including the local pattern of development; or
✓ B. Association with the lives of a person or persons significant in our past; or that
✓ C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represents the work of a master, or that possesses high artistic values or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. Has yielded or are likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

Parcel 10 # 05-22-30-9 400-76-030
Year built  1975

Legal description  N/A
Historic name of building (if any)
Historic district name (if any)

Date received: 12-18-15
HPC Meeting: 2-10-16

Case File No.: HOA 16-002
Florida Master Site File No.: OR- 9885

Local Historic Landmark
Local Historic Resource
# Property Record - 05-22-30-9400-76-030

## Property Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Skolfield Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Names</td>
<td>Skolfield Properties LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>WP - Winter Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Use</td>
<td>1200 - Store/Office/Resid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>118 W Comstock Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Park, FL 32789-4310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address</td>
<td>118 W Comstock Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Park, FL 32789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Property Features

[Map Image]

---

http://www.ocpafl.org/Searches/ParcelInfoPrinterFriendly.aspx/PFSettings/AA1AB1AD0... 1/19/2016
Property Description

TOWN OF WINTER PARK A/67 & B/86 & MISC BOOK 3/220 LOT 3 & W 2 FT LOT 2 BLK 76

Total Land Area

6,898 sqft (+/-) | 0.16 acres (+/-) GIS Calculated

Land (includes working values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Code</th>
<th>Zoning Land Units</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Land Value</th>
<th>Class Unit Price</th>
<th>Class Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1200 - Store/Office/Resid</td>
<td>6898 SQUARE FEET</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>234,532</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>234,532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buildings (includes working values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Code</th>
<th>Type Code</th>
<th>Building Value</th>
<th>Estimated New Cost</th>
<th>Actual Year Built</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Baths</th>
<th>Floors</th>
<th>Gross Area</th>
<th>Living Area</th>
<th>Exterior Wall</th>
<th>Interior Wall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04 - Commercial</td>
<td>1210 - Store/Office/Res 2</td>
<td>$78,695</td>
<td>$109,299</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1184 sqft</td>
<td>1152 sqft</td>
<td>Wood.Shshthn</td>
<td>Drywall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extra Features (includes working values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date Built</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>XFOB Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3066 - Pav Brick</td>
<td>04/16/1993</td>
<td>3923 Unit(s)</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$9,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT2 - Patio 2</td>
<td>04/01/1993</td>
<td>1 Unit(s)</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Subject:**

Constance C. Canright has requested the listing of her property at 1574 Sunset Drive as a historic resource on the Winter Park Register of Historic Places.

**Motion | Recommendation:**

The Historic Preservation Board voted unanimously on February 10, 2016 to recommend listing 1574 Sunset Drive as a historic resource on the Winter Park Register of Historic Places. The listing is finalized by resolution of the City Commission (attached).

**Background:**

1574 Sunset Drive was built in 1927 and is significant for its association with the Florida Land Boom period of development in Winter Park. It is an uncommon Florida example of a shingled cottage with Colonial Revival style influences.

**Alternatives | Other Considerations:**

**Fiscal Impact:**

None
RESOLUTION NO. ______

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, DESIGNATING 1574 SUNSET DRIVE, WINTER PARK, FLORIDA AS A HISTORIC RESOURCE ON THE WINTER PARK REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES.

WHEREAS, there are located within the City of Winter Park historic sites, areas, structures, buildings, improvements and appurtenances, both public and private, both on individual properties and in groupings, that serve as reminders of past eras, events, and persons important in local, state and national history; or that provide significant examples of past architectural styles and development patterns and that constitute unique and irreplaceable assets to the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission recognizes that the sites and properties of historical, cultural, archaeological, aesthetic and architectural merit contribute to the public health, welfare, economic well-being and quality of life of the citizens of Winter Park; and

WHEREAS, there is the desire to foster awareness of and civic pride in the accomplishments of the past; and

WHEREAS, the Winter Park Historic Preservation Board determined that 1574 Sunset Drive meets the criterion for historic resource status through its association with the Florida Land Boom period of development of Lake Knowles Terrace, and as an example of a shingled cottage with Colonial Revival influences in Winter Park.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida that:

The City Commission of the City of Winter Park hereby supports and endorses the designation of 1574 Sunset Drive as a historic resource on the Winter Park Register of Historic Places.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park held in City Hall, Winter Park on this 22nd day of February 2016.

_________________________________  Steve Leary, Mayor

ATTEST:

_______________________________
City Clerk Cynthia S. Bonham
HDA 16-003 Request by Constance C. Canright to designate her property at 1574 Sunset Drive, Winter Park, Florida as a historic resource on the Winter Park Register of Historic Places. Zoned R-1A. Parcel ID #32-21-30-4536-02-242.

**Background.** 1574 Sunset Drive has been the home of Ms. Constance Canright since 1951. It was during the Florida Land Boom in the Lake Knowles subdivision. But for the generous quantity of windows and porches, the charming shingled cottage could have been transplanted from New England.

**Description.** The property is located at the intersection of Sunset Drive and Chestnut Avenue in the Florida Land Boom subdivision of Lake Knowles Terrace which was platted in 1925. *The Chronological History of Winter Park* notes that the 65 lots in the second section of Lake Knowles Terrace were sold the first day. The brick streets of Sunset and Chestnut and curving intersection feature a small park space.

Built about 1927, 1574 Sunset Drive is a wood frame, two story residence. The plan is irregular and the roofline is cross-gabled and low pitched. The roof has composition shingles. The roof-wall junction is slightly boxed with a simple Colonial Revival cornice treatment. The exterior walls are clad in wood shingles and have wide corner boards. Fenestration consists of wood sash windows singly and in pairs with six-over-six and four-over-four glazing patterns. The primary front-gabled façade faces Sunset Drive. This façade features two pairs of six-over-six sash windows in the first and second floors and a louvered attic vent in the gable peak. Louvered attic vents in this same style are repeated in each elevation’s gable end. A short side-gabled wing projects from the north side. The entry door is located under a simple flat roofed portico with a square column on this wing. A single six-over six sash window is located on the second floor over the entry. This wing has a screened porch on the side elevation with a second floor open porch surrounded by a simple wood railing.

Another narrow wing extends off the rear elevation. This wing includes a single car garage with wood carriage type doors and a shed roofed rear entrance porch. A single width carport of more modern origin extends from the garage. A single width driveway connects the garage and carport to Chestnut Avenue. This wing features four-over four-sash windows. Although
well integrated in style and materials, this wing may have been built after the main body of the house.

The southeast side elevation is set near the side lot line. It has a distinctive second floor balcony under a shed roof. The balcony has square wood columns and wood railings. The substantial wood balusters are curved in a graceful shape staff has not seen elsewhere. The property is in good condition.

**Architecture.** The simplicity of details classify the architecture as Frame Vernacular. This has been the predominant type of wood frame architecture from Florida’s Territorial Period to the present. Vernacular building traditions result from the builder’s experience, available resources and responses to the local environment. After 1910 platform framing was introduced. With this method, each floor was constructed separately and was both simpler and more rigid than the balloon framing system it replaced.

Horizontal wood siding was the most typical common with shingles and board and batten less common. Windows are double sash and the size of the panes generally increased over the years. Details were simple and would have included jig-sawn woodwork on porches and eaves, depending on the builder’s skills.

Winter Park builders had access to locally milled lumber including old growth cypress and pine. The railroad also supplied building materials. Land Boom era contractors had access to architectural pattern books so builders had both inspiration and materials to add stylish details to simple buildings such as the paired six-over-six windows and well-crafted cornices.

**Significance.** 1574 Sunset Drive is significant for its association with the Florida Land Boom period of development in Winter Park. It is an uncommon example of a shingled cottage with Colonial Revival influences in Winter Park.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Recommend approval for listing as a historic resource on the Winter Park Register of Historic Places. Staff also recommends that the house be recorded as the Constance Canright House in recognition of the owner of 65 years.
City of Winter Park Historic Designation Application

1. **1574 Sunset Dr., Winter Park, FL**
   - Building address
   - **Constance Canright**
   - Owner's name(s)
   - **1574 Sunset Dr.**
   - Address
   - **(407) 647-5932**
   - Telephone

Applicant's name (if different from above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Constance C. Canright**, as owner of the property described above, do hereby authorize the filing of this application for historic designation for that property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner's Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constance C. Canright</td>
<td>1-1-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic Preservation Board Office Use**

**Criteria for Designation**

- **✓** A. Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history including the local pattern of development; or
- **✓** B. Association with the lives of a person or persons significant in our past; or that
- **✓** C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represents the work of a master, or that possesses high artistic values or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- **†** D. Has yielded or are likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.

