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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  Reverend Leslie McCarrick, Winter Park Christian Church
Pledge of Allegiance

3 Approval of Agenda

4 Citizens Budget Comments

5 Mayor’s Report
   a. Recognition – Summer Youth Enrichment Program providers and participants
   b. Check presentation – David Rider, YMCA

6 City Manager’s Report

*Projected Time
*Subject to change

15 minutes

5 minutes
## City Attorney’s Report
*Projected Time
*Subject to change

## Non-Action Items
*Projected Time
*Subject to change

### 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)*

## Consent Agenda
*Projected Time
*Subject to change

| a. Approve the minutes of July 11, 2016. |
| b. Approve the following contracts: |
| 1. Piggyback contract with Fastenal, TCPN Contract No. R142101 – MRO Equipment, Supplies & Related Items/Service; and authorize the Mayor to execute contract. |
| 3. Piggyback contract with HD Supply Waterworks, Water/Wastewater Material Alliance Extension Agreement No. 895; and authorize the Mayor to execute contract. |
| c. Approve the policy change regarding the special event banner program to include companies over 75 years old and have demonstrated community value as a special event. |

## Action Items Requiring Discussion
*Projected Time
*Subject to change

| a. Set tentative millage rate and budget discussion |

## Public Hearings
*Projected Time
*Subject to change

| a. Request of Phil Kean Designs, Inc. (Tabled from July 11, 2016 Commission meeting): |
| - Amend the conditional use approval granted on October 12, 2015 to redevelop the property at 652 West Morse Boulevard in order to develop 10 residential units in lieu of the approved 11 residential units and to modify the approved architectural elements. |
b. **Request of Wekiva Capital Partners, LLC:**
   - Conditional use approval to build a seven unit cluster housing project of two story houses of approximately 1,500 square feet in each house at 741 and 751 Minnesota Avenue.

c. **Request of Oppidan Holdings LLC:**
   - Conditional use approval to build a one story, Orchard Supply Hardware Retail Store of approximately 32,355 square feet in size on 2.4 acres adjacent to Orlando Avenue between Miller and Indiana Avenues, addressed as 1111 S. Orlando Avenue and 1240 Miller Avenue.

d. **Ordinance – Granting the petition of the Ravaudage Community Development District and dissolving the Ravaudage Community Development District (CDD) pursuant to Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes (1)**

### 13 City Commission Reports

| a. Commissioner Seidel |
| b. Commissioner Sprinkel |
| c. Commissioner Cooper |
| d. Commissioner Weldon |
| e. Mayor Leary |

*Projected Time
*Subject to change

10 minutes total

---

**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 has scheduled first crossing work for July 29-31. All crossing improvements are to be completed by August 2017.</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>Completed at July 11 Commission meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hope Baptist Church Project</td>
<td>Previously the Pastor had agreed to obtain assistance of a designer to improve the architectural appearance of the buildings.</td>
<td>The Pastor’s daughter will be following up on this by coordinating with the Planning Department actions that can be taken and then coming back to the Commission to finalize this matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Park restrooms</td>
<td>Design is complete on two new restrooms. Both are under construction.</td>
<td>Site work for the soccer field restroom began June 13. Site work for the baseball field restroom began June 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denning Drive</td>
<td>Denning Drive public meetings</td>
<td>City staff moving forward with design on Denning Drive based on approved concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
<td>Staff is updating the data, inventory and analysis for each element.</td>
<td>The update is due to the Department of Economic Opportunity by February 1, 2017. Schedule is available at <a href="http://www.cityofwinterpark.org/comp-plan">www.cityofwinterpark.org/comp-plan</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole County Drainage Ditch</td>
<td>Perform flood study for the contributing Seminole County and Winter Park drainage basins.</td>
<td>Execute joint participation agreement by August 2016.</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.
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. Mayor Leary asked for a moment of silence before the invocation due to the tragic incident with the deaths of the Dallas police officers. The invocation was provided by Reverend Steve May, First Baptist Church of Winter Park, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Members present:  
Mayor Steve Leary  
Commissioner Greg Seidel (via Skype)  
Commissioner Sarah Sprinkel  
Commissioner Carolyn Cooper  
Commissioner Pete Weldon  

Also present:  
City Manager Randy Knight  
City Clerk Cynthia Bonham  
City Attorney Rick Geller (for Attorney Ardaman)

Approval of the agenda

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

Mayor’s Report

a. Presentation – Winter Park High School Foundation Check

Sid Cash, on behalf of the Winter Park High School Foundation, Winter Park Pop Warner, and the community who supported ‘Restore the Roar’, presented the City with a $200,000 for their contribution toward the installation of the artificial turf surface on Showalter Field. He stated that Winter Park Pop Warner is pursuing to help fund the improvement of the scoreboard with the help of the City.