**Parcel #:** 32-21-30-4586-02-242  
**C. 1927**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal description</th>
<th>Year built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic name of building (if any)</th>
<th>Historic district name (if any)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date received:</th>
<th>HPC Meeting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-11-16</td>
<td>2-10-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case File No.</th>
<th>Florida Master Site File No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDA 16-003</td>
<td>OR-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**☐ Local Historic Landmark**  
**☑ Local Historic Resource**
Property Record - 32-21-30-4536-02-242

Property Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1574 Sunset Dr</td>
<td>1574 Sunset Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canright Constance C Tr</td>
<td>Winter Park, FL 32789-2032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Physical Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP - Winter Park</td>
<td>1574 Sunset Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter Park, FL 32789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Property Use | 0100 - Single Family |

| QR Code For Mobile Phone | 302132453602242 02/20/2006 |

Property Features

Property Description

LAKE KNOWLES TERRACE K/4 BEG NE COR LOT 24 RUN S 42.2 FT SWLY TO PT 65.4 FT WLY OF SE COR LOT 25 NOLY ALONG W LINES LOTS 25 & 24 TO BEG BLK 2

Total Land Area

8,509 sqft (+/-)  | 0.20 acres (+/-)  | GIS Calculated

Land (includes working values)
Land Use Code | Zoning | Land Units | Unit Price | Land Value | Class Unit Price | Class Value
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
0100 - Single Family | R-1A | 1 LOT(S) | $213,000.00 | $213,000 | $0.00 | $213,000

Buildings (includes working values)

Model Code | Type Code | Building Value | Estimated New Cost | Actual Year Built | Beds | Baths | Floors | Gross Area | Living Area | Exterior Wall | Interior Wall
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
01 - Single Fam Residence | 0102 - Single Fam Class II | $32,773 | $81,443 | 1927 | 3 | 1.0 | 2 | 1978 sqft | 1272 sqft | Wood.Shiing | Plastered

Subarea Description | Sft | Value
--- | --- | ---
BAS - Base Area | 504 | $29,766
FOP - F/Opn Prch | 28 | $413
FSP - F/Scr Prch | 84 | $1,713
FUS - F/Up Story | 768 | $38,566
UCP - Unf Carp rt | 220 | $2,599
UEP - Unf E Prch | 56 | $1,654
UGR - Unf Garage | 264 | $6,260
UOP - Unf O Prch | 54 | $472

Extra Features (includes working values)

Description | Date Built | Units | Unit Price | XFOB Value
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
FPL2 - Average Fireplace | 01/01/1927 | 1 Unit(s) | $2,500.00 | $2,500

http://www.ocpafl.org/Searches/ParcelInfoPrinterFriendly.aspx/PFSettings/AA1AB1AD0...  1/11/2016
Parcel Photos - 1574 Sunset Dr

302132453602242 02/20/2006
on a private examination taken and made before me, separate and apart from her said husband, did further acknowledge that she executed the said lease freely and voluntarily and without compulsion, constraint, apprehension or fear of or from her said husband.

Witness my hand and official seal at Orlando in said County and State, the day and year aforesaid.

[Signature]

(Notarial Seal)

F. M. Robinson
Notary Public State of Florida at Large
My commission expires March 10, 1927

Filed in office and recorded this 6th day of February A.D. 1926 at 3:40 P.M.

[Signature]

CLERK

D. C.

THIS INDENTURE, Made this 6th day of January A.D. 1926, between Samuel S. Thorpe and Margaret A. Thorpe, his wife, of the County of Hennepin and State of Minnesota, parties of the first part, and AMERICAN BANK AND TRUST COMPANY, AS TRUSTEE, a banking corporation of the City of St. Petersburg, State of Florida, party of the second part;

WITNESSETH, That the said parties of the first part, for and in consideration of the sum of Ten Dollars ($10.00) and other valuable considerations to them in hand paid, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, have granted, bargained, sold and transferred, and by these presents do grant, bargain, sell and transfer unto the said party of the second part and its successors and assigns forever, all those certain parcels of land lying and being in the County of Orange and State of Florida, more particularly described as follows:

All of Blocks One (1) Two (2) Three (3) Four (4) Five (5) Six (6) Seven (7) and Eight (8) Lake Knowles Terrace, and addition to the Town of Winter Park, according to the plat thereof on file and of record in Plat Book E, on page 4 of the Public Records of Orange County.

Subject to a mortgage for Twenty Five Thousand Dollars ($25,000.00) dated the 20th day of August A.D. 1934, and recorded in Book B2 on page 360 of the Public Records of said Orange County.

TOGETHER with all the tenements, hereditaments and appurtenances, with every privilege, right, title, interest and estate, dower and right of dower, reversion, remainder and easement thereto belonging or in anywise appertaining: TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the same forever.

And the said parties of the first part do covenant with the said party of the second part that they are lawfully seised of the said premises, that they are free from all incumbrances, except as above stated, and that they have good right and lawful authority to sell the same, and the said parties of the first part do hereby fully warrant the title to said land, and will defend the same against the lawful claims of all persons whomsoever.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said parties of the first part have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year above written.

Signed, sealed and delivered in our presence:

Pauline Josefich

[Signature]

[SEAL]

K. E. Shuler

[Signature]

[SEAL]

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN

Agenda Packet Page 52
I HEREBY CERTIFY, that on this 8th day of January A. D. 1926, before me personally appeared Samuel S. Thorpe and Margaret A. Thorpe, his wife, to me known to be the persons described in and who executed the foregoing conveyance to AMERICAN BANK AND TRUST COMPANY, as Trustees and severally acknowledged the execution thereof to be their free act and deed for the uses and purposes therein mentioned; and the said Margaret A. Thorpe, the wife of the said Samuel S. Thorpe, on a separate and private examination taken and made by and before me and separately and apart from her said husband, did acknowledge that she made herself a party to the said Deed of Conveyance for the purpose of renouncing, relinquishing and conveying all her right, title and interest, whether of dower or of separate property, statutory or equitable, in and to the land therein described, and that she executed said deed freely and voluntarily, and without any constraint, fear, apprehension or compulsion of or from her said husband.

WITNESS my signature and official seal at Minneapolis, in the County of Hennepin and State of Minnesota, the day and year last aforesaid.

E. Lynders
E. Lynders
Rotary Public, Hennepin County, Minn
My commission expires April 23rd, 1920

(Notarial Seal)

Filed in office and recorded this 12th day of February A. D. 1926 at 12:36 P. M.

BY

CLERK

D. O. E.

THIS INDENTURE, made this 12th day of February A. D. 1926 BETWEEN Elizabeth S. Rice (Widow) of the County of Orange in the State of Florida party of the first part, and Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company of the County of Orange in the State of Florida parties of the second part,

WITNESSES: That the said party of the first part, for and in consideration of the sum of Ten dollars and other valuable considerations to her in hand paid by the said parties of the second part, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, has granted, bargained and sold to the said parties of the second part, their heirs and assigns forever, the following described land, to-wit:

Beginning at the Northeast corner of Main Street and Summerlin Place, and running North along Main Street 10.435 feet, East 89.36 feet South 104.35 feet to the North line of Summerlin Place West 89.36 feet to the place of beginning, being part of the NE^2 of SE^2 of Section 62, Township 22 South Range 29 East.

And the said party of the first part does hereby fully warrant the title to said land, and will defend the same against the lawful claims of all persons whatsoever.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said party of the first part has hereunto set her hand and seal the day and year first above written.

Signed, sealed and delivered in presence of us:

Florence S. Mattinling
J. Lee Greene

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF ORANGE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this day personally appeared before me, an officer duly authorized to administer oaths and take acknowledgments, Elizabeth S. Rice to me well known and known to me
This Indenture, Made this 2nd day of May A. D. 19_25
between the AMERICAN BANK AND TRUST COMPANY, as Trustee, a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, party of the first part, and
L. C. N. M., party of the second part,

of the County of and State of Florida, the State of Florida, party of the first part, and

WITNESSETH, that the said party of the first part, for and in consideration of the sum of

Ten dollars and other good and valuable considerations,

in hand paid by the said party of the first part to the said party of the second part, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, hath sold, released, conveyed, and by these presents does sell, release and convey unto the said party of the first part, heretofore and forever, all the following described lot, piece or parcel, or parcel of land, situate, lying and being in the County of Orange, State of Florida, to wit:

Lot twenty-four (24) in block two (2) of Lakeview Second Addition according to the map or plat on file and of record in the Public Records of Orange County, Florida in Plat Book M at page 79.

Under and subject, nevertheless, to the following conditions and restrictions, the acceptance of which form a part of the valuable considerations for this conveyance, to wit:

FIRST: That all lots in said section are hereby designated as residential lots, and that no building shall be erected upon the above described premises, which shall cost less than Four Thousand ($4,000.00) Dollars, if erected on any lot, failing the following conditions:

1. Twenty-five (25) feet between the front property line of said premises, one half of a (1/2) foot from the side property line where any such conditions apply, and property line or not less than five (5) feet to any other inside property line.

2. That there be hereby reserved over, under and across the rear on the back end of the above described premises, an easement of thirty (30) feet in width, for the purpose of connecting and maintaining sewage lines, water mains, gas mains, and electric light or telephone conduits, and the servitudes quarters or garage above referred to shall never be erected or encroached upon by any portion of said easement or reservation; the said strip of land, three (3) feet in width, upon which the street is reserved as being shown and marked upon the map or plat of this property and designated as a "servitude.

3. That such lots of general design approved by the Florida State Board of Health, shall be erected, constructed and maintained upon each property by the said party of the first part, the heirs and assigns, of such design, and capable of taking care of the sewage and waste of the building or buildings erected thereon.

SECOND: That residence on inside lots shall face the front lot line, and on corner lots shall face the same street as those on the adjoining inside lots.