City Manager’s Report

a. Presentation of the proposed 2016/2017 budget

City Manager Knight presented and provided an overview of the proposed budget for the upcoming fiscal year. Upon discussion, a work session was scheduled for 1:30, July 25 to receive a presentation on the broadband feasibility study and to have a budget/strategic discussion.

City Attorney’s Report

City Attorney Geller reported that the bond validation lawsuit has been filed. The timing was addressed by City Attorney Geller and City Manager Knight.

Non-Action Item

No items.
Consent Agenda

a. Approve the minutes of June 27, 2016.
b. Approve the following contracts:
   1. Piggyback contracts with Daktronics for TCPN Contract No. R5195, Scoreboards and Electronic Signs; and Nevco, Inc. for NJPA Contract No. 082114-NVC, Video Display & Scoring Solutions; and authorize the Mayor to execute contracts; not to exceed $185,000. **PULLED FROM CONSENT AGENDA. THE ITEM WAS NOT APPROVED.**

Motion made by Commissioner Sprinkel to approve Consent Agenda items ‘a’ and ‘b-2’; seconded by Commissioner Weldon and carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote. No public comments were made.

Consent Agenda Item b-1:

City Manager Knight pulled this item to discuss. He addressed both companies and asked the Commission not to approve this item because they are finding that the piggybacking contract does not match the scoreboard they are purchasing. He stated they will be doing a short one week bid process so both companies can give the City a hard bid on the scoreboard they are looking at.

Motion made by Commissioner Cooper to authorize staff to go ahead with the bid and for an amount up to $185,000 to award to whichever one comes in with the lowest, most responsible bid; seconded by Commissioner Sprinkel and carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote. No public comments were made.

Action Items Requiring Discussion

a. City Visioning Process Presentation

Commissioner Cooper asked to be able to make a correction. She stated when they initially started looking at this she believed they said they were going to put this in the comprehensive plan but after pulling the minutes and reviewing it, that was not the case. She stated this will end up being an advisory document. Commissioner Weldon expressed the importance that the community be accurately informed.

CRA Manager Kyle Dudgeon stated this was meant to be a guiding document that is not part of the comprehensive plan. He spoke about the steering committee and the many meetings they attended and that they have accomplished their goal. He commented that last month the committee unanimously approved a vision statement and four underlying themes for the Commission’s consideration tonight. He introduced John Gill, Chairman of the Steering Committee and Bruce Meighen,
Principle at Logan Simpson from the consulting team that assisted them with the process.

John Gill, Visioning Steering Committee Chairman, recognized the members of the committee who were present. He summarized the process taken place over the last 13 months and the representation of the 21 committee members who represented all aspects of the City. He played a video showing what the committee did during those months.

Bruce Meighen, Logan Simpson, presented the results of the committee’s work. He spoke about the large amount of public involvement, the process and the different phases they went through that included neighborhood meetings, and social events where residents communicated what they love about Winter Park and how they believe Winter Park will change over the next 30-40 years. He stated they took that information and created vision statements that were a compromise as they considered all peoples views and worked to find the correct words to use which brought them to the final phase today with receiving the Commission’s input.

Mr. Gill summarized the vision themes and their vision statement brought forward. Committee members Jeff Blydenburgh and Dykes Everett spoke about the need to preserve Winter Park and what they accomplished. Mr. Everett asked the Commission not to get caught up with the wordsmithing of the vision statement itself because while it is important it is not as important as the full guts of the document.

Mr. Gill provided the following: Supporting Document A: ‘Representing the Art of the Possible’ that contains big ideas for possible further consideration; Supporting Document B: Public Outreach Summary of Results June 2016; and Supporting Document C: Steering Committee Packets June 2016. The document entitled “Vision Winter Park” contains the acknowledgements, Our Vision, Vision Themes and summarized the entire year process.