THIRD: That no building shall be erected upon any of the above described premises, so that any porches thereof shall be nearer than thirty (30) feet to the front street property line of said premises, nor nearer than ten (10) feet to the side property line where any such conditions apply, and property line or not less than five (5) feet to any other inside property line.

FOURTH: That there be hereby reserved over, under and across the rear on the back end of the street described property, an easement of fifteen (15) feet in width, for the purpose of connecting and maintaining sewage lines, water mains, gas mains, and electric light or telephone conduits, and the servitudes quarters or garage above referred to shall never be erected or encroached upon by any portion of said easement or reservation; the said strip of land, three (3) feet in width, upon which the street is reserved as being shown and marked upon the map or plat of this property and designated as a "servitude.

FIFTH: That said lots of general design approved by the Florida State Board of Health, shall be erected, constructed and maintained upon each property by the said party of the first part, the heirs and assigns, of such design, and capable of taking care of the sewage and waste of the building or buildings erected thereon.

SIXTH: That the said party of the second part, the heirs and assigns, are restricted and prohibited for the period of ninety-nine years from the date hereof from selling, conveying, leasing, letting or otherwise granting the said above described property or any interest therein or thereof to any person or persons other than White or Colored.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the same, together with all and singular the appurtenances thereto belonging or in anywise appertaining, and all the estate, right, title, interest and claim whatsoever of the said party of the first part, either in law or equity, to the only proper use and benefit of the said party of the second part, heretofore and forever.

And the said party of the first part, for itself, its successors and assigns, does hereby covenant with the said party of the second part, that the said premises are free and clear from all incumbrances created or imposed by the said party of the first part, and all the said premises and successors of the said premises shall, to the best of the said party of the second part, heretofore and forever, against the lawful claims and demands of all persons claiming by, through or under the said party of the first part, specially excepting out of this warranty possible liens for paying and public rights in any highways adjacent to said premises and zoning and restrictions by public authorities.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said party of the first part has caused these presents to be signed in its name by its Vice-President, and its corporate seal to be affixed, attested by its Secretary, the day and year above written.

AMERICAN BANK & TRUST COMPANY AS TRUSTEE,

(Corporate Seal)

Attorn

By

President

Thorpe Bros. Development Company

By

President
STATE OF Florida

COUNTY OF Pinellas

I HEREBY CERTIFY, That on the 8th day of February, A.D., 1928, before me personally appeared

C. Y. Tyler

and

Mrs. Marie Ivan

respectively Vice-President and Secretary of the American Bank and Trust Company of St. Petersburg, Florida, to me well known to be the persons described in and who executed the foregoing conveyance to

WITNESS my signature and official seal at St. Petersburg, in the County of Pinellas and State of Florida, the day and year last aforesaid.

My Commission expires

Notary Public, State of Florida, at Large.
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 Ordinance authorizing the refunding of the Electric Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2007

motion | recommendation

Approve first reading of Bond Ordinance and schedule second reading for March 14, 2016

background

The City has an opportunity to refund the outstanding Electric Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2007. The City’s Financial Advisor, Public Financial Management (PFM), has estimated net present value savings at $1,540,000 or 8.5% of the refunded bonds. Annual debt service savings are estimated at about $100,000. Final maturity of the 2016 bonds is October 1, 2037 which is the same as the 2007 bonds that will be refunded.

The City’s Debt Management Policy sets a minimum target net present value savings of at least 5% for an advance refunding. Staff and PFM are planning to refund the bonds using a competitive bond sale.

alternatives | other considerations

1. Postpone refunding of the bonds and hope for long-term interest rates to go down further
2. Don’t refund the 2007 bonds

fiscal impact

Net present value savings estimated at $1,540,000 and annual debt service savings estimated at $100,000.
ORDINANCE NO. [_____] -16

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF NOT EXCEEDING $21,000,000 ELECTRIC REFUNDING REVENUE BONDS OF THE CITY TO FINANCE THE REFUNDING OF A PORTION OF ITS OUTSTANDING ELECTRIC REFUNDING AND IMPROVEMENT REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2007 AND PAYING THE COSTS OF ISSUANCE THEREOF; PROVIDING FOR THE PAYMENT OF SUCH BONDS FROM THE NET REVENUES DERIVED FROM THE ELECTRIC SYSTEM OF THE CITY ON PARITY WITH THE CITY’S OUTSTANDING ELECTRIC REVENUE BONDS; PROVIDING FOR THE SALE OF SUCH BONDS PURSUANT TO A COMPETITIVE PUBLIC SALE OR A NEGOTIATED PUBLIC SALE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY FOR THIS ORDINANCE. This ordinance is enacted pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 166, Parts I and II, Florida Statutes; Chapter 86, Article III, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Winter Park, Florida (the "City"); and other applicable provisions of law.

SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS. Capitalized terms used herein but not otherwise defined shall have the meaning ascribed to them in Resolution No. 1898-05 duly adopted by the City on May 9, 2005 (the “Original Resolution”).

SECTION 3. FINDINGS. It is hereby ascertained, determined and declared that:

A. Under current municipal bond market conditions, it is in the best interests of the City to advance refund and prepay a portion of its outstanding Electric Refunding and Improvement Revenue Bonds, Series 2007 (the “2007 Bonds”) with proceeds to be derived from the sale of one or more series of its electric revenue bonds to be issued under the Original Resolution.

B. It is necessary and desirable by the City to issue electric refunding revenue bonds to be designated by the City in an amount not exceeding $21,000,000 to advance refund and prepay a portion of its outstanding 2007 Bonds and to pay the costs of issuance thereof (the “Bonds”) pursuant to a competitive public sale or a negotiated public sale upon the advice of the City’s financial advisor, Public Financial Management, Inc.

SECTION 4. AUTHORIZATION OF BONDS. The issuance by the City of not exceeding $21,000,000 electric refunding revenue bonds for the purpose described above; to bear interest at a rate or rates not exceeding the maximum legal rate per annum, to be payable, to mature, to be subject to redemption and to have such designations and other characteristics
as shall be provided by subsequent resolution or resolutions of the Commission prior to their
delivery; and to be secured on a parity with the lien of the holders of its outstanding electric
revenue bonds under the Original Resolution upon and pledge of the net revenues derived by
the City from its electric system; is hereby authorized. The Commission may adopt a specific
bond resolution (including any necessary resolutions supplemental to the Original Bond
Resolution) supplemental to this ordinance, setting forth the maturities (or a mechanism for
determining such maturities on or prior to the sale of such Bonds) and the fiscal details and
other covenants and provisions necessary for the marketing, sale and issuance of such Bonds. In
addition the bond resolution may authorize various interest rate modes and appropriate
agreements for such modes, and may establish special accounts and include provisions for the
sole benefit of the holders of such Bonds, as circumstances dictate, in order to fully protect the
rights of the holders of such Bonds.

The Bonds, when delivered by the City pursuant to the terms of the Original Resolution
and any resolution supplemental thereto as contemplated hereby shall not constitute general
obligations or indebtedness of, or a pledge of the faith, credit or taxing power of, the City or of
the State of Florida or any agency or political subdivision thereof, but are limited, special
obligations of the City, the principal of, premium, if any, and interest on which are payable
from the net revenues. Neither the City nor the State of Florida, or any agency or political
subdivision thereof, will be obligated (i) to exercise its ad valorem taxing power or any other
taxing power in any form on any real or personal property to pay the principal of, premium, if
any, or interest on the Bonds, or other costs incident thereto, or (ii) to pay the same from any
funds of the City except from the net revenues in the manner provided in the Original
Resolution and any resolution supplemental thereto. The Bonds do not constitute a lien upon
any other property of or in the City.

SECTION 5. GENERAL AUTHORITY. The Mayor, City Manager and Finance
Director of the City, or any of them, are hereby authorized, pending adoption of the above
resolutions, to do all things and to take any and all actions on behalf of the City, without further
action by the Commission, to provide for issuance of the Bonds; to furnish disclosures,
representations, certifications and confirmations concerning the City; to solicit bids from
financial institutions for the purchase of the Bonds; and to execute and deliver any
commitments from financial institutions regarding the Bonds and all other documents and
instruments deemed appropriate by any of such officers, the approval of the City and all
corporate power and authority for such actions to be conclusively evidenced by the execution
and delivery thereof by any of such officers.

SECTION 6. REPEALER. All ordinances, resolutions or parts thereof in conflict with
this ordinance are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

SECTION 7. EFFECTIVE DATE. This ordinance shall take effect immediately upon
its final passage and enactment.
ENACTED after reading by title at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida, held in City Hall, Winter Park, Florida, on this 14th day of March, 2016.

Mayor Steve Leary

ATTEST:

City Clerk Cynthia S. Bonham
Subject: Request to Rezone 1240 Fairview Avenue.

This public hearing involves the request by Alfredas Sumanas (property owner) to change the Comp. Plan future land use and Zoning for 1240 Fairview Avenue from Office to Commercial (C-3A). Mr. Sumanas is experiencing difficulty in leasing this property as office space and desires commercial zoning that would allow a wide range of potential tenants such as beauty salons. The building on this property is a former converted duplex of 2,500 sq. ft. with four parking spaces. Half of it is rented as an insurance office and the other half would be rented for a one or two person salon if the zoning were changed.

Summary:

This block of property between Orlando Avenue and Grove Avenue has split zoning with Commercial (C-3) zoning on the east half of the block on the properties fronting on Orlando Avenue and Office zoning on the west half of the block. The purpose of the split zoning, established in 1971, was to have less intense office businesses on the west half of the block that is adjacent to the residential neighborhood. Generally commercial businesses have more traffic and longer hours than office businesses that tend to be more weekday, 9-5 operations. Thus office businesses are more compatible to be adjacent to residential homes because their activity is during the day when residents are often at work and then quieter at nights and on weekends when the residents tend to be at home.

In the specific case of 1240 Fairview Avenue, this property sits in between office and commercial properties. This location provides the opportunity to be rezoned to commercial without impacting the general philosophy of maintaining office uses adjacent to residential areas.

The City frequently receives inquiries from salons, spas and other personal care businesses about renting spaces in office buildings. Traditionally almost all zoning codes tend to treat salons, spas and such as “personal services” that are permitted in commercial zoning and not as professional or business offices allowed in office zoning. The larger franchise operations such as The Hair Cuttery, Great Clips, Floyd’s and other spas are appropriately zoned only for commercial areas. However there are a large number of sole proprietor businesses that have developed clienteles that want to own their own business space versus leasing a “chair” or being an employee.
In Winter Park, we have seen the Phenix salons at the corner of Fairbanks and New York Avenues and the Porte Noire Salon Collective at 1408 Gay Road with business models that rent individual salon suites for single proprietors. The operational characteristics of these single person suites are compatible with the traffic and activity within office buildings.

**Planning Staff Recommendation:**

The location of this property allows rezoning to commercial without violating the general desire and protections of having office zoning adjacent to residential areas. The parking and traffic impact from a single person salon will not be any different than if leased as office space. The staff is recommending establishment of C-3A zoning (versus C-3) since there are greater residential protections within that zoning district.

**Planning and Zoning Board Recommendation:**

**Motion made by Tom Sacha, seconded by Peter Gottfried to APPROVE the request amend the "Comprehensive Plan" Future Land Use Map to change from Office to a Commercial designation on the property at 1240 Fairview Avenue. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.**

**Motion made by Tom Sacha, seconded by Peter Gottfried to APPROVE the request to amend the official zoning map to change from Office (O-1) district zoning to commercial (C-3A) on the property located at 1240 Fairview Avenue. Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.**
REQUEST OF ALFREDAS SUMANAS TO: AMEND THE "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN" FUTURE LAND USE MAP TO CHANGE FROM OFFICE TO A COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION ON THE PROPERTY AT 1240 FAIRVIEW AVENUE.

REQUEST OF ALFREDAS SUMANAS TO: AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP TO CHANGE FROM OFFICE (O-1) DISTRICT ZONING TO COMMERCIAL (C-3A) DISTRICT ZONING ON THE PROPERTY AT 1240 FAIRVIEW AVENUE.

Planning Manager Jeffrey Briggs presented the staff report and explained that this public hearing involves the request by the Alfredas Sumanas (property owner) to change the Comp. Plan future land use and zoning for 1240 Fairview Avenue from Office to Commercial. Mr. Sumanas is experiencing difficulty in leasing this property as office space and desires commercial zoning that would allow a wide range of potential tenants such as beauty salons. The building on this property is a former converted duplex of 2,500 sq. ft. with four parking spaces. Half of it is rented as an insurance office and the other half would be rented for a single person salon if the zoning were changed. Mr. Briggs provided an overview of the neighborhood dynamics as well as discussed personal service business in the commercial zoning versus office zoning. He noted that in the specific case of 1240 Fairview Avenue, this property sits in between office and commercial properties. This location provides the opportunity to be rezoned to commercial without impacting the general philosophy of maintaining office uses adjacent to residential areas. Mr. Briggs summarized by stating that the location of this property allows rezoning to commercial without violating the general desire and protections of having office zoning adjacent to residential areas. The parking and traffic impact from a small salon will not be any different than if leased as office space. The staff is recommending establishment of C-3A zoning (versus C-3) since there are greater residential protections within that zoning district. Staff recommendation is for approval of the request for Commercial FLU and C-3 Zoning for 1240 Fairview Avenue. Mr. Briggs responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Alfredas Sumanas, the applicant, explained to the Board members the difficulty he has in securing tenants for his property due to the current comprehensive plan designation and zoning category. He has been contacted by persons that want to rent the space for a small hair salon but the zoning prohibits such.

Joe Linartas, neighboring property owner, addressed the Board in favor of the request. He agreed with the comments made by Mr. Sumanas.

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

The Planning Board members agreed that in this circumstance, this property could be rezoned and still retain the office buffer on the corner adjacent to the residential neighborhood.

Motion made by Tom Sacha, seconded by Peter Gottfried to APPROVE the request amend the "Comprehensive Plan" Future Land Use Map to change from Office to a Commercial designation on the property at 1240 Fairview Avenue. Motion carried unanimously by a 7-0 vote.

Motion made by Tom Sacha, seconded by Peter Gottfried to APPROVE the request to amend the official zoning map to change from Office (O-1) district zoning to Commercial (C-3A) on the property located at 1240 Fairview Avenue. Motion carried unanimously by a 7-0 vote.
ORDINANCE NO.       

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA AMENDING CHAPTER 58, "LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE", ARTICLE I "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN" FUTURE LAND USE MAP SO AS TO CHANGE THE FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF OFFICE TO COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION ON THE PROPERTY AT 1240 FAIRVIEW AVENUE, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED HEREIN, PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Winter Park City Commission adopted its Comprehensive Plan on February 23, 2009 via Ordinance 2762-09, and

WHEREAS, Section 163.3184, Florida Statutes, establishes a process for adoption of comprehensive plans or plan amendments amending the future land use designation of property; and

WHEREAS, this Comprehensive Plan amendment meets the criteria established by Chapter 163 and 166, Florida Statutes; and pursuant to and in compliance with law, notice has been given to Orange County and to the public by publication in a newspaper of general circulation to notify the public of this proposed Ordinance and of public hearings to be held; and

WHEREAS, the Winter Park Planning and Zoning Board, acting as the designated Local Planning Agency, has reviewed and recommended adoption of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment, having held an advertised public hearing on February 2, 2016, provided for participation by the public in the process, and rendered its recommendations to the City Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Winter Park City Commission has reviewed the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment and held advertised public hearings on February 22, 2016 and March 14, 2016 and provided for public participation in the process 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 CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. That Chapter 58 "Land Development Code", Article I, "Comprehensive Plan" future land use plan map is hereby amended so as to change the future land use map designation of office to commercial on the property at 1240 Fairview Avenue, more particularly described as follows:

LOT 13, BLOCK 6 PER THE PLAT OF KILLARNEY ESTATES RESURVEY, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK "L", PAGE 19 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

Property Tax ID # 12-22-29-4172-06-130
SECTION 2. Severability. If any Section or portion of a Section of this Ordinance proves to be invalid, unlawful, or unconstitutional, it shall not be held to invalidate or impair the validity, force, or effect of any other Section or part of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3. Conflicts. All Ordinances or parts of Ordinances in conflict with any of the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION 4. Effective Date. An amendment adopted under this paragraph does not become effective until 31 days after adoption. If timely challenged, an amendment may not become effective until the state land planning agency or the Administration Commission enters a final order determining that the adopted small scale development amendment is in compliance.

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 ____________, 2016.

Mayor

______________________________
Mayor Steve Leary

Attest:

______________________________
City Clerk
ORDINANCE NO.  

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 58 "LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE" ARTICLE III, "ZONING" AND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP SO AS TO CHANGE OFFICE (O-1) DISTRICT ZONING TO COMMERCIAL (C-3A) DISTRICT ZONING ON THE PROPERTY AT 1240 FAIRVIEW AVENUE, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED HEREIN, PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the owners of property at 426 West Lyman Avenue have requested a Zoning map amendment consistent with the amended Comprehensive Plan, and the requested zoning text change will achieve conformance with the Comprehensive Plan for the property and such municipal zoning meets the criteria established by Chapter 166, Florida Statutes and pursuant to and in compliance with law, notice has been given to Orange County and to the public by publication in a newspaper of general circulation to notify the public of this proposed Ordinance and of public hearings to be held; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Winter Park has recommended approval of this Ordinance at their February 2, 2016 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission of the City of Winter Park held a duly noticed public hearing on the proposed zoning change set forth hereunder and considered findings and advice of staff, citizens, and all interested parties submitting written and oral comments and supporting data and analysis, and after complete deliberation, hereby finds the requested change consistent with the City of Winter Park Comprehensive Plan and that sufficient, competent, and substantial evidence supports the zoning change set forth hereunder; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission hereby finds that this Ordinance serves a legitimate government purpose and is in the best interests of the public health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Winter Park, Florida.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ENACTED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Official Zoning Map Amendment. That Chapter 58 "Land Development Code", Article III, "Zoning" and the Official Zoning Map is hereby amended so as to change the zoning designation of Office (O-1) District to Commercial (C-3A) District zoning on the property at 1240 Fairview Avenue, more particularly described as follows:

LOT 13, BLOCK 6 PER THE PLAT OF KILLARNEY ESTATES RESURVEY, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK "L", Page 19 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

Property Tax ID # 12-22-29-4172-06-130
SECTION 2. Severability. If any Section or portion of a Section of this Ordinance proves to be invalid, unlawful, or unconstitutional, it shall not be held to invalidate or impair the validity, force, or effect of any other Section or part of this Ordinance.