Commissioners thanked the committee for their dedication and accomplishments and for the excellent outcome. It was clarified that the committee has completed their task and is no longer seated as a committee.

Commissioner Cooper agreed with pages 0-28 and was receptive to exploring the other ‘big ideas’. She expressed her preference to include other words/values in the main vision statement as communicated to her by concerned residents (heritage) and to change the word “incentivizing” to “increasing” public and private green space under vision theme #2.

Commissioner Weldon spoke about the construction of the words used in the vision statement and the importance that everyone is comfortable with the overriding vision statement and to make sure that residents are confident that their heritage is not going to be lost. Mr. Meighen addressed the many sets of words provided to the committee to help craft the vision statement and themes. Mr. Gill stated they
believed there were no omissions and that the words used were conveying the community feeling that our history and heritage are very important. Mayor Leary expressed that the committee has crafted a vision statement that gets through a thought and emotion without having individual specific words that people want to see in it.

**Motion made by Mayor Leary to accept the vision statement and vision themes, seconded by Commissioner Weldon.**

Joe Terranova, 151 N. Virginia Avenue, complimented the committee for a job well done.

The following spoke about the job well done by the committee but asked to include words such as “heritage”, “history”, “village scale” and “low density”:

Mary Daniels, 650 W. Canton Avenue
Penny Potter, 1360 Canterbury Road
Mary Randall, 1000 S. Kentucky Avenue (also addressed lack of buffered zones around new growth)
Pat McDonald, 2348 Summerfield Road
Linda Kulmann, 257 E. Canton Avenue
Betti Gorenflo, 591 Lakefront Boulevard
Maria Bryant, 450 S. Virginia Avenue
Martha Bryant Hall, 331 W. Lyman Avenue
Roberta Willenkin, 1580 Grove Terrace

Gary Sacheck, 1034 Aloma Avenue, spoke about traffic control in the City.

Commissioner Sprinkel spoke about the City’s heritage being very important to her but that she needs to support the outcome of the committee because she believed that the vision statement and vision themes do not take away the City’s heritage but was designed to build it up.

Commissioner Seidel addressed not being comfortable changing what the committee has done but would agree if the committee discussed adding ‘heritage’ into the statement. Commissioner Cooper agreed to have the language looked at by the committee because of what has been heard today from concerned residents.

**Motion made by Commissioner Cooper to table this until our next meeting to re-seat the committee and to give the committee an opportunity to look at the final vision statement and themes relative to what the residents have brought forward today. Motion failed for lack of a second.**

**Motion amended (amendment #1) by Commissioner Cooper to add the word ‘heritage’ back into the overarching ‘Our Vision’ statement after the word ‘culture’ (Arts, Culture, and Heritage); seconded by Commissioner Seidel for discussion.
Motion amended by Commissioner Cooper that under Vision Statement 2, (the 5th supporting statement) that we replace the word “incentivizing” public and private green space with “increasing” public and private green space. Motion failed for lack of a second.

Motion amended (amendment #2) by Commissioner Cooper to add under Vision Theme #2 an additional item that says “safeguard our small town feel and our village ambiance”; seconded by Commissioner Seidel for discussion.

Commissioner Seidel addressed the amendment made to add the word ‘heritage’ but was not comfortable changing the wording. He commented that he valued the time and the work performed of the visioning committee that he believed to be an excellent document. Attorney Geller stated the committee would have to be re-seated if any further changes were to be made. Mayor Leary clarified that the motion to re-seat the committee failed.

Motion to amendment #1 withdrawn (as the seconder) by Commissioner Seidel to add the word ‘heritage’. Amendment #1 failed for lack of a second.

Amendment #2 to add under Vision Theme #2 an additional item that says “safeguard our small town feel and our village ambiance” was addressed by Commissioner Cooper. She stated she wanted this because of the high level value that was stated numerous times and is talked about in the visioning documents.

Commissioner Seidel spoke about amendment #2 to add an additional item that says “safeguard our small town feel and our village ambiance”. He spoke about the visioning statement and believed this was addressed there. Commissioner Seidel withdrew his second. Amendment #2 failed for lack of a second. The motion was withdrawn by Commissioner Cooper.

Commissioner Weldon clarified that there is nothing in the document that any resident should fear; that everything ratifies the values that everyone shares about the City. He stated they should be ratifying the work of the committee without question and to re-write the words at the last minute after a year of effort, the funds spent and the energy expended is not honoring the process. He stated there is no downside to accepting what has been offered; only upside.