SECTION 3. Conflicts. All Ordinances or parts of Ordinances in conflict with any of the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION 4. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall become effective upon the effective date of Ordinance ________. If Ordinance ________ does not become effective, then this Ordinance shall be null and void.

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 _____________, 2016.

_________________________________________  Mayor Steve Leary

Attest:

_________________________________________

City Clerk
CITY OF WINTER PARK
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD

Staff Report
February 2, 2016

REQUEST OF ALFREDAS SUMANAS TO: AMEND THE "COMPREHENSIVE PLAN" FUTURE LAND USE MAP TO CHANGE FROM OFFICE TO A COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION ON THE PROPERTY AT 1240 FAIRVIEW AVENUE.

REQUEST OF ALFREDAS SUMANAS TO: AMEND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP TO CHANGE FROM OFFICE (O-1) DISTRICT ZONING TO COMMERCIAL (C-3) DISTRICT ZONING ON THE PROPERTY AT 1240 FAIRVIEW AVENUE.

This public hearing involves the request by the Alfredas Sumanas (property owner) to change the Comp. Plan future land use and zoning for 1240 Fairview Avenue from Office to Commercial. Mr. Sumanas is experiencing difficulty in leasing this property as office space and desires commercial zoning that would allow a wide range of potential tenants such as beauty salons. The building on this property is a former converted duplex of 2,500 sq. ft. with four parking spaces. Half of it is rented as an insurance office and the other half would be rented for a single person salon if the zoning were changed.

Neighborhood Context:

This block of property between Orlando Avenue and Grove Avenue has split zoning with Commercial (C-3) zoning on the east half of the block on the properties fronting on Orlando Avenue and Office zoning on the west half of the block. The purpose of the split zoning established in 1971 was to have less intense office businesses on the west half of the block that is adjacent to the residential neighborhood. Generally commercial businesses have more traffic and longer hours than office businesses that tend to be more weekday, 9-5 operations. Thus office businesses are more compatible to be adjacent to residential homes because their activity is during the day when residents are often at work and then quieter at nights and on weekends when the residents tend to be at home.

In the specific case of 1240 Fairview Avenue, this property sits in between office and commercial properties. This location provides the opportunity to be rezoned to commercial without impacting the general philosophy of maintaining office uses adjacent to residential areas.
Personal Service Businesses in Commercial versus Office Zoning:

The City frequently receives inquiries from salons, spas and other personal care businesses about renting spaces in office buildings. Traditionally almost all zoning codes tend to treat salons, spas and such as “personal services” that are permitted in commercial zoning and not as professional or business offices allowed in office zoning. The larger franchise operations such as The Hair Cuttery, Great Clips, Floyd’s and other spas are appropriately zoned only for commercial areas. However there are a large number of sole proprietor businesses that have developed clienteles that want to own their own business space versus leasing a “chair” or being an employee. In Winter Park, we have seen the Phenix salons at the corner of Fairbanks and New York Avenues and the Porte Noire Salon Collective at 1408 Gay Road with business models that rent individual salon suites for single proprietors. The operational characteristics of these single person suites are compatible with the traffic and activity within office buildings. This application then provides an opportunity for a discussion as to whether our office zoning could make some allowance for these single person personal service barbers or salons. The planning staff would favor such an allowance so that in circumstances like this one, a single person salon could go into this building without having to rezone to commercial.

Staff Analysis of the Applicant’s Requests:

The location of this property allows rezoning to commercial without violating the general desire and protections of having office zoning adjacent to residential areas. The parking and traffic impact from a single person salon will not be any different than if leased as office space. The staff is recommending establishment of C-3A zoning (versus C-3) since there are greater residential protections within that zoning district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS FOR APPROVAL of the request for Commercial FLU and C-3A Zoning for 1240 Fairview Avenue.
Subject: Conditional Use Request for an REI Store in the Winter Park Village at 402 & 490 N. Orlando Avenue.

This public hearing involves a Conditional Use request by Winter Park Town Center, Ltd. to demolish the existing Chamberlin’s Food Market and the adjacent small office building in the Winter Park Village (402/490 North Orlando Avenue), and construct a new 25,135-square foot REI retail building with a 1,200-square foot mezzanine. This is a Conditional Use because it is a new building over 10,000-square feet.

Summary:

These properties are zoned C-1 which allows up to a 45% Floor Area Ratio (FAR). For the Winter Park Village, the FAR is calculated for the entire block bounded by Orlando, Webster, Denning and Canton. This project is proposing to demolish 25,530-square feet of building and rebuild 26,335-square feet, therefore, the increase is only 805-square feet. The resultant FAR is 30.6%. There is not a parking space increase resulting from the extra 805-square feet of building because the back-of-house storage or warehouse portions of the REI store, which are calculated based on one space per 1,000 sq. ft. are larger than the Chamberlin’s store.

The proposed building height is 24 feet with some added parapet elements, which are all much lower than the maximum 55 feet allowed height in this location. The proposed setback along Orlando Avenue is a minimum of 25 feet and along Canton Avenue it is approximately 45 feet, which is larger than the required 15 feet. There will be an attractive landscape area (that will also serve as retention area) between the REI building and Orlando Avenue which is being continued south down to the corner of Canton Avenue. That will greatly improve the aesthetics of the view of this property from Orlando Avenue.

The service and loading area faces Canton Avenue (as it does now), and the applicant’s plans show screen walls for the loading dock and dumpster areas. Also, more importantly the plans continue the REI mural wall pattern along that rear building side in order to increase the attractiveness of this Canton Avenue facing view. However, even with these improvements, this is still a rear loading/service area that greets drivers on Canton Avenue. One idea that staff proposed was to eliminate the three parking spaces so that the center landscape island can be more elaborate to attract visual attention from the other elements, which has been agreed upon by the applicant.
In terms of traffic impact for the proposed use as a specialty retail store versus a supermarket, according to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (I.T.E.) data, the traffic generation/car trips per day will decrease slightly.

The scale of this project and the materials presented allows the City to combine the Preliminary and Final Conditional Use approvals. The final engineering and landscape plans can be administratively approved. The materials submitted include the prospective signage which conforms to the City’s Code.

Planning Staff Recommendation:

This will be an attractive redevelopment for a very visible corner of Orlando and Canton Avenues. The end result will be much more visually attractive than the current conditions. The square footage of the new REI store is virtually the same as the Chamberlin’s that is being demolished; there is no impact on parking and some small decrease in projected traffic generation. The staff recommendation was for approval of both the Preliminary and Final Conditional Use approvals with the conditions that were attached to the P&Z motion.

Planning and Zoning Board Recommendation:

Motion made by Mr. Sacha, seconded by Mr. Gottfried to APPROVE the request of Winter Park Town Center for Conditional Use approval to demolish and rebuild approximately 25,000 square feet of retail building area within the Winter Park Village shopping center at 402 and 490 N. Orlando Avenue subject to the following conditions recommended by staff and agreed to by the applicant:

1. That the Public Works Department must approve the storm water so that the water quality requirements continue to be met.
2. That if any new electric transformers/switch gear or backflow preventers are required that they be located where not visible from a public street and shall also be landscaped so as to be effectively screened from view.
3. That the landscaping for the project complies with the City’s code and be compatible with the existing Winter Park Village landscaping.
4. That the Canton Avenue landscape island be increased in size and plantings by eliminating the three parking spaces to increase the landscape area

Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.
P&Z Minutes: February 2, 2016:

REQUEST OF WINTER PARK TOWN CENTER LTD FOR: CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO DEMOLISH AND REBUILD APPROXIMATELY 25,000 SQUARE FEET OF RETAIL BUILDING AREA WITHIN THE WINTER PARK VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTER AT 402 AND 490 N. ORLANDO AVENUE, ZONED C-1.

Planning Manager Jeffrey Briggs presented the staff report and explained that this public hearing involves a Conditional Use request by Winter Park Town Center, LTD to demolish the existing Chamberlin’s Food Market and south adjacent small office building in the Winter Park Village (402/490 North Orlando Avenue), and construct a new 25,135-square foot REI retail building with a 1,200-square foot mezzanine. He explained that this request is a Conditional Use because it was a new building over 10,000-square feet. He provided an overview of the project and reviewed the parking requirements, building heights, landscaping, aesthetics, and traffic generation. The materials submitted include the prospective signage which conforms to the City’s Code. Mr. Briggs summarized by stating that staff feels that this will be an attractive redevelopment for a very visible corner of Orlando and Canton Avenues. The square footage of the new REI store is virtually the same as the Chamberlin’s that is being demolished; there is no impact on parking and some small decrease in projected traffic generation. Staff recommendation is for approval of both the Preliminary and Final Conditional Use approvals with the following conditions:

1. That the Public Works Department must approve the storm water so that the water quality requirements continue to be met.
2. That if any new electric transformers/switch gear or backflow preventers are required that they be located where not visible from a public street and shall also be landscaped so as to be effectively screened from view.
3. That the landscaping for the project complies with the City’s code and be compatible with the existing Winter Park Village landscaping.
4. That the Canton Avenue landscape island be increased in size and plantings by eliminating the three parking spaces to increase the landscape area.