Upon a roll call vote to accept the vision statement and the vision themes, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Sprinkel, Cooper and Weldon voted yes. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

Public Comments (items not on the agenda):

Pat McDonald, 2348 Summerfield Road, asked about the timing of the bond validation and if the civic center would still be torn down in January. Mayor Leary
stated they just heard about this timeframe and they need to regroup to try and determine the strategy moving forward.

Linda Eriksson, 535 N. Interlachen, informed the Commission that the property located at 503 N. Interlachen is scheduled to be torn down (the pink apartments that have been there for 50 plus years). She expressed concerns with that property becoming a three story multi-million dollar condo complex and with concerns regarding our historic preservation. Staff will review this.

**Recess**

A recess was taken from 6:09 – 6:24 p.m.

**Public Hearings:**

- **Request of Morney Partnership Ltd. for the property at 226 Hannibal Square, East:**

  ORDINANCE NO. 3043-16: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 58 “LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE” ARTICLE III, “ZONING” AND THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP SO AS TO CHANGE PARKING LOT (PL) DISTRICT ZONING TO MEDIUM DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3) DISTRICT ZONING ON THE PROPERTY AT 226 HANNIBAL SQUARE, EAST, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED HEREIN, PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE. **Second Reading**

  Attorney Geller read the ordinance by title.

  **Motion made by Commissioner Sprinkel to adopt the ordinance; seconded by Commissioner Weldon.**

  The following opposed the three story residential home being proposed:
  Stuart Bogue, 2270 Howard Drive
  Martha Bryant Hall, 331 W. Lyman Avenue

  Commissioner Cooper addressed the conditional use approval from the previous meeting. Mr. Briggs explained the conditional use is dependent upon the zoning being put into place and is not effective until the zoning is adopted. He explained if the Commission votes no, the zoning stays PL. It was clarified that the zoning before it was changed to PL was R-3. Commissioner Cooper stated if they do not want three stories built here, they have to vote no.

  Commissioner Seidel asked if the R-3 zoning allows three story homes. Mr. Briggs explained that two stories is a permitted use and three stories require a conditional use approval. Commissioner Weldon explained that the lot is very small and it has underlying medium density residential zoning in the comprehensive plan; if you uphold the R-3 zoning it can only be one dwelling even though it is medium density residential.
Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Sprinkel and Weldon voted yes. Commissioners Seidel and Cooper voted no. The motion carried with a 3-2 vote.

b. RESOLUTION NO. 2175-16: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, CREATING A PROPERTY ASSESSED CLEAN ENERGY PROGRAM AND JOINING THE CLEAN ENERGY GREEN CORRIDOR PROGRAM IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 163.08, FLORIDA STATUTES; APPROVING A NON-EXCLUSIVE MEMBERSHIP AGREEMENT PURSUANT TO SECTION 163.01, FLORIDA STATUTES BETWEEN THE CITY AND THE GREEN CORRIDOR PROPERTY ASSESSMENT CLEAN ENERGY DISTRICT; PROVIDING FOR AUTHORIZATION; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Attorney Geller read the resolution by title. City Manager Knight explained this is similar to the one approved last year who is also asking to be non-exclusive under the PACE Program.

Motion made by Commissioner Sprinkel to adopt the resolution; seconded by Commissioner Weldon. No public comments were made. Upon a roll call vote, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Sprinkel, Cooper and Weldon voted yes. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

c. Request of Phil Kean Designs, Inc.: Amend the conditional use approval granted on October 12, 2015 to redevelop the property at 652 West Morse Boulevard in order to develop 10 residential units in lieu of the approved 11 residential units and to modify the approved architectural elements.

Planning Manager Jeff Briggs explained the request to amend the conditional use approval granted on October 12, 2015 and where they reduced the density and separated some of the buildings so there are open space green areas in between the buildings that run north/south. He stated in order to maintain the square footage they are closer to the City park area; the City park walkway from Morse back to the Community Center is now closer to the property line by about 3 feet. He addressed the previous discussion that this is City property that is not heavily used and whether there was an advantage to having the townhouse HOA help the City by taking care of the park.