Attorney Rebecca Wilson, 215 North Eola Avenue, represented the applicant, Winter Park Town Center Limited. She stated that they are excited to bring this project to the city and feel that it will be a great addition to the Winter Park Village, and that they are in agreement with the conditions listed in the staff report. She responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Jim Conroy, representing Casto Southeast, responded to Board member questions regarding the demolition and construction timeline. He explained that Chamberlin’s lease ends in May 2016, and demolition of will begin soon thereafter. He said that it is anticipated that construction will be complete in January of 2017 and it is anticipated to open in the spring of 2017.

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

The Board members expressed support of the project and expressed that this would be a very welcome improvement to that prominent location.

Motion made by Mr. Sacha, seconded by Mr. Gottfried to APPROVE the request of Winter Park Town Center for Conditional Use approval to demolish and rebuild approximately 25,000 square feet of retail building area within the Winter Park Village shopping center at 402 and 490 N. Orlando avenue subject to the conditions recommended by staff and agreed to by the applicant: Motion carried unanimously, by a 7-0 vote.
REQUEST OF WINTER PARK TOWN CENTER LTD FOR: CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO DEMOLISH THE EXISTING CHAMBERLIN’S NATURAL FOOD MARKET AND SOUTH ADJACENT OFFICE BUILDING, LOCATED AT 402/490 NORTH ORLANDO AVENUE, AND CONSTRUCT A NEW 25,135-SQUARE FOOT RETAIL BUILDING WITH A 1,200-SQUARE FOOT MEZZANINE.

This public hearing involves a Conditional Use request by Winter Park Town Center, LTD to demolish the existing Chamberlin’s Food Market and south adjacent small office building in the Winter Park Village (402/490 North Orlando Avenue), and construct a new 25,135-square foot REI retail building with a 1,200-square foot mezzanine. This is a Conditional Use because buildings over 10,000-square feet in the C-1 zoning district require Conditional Use approval.

Project Development Standard Parameters: C-1 zoning allows up to a 45% Floor Area Ratio (FAR) which is done on a global basis for the entire block of the Winter Park Village bounded by Orlando, Webster, Denning and Canton. This project is proposing to demolish 25,530-square feet of building and rebuild 26,335-square feet, therefore, the increase is only 805-square feet. There is not a parking space increase resulting from the extra 805-square feet of building because the back-of-house storage or warehouse portions of the REI store, which are calculated based on one space per 1,000 sq. ft. are larger than the Chamberlin’s store.

The proposed building height is 24 feet with a 3 foot parapet wall for a total visible height of 27 feet, which lower than the maximum 55 feet allowed height in this location. The proposed setback along Orlando Avenue is a minimum of 25 feet and along Canton Avenue it is approximately 45 feet, which is larger than the required 15 feet. There will be an attractive landscape area (that will also serve as retention area) between the REI building and Orlando Avenue which is being continued south down to the corner of Canton Avenue. That will greatly improve the aesthetics of the view of this property from Orlando Avenue.

The service and loading area faces Canton Avenue (as it does now), and the applicant’s plans show screen walls for the loading dock and dumpster areas. Also, more importantly the plans continue The REI mural wall pattern along that rear building side in order to increase the attractiveness of this Canton Avenue facing view. However, even with these improvements, this is still a rear loading/service area that greets drivers on canton Avenue. One idea that staff has is to eliminate the three parking spaces so that the center landscape island can be more elaborate to attract visual attention from the other elements.
In terms of traffic impact for the proposed use as a specialty retail store versus a supermarket, according to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (I.T.E.) data, the traffic generation/car trips per day will decrease slightly.

The scale of this project and the materials presented allows the City to combine the Preliminary and Final Conditional Use approvals. The final engineering and landscape plans can be administratively approved. The materials submitted include the prospective signage which conforms to the City’s Code.

Staff Analysis of the Applicant’s Request:

This will be an attractive redevelopment for a very visible corner of Orlando and Canton Avenues. The end result will be much more visually attractive than the current conditions. The square footage of the new REI store is virtually the same as the Chamberlin’s that is being demolished; there is no impact on parking and some small decrease in projected traffic generation.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION IS FOR APPROVAL of both the Preliminary and Final Conditional Use approvals with the following conditions:**

1. That the Public Works Department must approve the storm water so that the water quality and water retention requirements continue to be met.

2. That if any new electric transformers/switch gear or backflow preventers are required that they be located where not visible from a public street and shall also be landscaped so as to be effectively screened from view.

3. That the landscaping for the project complies with the City’s code and be compatible with the existing Winter Park Village landscaping.

4. That the Canton Avenue landscape island be increased in size and plantings by eliminating the three parking spaces to increase the landscape area.
January 7, 2016

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Jeff Briggs, Planner
Winter Park Planning Dept.
401 Park Avenue South
Winter Park, FL 32789

Re: Winter Park Village- 2016 CUP

Dear Jeff:

As you know this firm represents Winter Park Town Center LTD which owns the Winter Park Village. Enclosed please find our application for a new conditional use permit to redevelop a portion of the Winter Park Village:

- Application
- Property Appraiser Information
- Application Fee
- Development Plan
- Survey
- 3-D Elevations

The proposed CUP requests the demolition of 25,530 sf of existing commercial and replaces it with an approximately 25,135 sf building with a 1,200 sf mezzanine. The front setback is increased to 25 ft. In addition, the new landscaping will meet or exceed City code and be compatible with existing Winter Park Village landscaping. The stormwater will be managed through the existing master stormwater system for Winter Park Village.
Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Very truly yours,

MRW/sjg

M/Rebecca Wilson

c: Jim Conroy
**Internally Illuminated Pan Channel Letters**

Scale: 3'/8" = 1'-0"

Manufacture and install three (3) new sets of internally-illuminated, channel letters and logos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Specification/Material</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter returns</td>
<td>Fabricated .060&quot; alum.</td>
<td>ptd. - sat</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimcap</td>
<td>1&quot; Jewell trimcap</td>
<td>ptd. - sat</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter faces</td>
<td>.125&quot; translucent white acrylic</td>
<td>NiA</td>
<td>#7328 White acrylic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Acrylic face must be matte finish so as not to be reflective when sign is not illuminated.

**CHANNEL LETTER/LOGO SECTION DETAIL**

Scale: NTS

---

**ADART**

2970 W. SHAW LANE/SUITES 102
FRESNO, CA 93711
T 559.235.2162
W www.adart.com
### Monument Remodel

Manufacture and install one (1) new internally-illuminated cabinet for one (1) existing monument sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Specification/Material</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return Sample</td>
<td>Fabricated alum.</td>
<td>ptd.- sat.</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>ptd.- sat.</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faces</td>
<td>Flex</td>
<td>Digital print</td>
<td>Black with white copy &amp; logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monument Sign E (conceptual rendering) - Scale: NTS

**Monument Reface**

Manufacture and install two (2) new faces for one (1) existing monument sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Specification/Material</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faces</td>
<td>Aluminum with rout out copy</td>
<td>ptd. - satin</td>
<td>SW 7010 White Duck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy</td>
<td>Backed with acrylic</td>
<td>Day / night</td>
<td>Cyrus Day/Night Plex #11241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WINTER PARK
STOREFRONT ELEVATIONS

OCTOBER 22, 2015
NOTE:
ALL ITEMS ARE LANDLORD PROVIDED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED
EAST ELEVATION

- PAINTED GRAPHICS BY REI
- STEEL CANOPY
- EMPLOYEE ENTRY/EXIT WITH INTERCOM
- WAREHOUSE MEZZANINE ROOFING BEYOND
- METAL COPING
- STANDARD SIZE CONCRETE BLOCK (TRENDSTONE: GRANITE GRAY)
- STANDARD SIZE SPLIT FACE CONCRETE BLOCK (TRENDSTONE: ASH CHARCOAL)
- STUCCO PARAPET
- TRASH ENCLOSURE
- STEEL CANOPY WITH EXTERIOR LIGHTING (CANOPY AT 14'-6" TALL FROM BOTTOM OF SLOPE)
- PRECAST CONCRETE SELL CAP
- LANDSCAPE FEATURE (EXISTING TO REMAIN)
- LOADING DOCK OVERHEAD DOOR
- ADJACENT TENANT
- REI METAL SIGNING
- VERTICAL ORIENTATION
- AEP SPAN HR 36 PANEL (COLOR: VINTAGE)
- HORIZONTAL METAL CHANNEL TO MATCH AEP SPAN

Top of Metal Facade 20'-4"  
Top of CMU Wall 20'-4"  
First Floor Level 5'-0"

NOTE:
ALL ITEMS ARE LANDLORD PROVIDED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED
Subject: Request for Subdivision or Lot Split Approval at 360 Beloit Avenue.

Z Properties, Inc. (contract purchaser) is requesting subdivision or lot split approval to divide the property at 360 Beloit Avenue into two (2) single-family lots. The zoning of this property is R-1A. The property is currently occupied by one single-family home, which is to be demolished.

Summary:

**ZONING CONFORMANCE:** The proposed lots are to be split (vertically) and will measure approximately 67 feet in width, and 8,815-square feet and 7,836-square feet in size. The R-1A zoning requires a minimum of 75 feet of lot width, and a minimum of 8,500-square feet of land area. Thus, this request needs variances for the lot widths and one of the lots for land area. The applicant commented that it is the impact of the cul-de-sac bulb that reduces the lot area requiring that variance.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONFORMANCE:** The practice outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and the Subdivision Code is to look at the surrounding neighborhood to see what standard is for typical lot sizes with the same zoning. By lot “size” the City uses the same two criteria for “size” as outlined in the R-1A “minimum building site” standard, which is bot lot width and lot area. The Code dictates that the compatibility review area is within a 500-foot radius of the subject property, and is limited to those properties within in the same R-1A zoning category.

There are 51 properties zoned R-1A within the 500 foot radius. The average lot width of these 51 homes is 65.8 feet, and median lot width is 53.1 feet. Of the 51 homes, 65% of them are on lots less than 75 feet in width, and the other 35% of the homes are on lots of 75 feet or greater.

While the proposed lot to the east meets the minimum land area requirements for R-1A (8,500-square feet), the west lot is smaller than the minimum, and measures approximately 7,836-square feet. The average lot area from this 51 home survey is 11,333-square feet, and the median lot area is 11,322-square feet. In the immediate neighborhood area, within the 500-foot radius, there are some lots with exceptions to the R-1A minimum land area requirements (23%), but a majority of the homes (77%) either conform to or exceed the R-1A minimum land area requirements.
DEVELOPMENT PLANS: The applicant has provided a generalized front elevation for the types of home that their company builds, and a general site plan for the layout of the proposed homes. They will comply with the normal single-family development standards, setbacks, etc. Per our Subdivision Code, the City can condition any approval upon the subsequent submission, review and approval of house plans, as well as place conditions upon this approval.

Planning Staff Recommendation:

From Staff’s prospective, this lot split request generally meets the Comprehensive Plan comparisons and is not markedly different from the previous subdivision approved for the four lots at 1004 North Pennsylvania that were 60 feet wide and 9,480-square feet in size. The Planning Staff recommendation was for approval, of the lot split and the variance request.

Planning & Zoning Board Recommendation:

The Planning & Zoning Board received 10 letters that were in favor of the request. One speaker supported the request but asked for the homes to look more like they fronted on Beloit Avenue as all the patio homes across the street look like. Another resident spoke in opposition because he felt including the Beloit patio homes in the neighborhood comparisons created an unfair comparisons with the neighborhood on the south side of Beloit.

The Planning Board felt that the comparison method that the City uses looks at the entire surroundings. The members however did agree that the future homes should appear as if the “fronts” are on Beloit Avenue and agreed that since the plans presented are the ones that have generated letters in support that those plans should be the actual ones that are constructed.

Motion made by Peter Weldon, seconded by James Johnston to APPROVE the request to subdivide the property at 360 Beloit Avenue into two single-family building lots subject to conformance to the site plans and the elevations presented at the February 2, 2016 public hearing and with the request for emphasis on creating the appearances of front entrances on Beloit Avenue. All building permit materials are to be consistent with those presented at the February 2nd public hearing. If staff feels that there are any substantial changes, the revisions will be brought back to the Planning and Zoning Board for public hearing review.

Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.
P&Z Minutes: February 2, 2016:

REQUEST OF Z PROPERTIES FOR: SUBDIVISION APPROVAL TO DIVIDE THE PROPERTY AT 360 BELOIT AVENUE, INTO TWO SINGLE FAMILY BUILDING LOTS.

Planning Manager Jeffrey Briggs presented the staff report and explained that Z Properties, Inc. (contract purchaser) is requesting subdivision or lot split approval to divide the property at 360 Beloit Avenue into two (2) single-family lots. The zoning of this property is R-1A. He reviewed the zoning and comprehensive plan test as relates to the City’s review process of subdivisions or lot split requests and provided an overview of the applicant’s development plans. He said that the applicant has provided generalized elevations and floor plans for the types of homes anticipated to be built on these lots, if approved.

From staff’s prospective, this lot split request generally meets the Comprehensive Plan test and is not markedly different from the previous subdivision approved for the four lots at 1004 N. Pennsylvania that were 60 feet wide and 9,480 sq. ft. in size. Staff recommended approval of the request. Mr. Briggs responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Zane Williams, 271 North Pennsylvania Avenue, explained that various options were weighed for this site including the construction of one large single-family home. He said that consideration was given to the character of Beloit Avenue and the decision was made to construct two homes. He agreed with the staff report presented by Mr. Briggs.

Gary Hancock, Architect for the homes, spoke in support of the request.

John McDade, 450 Beloit Avenue, stated that he is the neighboring property owner but also the listing agent for the seller of the property. He spoke in support of the request and stated that he feels that two homes will be a nice fit for the neighborhood.

Dennis Casey, 443 Beloit Avenue, stated that he was not opposed to the lot split, but that he feels that the homes should face Beloit Avenue with garages in the rear keeping in character with the homes that already exist. He asked for plan changes to give the homes more of a “front door” look on Beloit Avenue.

Dick Gregor, 380 Waterfall Lane, spoke in opposition to the request. He did not feel that the homes are in keeping with the character in the neighborhood because the neighborhood affected is Waterfall Lane and not Beloit Avenue. He felt that it was not appropriate to use the Beloit patio homes to establish a lot size standard for this neighborhood on the south side of Beloit. He discussed his concerns with regard to the orientation of the homes and design.

Ira Kitograd, co-applicant, 731 Pansy Avenue, stated that he feels that they were sensitive to street views from Beloit and have made an effort to give appearance of 2 street frontages with the garages in the rear.

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

Chairman Johnston confirmed that the method of comparison is the same for this request as was done for the previous one at 1004 S. Pennsylvania. Mr. Weldon, Mr. Slocum and Mr. Hahn all expressed the importance of conformance to the plans presented for assurance to the neighbors as to design layout and for trying to increase the front door look on Beloit. Mr. Gottfried dis-agreed with the City’s system for evaluation because the character on both sides of Beloit differed substantially. Staff confirmed that approvals could be conditioned to specific plans and substantial changes returned to P&Z for review, following notice.
Motion made by Peter Weldon, seconded by James Johnston to APPROVE the request to subdivide the property at 360 Beloit Avenue into two single-family building lots subject to conformance to the site plans and the elevations presented at the February 2, 2016 public hearing and with the request for emphasis on creating the appearances of front entrances on Beloit Avenue. All building permit materials are to be consistent with those presented at the February 2nd public hearing. If staff feels that there are any substantial changes, the revisions will be brought back to the Planning and Zoning Board for public hearing review. Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.
CITY OF WINTER PARK
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD

Staff Report
February 2, 2016

REQUEST OF Z PROPERTIES INC FOR: SUBDIVISION OR LOT SPLIT APPROVAL TO DIVIDE THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 360 BELOIT AVENUE, ZONED R-1A, INTO TWO SINGLE-FAMILY BUILDING LOTS.

Z Properties, Inc. (contract purchaser) is requesting subdivision or lot split approval to divide the property at 360 Beloit Avenue into two (2) single-family lots. The zoning of this property is R-1A. The property is currently occupied by one single-family home, which is to be demolished.

During the City’s review process of subdivisions or lot split requests, there are two criteria that the lot split is required to meet. First is the ‘Zoning Test’ as to conformance with the zoning criteria. The next is the ‘Comprehensive Plan Test’ which is conformance to the neighborhood character.

ZONING TEST: This lot measures approximately 16,588-square feet in size, and has frontages on Beloit Avenue, Virginia Avenue, and Waterfall Lane. The lot measures approximately 114 feet in width along Beloit Avenue, 134 feet in width along Virginia Avenue, and 155 feet in width along Waterfall Lane. The proposed lots are to be split vertically between Waterfall Lane and Virginia Avenue (see attached). The lots will measure approximately 67 feet in width, and 8,815-square feet and 7,836-square feet in size. The R-1A zoning requires a minimum of 75 feet of lot width, and a minimum of 8,500-square feet of land area. Thus, this request does not meet the R-1A lot dimension and land area standards for one of the lots, and not the lot width for the other lot, thus variances are requested. The applicant will point out that it is the impact of the cul-de-sac bulb that reduces the lot area requiring that variance.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEST: The practice outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and the Subdivision Code is to look at the surrounding neighborhood to see what standard is for typical lot sizes with the same zoning. By lot “size” the City uses the same two criteria for “size” as outlined in the R-1A “minimum building site” standard, which is bot lot width and lot area. The Code dictates that the compatibility review area is within a 500-foot radius of the subject property, and is limited to those properties within in the same R-1A zoning category.

There are 51 properties zoned R-1A within the 500 foot radius. These are the four adjacent homes, homes along Beloit, Virginia and Pennsylvania Avenues, and homes on Misty Lane and Park North Court. The average lot width of these 51 homes is 65.8 feet, and median lot width is 53.1 feet.
Of the adjacent homes, 65% of them are on lots less than 75 feet in width, and the other 35% of the homes are on lots of 75 feet or greater. In the immediate neighborhood area, within a 500-foot radius of 360 Beloit Avenue, there are several exceptions to the R-1A lot frontage rule (65%).

While the proposed lot to the east meets the minimum land area requirements for R-1A (8,500-square feet), the west lot is smaller than the minimum, and measures approximately 7,836-square feet. The average lot area from this 51 home survey is 11,333-square feet, and the median lot area is 11,322-square feet. In the immediate neighborhood area, within the 500-foot radius, there are some lots with exceptions to the R-1A minimum land area requirements (23%), but a majority of the homes (77%) either conform to or exceed the R-1A minimum land area requirements.

**DEVELOPMENT PLANS:** The applicant has provided generalized elevations and floor plans for the types of homes anticipated to be built on these lots, if approved.

**SUMMARY:** Based on the application of the Comprehensive Plan policy and Subdivision Code text using lot area size (square footage) this request does not fully conform to the Zoning Test and Comprehensive Plan Test. Based on both the average and median lot frontage size for comparison purposes, this request does not conform to the Zoning Test (it needs variances), or the Comprehensive Plan Test of the neighborhood comparison for the west proposed lot (based on average and median lot area).

To the applicant’s credit, the average and median lot area for the surrounding properties compare favorably to the proposed 67 foot lot widths. While the east lot meets the minimum lot area requirements, the west lot does not and also does not compare favorably to the average and median lot size. Therefore, this is an interesting case where the neighborhood lot width comparison would favor the applicant’s request and variances but the neighborhood lot area comparison does not support the requests and so we are faced with a lot split that has a case for approval and for denial.

The Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Board has some latitude in the perspective on this request to look at the cul-de-sac bulb for a supporting factor of the smaller lot size. Or, P&Z can look predominately at the average and median lot size numbers for the neighborhood and determine they are too far away from the average/median lot size.

From Staff’s prospective, this lot split request generally meets the Comprehensive Plan test and is not markedly different from the previous subdivision approved for the four lots at 1004 N. Pennsylvania that were 60 feet wide and 9,480 sq. ft. in size.

**Staff Recommendation is for Approval.**
RELEVANT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICY:

Policy 1-3.6.8: Subdivision of Land and Lot Splits for Non-Lakefront Single Family and Low Density Multi-Family Property. The City shall consider approving subdivision and lot split applications, which are not lakefront properties and which are not estate lots in areas designated single family, low density or multi-family residential, when the proposed new lots are designed at size and density consistent with the existing conditions in the surrounding neighborhood within a radius of five hundred (500) feet.

ARTICLE VI. - SUBDIVISION AND LOT CONSOLIDATION REGULATIONS

Sec. 58-377. - Conformance to the comprehensive plan.

(a) In the City of Winter Park, as a substantially developed community, the review of lot splits, lot consolidations, plats, replats or subdivisions within developed areas of the city shall insure conformance with the adopted policies of the comprehensive plan as a precedent to the conformance with other technical standards or code requirements.

(b) In existing developed areas and neighborhoods, all proposed lots shall conform to the existing area of neighborhood density and layout. The proposed lot sizes, widths, depths, shape, access arrangement, buildable areas and orientation shall conform to the neighborhood standards and existing conditions. This provision is specifically intended to allow the denial or revision by the city of proposed lot splits, lot consolidations, plats, replats or subdivisions when those are not in conformance with the existing neighborhood density or standards, even if the proposed lots meet the minimum technical requirements of the zoning regulations.

(c) In determining the existing area or neighborhood density and standards, for the consideration of lot splits, plats, replats or subdivision of other than estate lots or lakefront lots, the planning and zoning commission and city commission shall consider the frontage and square foot area of home sites and vacant properties with comparable zoning within an area of 500-foot radius from the proposed subdivision.

(d) In order to implement the policies of the comprehensive plan, the city commission may also impose restrictions on the size, scale, and style of proposed building, structures, or other improvements. This provision shall enable the city commission to impose restrictions on the size, height, setback, lot coverage, impervious area or right-of-way access such that proposed building and other improvements match the dimension and character of the surrounding area or neighborhood.
Members of Planning & Zoning:

Allow us to introduce ourselves; my name is Ira Kitograd, Owner of IBK Construction, a custom home building company in Winter Park. My partner, Zane Williams, owner of Z Properties, is a custom homebuilder in Winter Park as well. Zane and I have been building homes in the Winter Park for a combined total of 30+ years and have collaborated on multiple properties in recent years.

We have the home located at 360 Beloit Avenue under contract. We intend to redevelop this property one of two ways; both options involve demolition of the current structure. Current zoning allows us to replace the current home with a new single-family residence. Preliminary design is a 6,000+ s.f home under air with a (3) car garage. Given the width of the lot we have the ability to build a 35 high structure. Our second option, pending approval, is to divide the property into two (2) parcels that will accommodate two smaller garden style homes of approximately 3,000 s.f each with rear loading garages and 30 foot in height.

Beloit Ave. is a special street, a street that has a series of smaller cottage/garden style homes each complementing each other in scale and style. Currently, twenty (20) of the twenty-three (23) homes on Beloit sit on 50 foot wide lots. If subject lot is divided each lot will be sixty-seven (67) feet in width.

Our preference is to divide the lot and build 2 smaller homes in keeping with the personality of the street.

There has been much precedent for the approval of this proposed lot division, most recently a similar property located just steps away on Pennsylvania Ave.

We look forward to meeting with the Neighbors and Board Members to discuss our plans in further detail.

Thank You

Ira Kitograd & Zane Williams
Comprehensive Plan Test
360 Beloit Avenue Lot Split

Date: January 2016

Average Lot Width = 65.8 feet
Average Lot Size = 11,333 square feet

360 Beloit Avenue

NOTES
R-1A Lots Within 500' of Site
Median Lot Width = 53.1 feet
Median Lot Size = 11,322 square feet
Date: January 24, 2016

Planning & Zoning Commission

Reference: 361 Beloit Ave, Lot Division

Dear Commission,

I am a neighbor of the above referenced property. I have met with Zane Williams and fully support removing the current home and building two smaller residences.

In favor of this project,

Ellen Prague
321 Beloit
Date: January 17, 2016

Planning & Zoning Commission

Reference: 361 Beloit Ave, Lot Division

Dear Commission,

I am a neighbor of the above referenced property. I have met with John Mcadade and fully support removing the current home and building two smaller residences.

In favor of this project,

[Signature]

Julia & Alex Wallace
339 Beloit Ave

*we would prefer the front doors face Beloit Avenue.*
Date: January 17, 2016

Planning & Zoning Commission

Reference: 361 Beloit Ave, Lot Division

Dear Commission,

I am a neighbor of the above referenced property. I have met with John Mcdaede and fully support removing the current home and building two smaller residences.

In favor of this project,

[Signature]

Lynn Howle
1144 N Pennsylvania Ave
Date: January 17, 2016

Planning & Zoning Commission

Reference: 361 Beloit Ave, Lot Division

Dear Commission,

I am a neighbor of the above referenced property. I have met with John McRae and fully support removing the current home and building two smaller residences.

In favor of this project,

Katherine & Gene
1143 N Pennsylvania Ave
Date: January 17, 2016

Planning & Zoning Commission

Reference: 361 Beloit Ave, Lot Division

Dear Commission,

I am a neighbor of the above referenced property. I have met with John Mcdafe and fully support removing the current home and building two smaller residences.

In favor of this project,

James & Virginia Stuart
360 Beloit Ave, Winter Park, FL 32789
Date: January 17, 2016

Planning & Zoning Commission

Reference: 361 Beloit Ave, Lot Division

Dear Commission,

I am a neighbor of the above referenced property. I have met with John Mcadie and fully support removing the current home and building two smaller residences. LOT SPLIT, TRUST ARCH REVIEW WILL BE PART OF-split approval

In favor of this project,

Dennis & Virginia Casey
443 Beloit Ave
Date: January 17, 2016

Planning & Zoning Commission

Reference: 361 Beloit Ave, Lot Division

Dear Commission,

I am a neighbor of the above referenced property. I have met with John Mcdale and fully support removing the current home and building two smaller residences.

In favor of this project,

Katherine & Kyle Bourne
1091 N Pennsylvania Av

[Signature]
Date: January 17, 2016

Planning & Zoning Commission

Reference: 361 Beloit Ave, Lot Division

Dear Commission,

I am a neighbor of the above referenced property. I have met with the owners representative and fully support removing the current home and building two smaller residences.

In favor of this project,

Ruth Kazeck
335 Beloit
Date: January 17, 2016

Planning & Zoning Commission

Reference: 361 Beloit Ave, Lot Division

Dear Commission,

I am a neighbor of the above referenced property. I have met with John Mcdade and fully support removing the current home and building two smaller residences.

In favor of this project,

Page Ritter
1184 N Pennsylvania Ave
Date: January 24, 2016

Planning & Zoning Commission

Reference: 361 Beloit Ave, Lot Division

Dear Commission,

I am a neighbor of the above referenced property. I have met with Zane Williams and fully support removing the current home and building two smaller residences.

In favor of this project,

Rick Proctor
453 Beloit