He stated one of the conditions was to work out the developer’s agreement to cover the maintenance of the park between the City and the developers. He stated there is a landscape plan as to what will happen to the City property and there will be a new walkway directly from the front door to the pathway. He stated they tried to make both sides of the walkway look the same in the landscape plan so it does not completely look like it’s their front yards and the developer’s agreement would put in effect that maintenance agreement. He addressed the positive recommendation from the P&Z. The walkway size was discussed as well as any signage rights the City has since it is the City’s property.
Applicant Jacob Farmer, 135 N. Knowles Avenue, explained they are lowering the density and increased the greenspace. He addressed the walkway and the landscape plan that is being enhanced, that they are re-doing the sidewalk and taking over maintenance on it. Mr. Farmer stated he was still interested in purchasing the City property.

Tom McMacken, 1821 Shiloh Lane, opposed the request because they have to go through our City property to get into their property. He asked that this be tabled until a property Notice of Disposal has been filed.

Mr. Farmer pointed out that the walkway was always designed that physical walking access to get to the front doors of the units would be through the park area. He stated there is only a difference of 2-3 feet from the first site plan and that there was never on the approved site plan of the original project a self-contained sidewalk inside their property line; you always had to access it through the park. He clarified the sidewalk is only being straightened out because of being in disrepair and winding around the trees. Mr. Briggs clarified that there was physically a way to get to the parking lot without having to cross; now there is no way to get there.

Commissioner Cooper stated it does not make sense to give away this property and if that is going to be done, they need to table this and discuss trading property of like value that could become parkland someplace else. Commissioner Weldon agreed because of the long and structured relationship the applicant has had with the City and they have expressed an interest in buying the property. He did not want to delay what they are doing but that the observation provided by former Commissioner McMacken is important. Mr. Briggs clarified that the CRA purchased this property and the current Park zoning.

Commissioner Seidel stated he recalls the previous approval and liked that they were using the park that he believed added character to the buildings and was in agreement with the request. He commented that going to the NOD process could cause issues with the adjacent property owner who may also want some of this property.

Upon discussion, Mr. Farmer agreed they would like to purchase the property, keep it greenspace and would become their private property. Commissioner Seidel expressed concerns with selling the property and then the owners putting up a fence so it is no longer open space. Mr. Briggs addressed you can sell it subject to a deed restriction.

Motion made by Commissioner Weldon to table this item to come back in two weeks while staff and the applicant discuss how to proceed; seconded by Mayor Leary. Upon a roll call vote, Commissioners Sprinkel, Cooper and Weldon voted yes. Mayor Leary and Commissioner Seidel voted no. The motion carried with a 3-2 vote.
**City Commission Reports:**

a. **Commissioner Seidel** – Thanked Commissioner Sprinkel for switching dates with him for his Coffee Talk. He spoke about touring cities in Eastern Europe and the town centers being preserved from when they were initially constructed. He wanted to give some thought to the old town concept as the City moves forward with figuring out the best way to preserve our historic assets.

b. **Commissioner Sprinkel** – Spoke about her upcoming Coffee Talk and the Pulse event scheduled for Tuesday, July 12 a month after the tragedy.

c. **Commissioner Cooper** – Asked about the schedule for reviewing R-2 zoning codes regarding the turning radius and putting the visitors parking inside a closed garage. City Manager Knight stated staff is looking at this.

d. **Commissioner Weldon** – Addressed being amazed at the quality of the visioning outcome and looks forward to talking about it further as they go through the Comprehensive Plan.

e. **Mayor Leary** – Reiterated the tragedy that took place in Dallas and that he appreciates our police department’s work to keep us safe. He reminded everyone about the Orlando United event tomorrow in Central Park and thanked staff for their efforts to put this event together.

The meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

Mayor Steve Leary

ATTEST:

______________________________
City Clerk Cynthia S. Bonham, MMC
Piggyback 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>Fastenal</td>
<td>TCPN</td>
<td>Contract No. R142101 – MRO Equipment, Supplies &amp; Related Items/Service</td>
<td>Contract sets pricing no predetermined amount to be spent. Any expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission approve piggyback contract with Fastenal and authorize the Mayor to execute contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESCO Distribution, Inc.</td>
<td>TCPN</td>
<td>Contract No. R142106 – Maintenance, Repair &amp; Operations (MRO) Supplies &amp; Related Services</td>
<td>Contract sets pricing no predetermined amount to be spent. Any expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission approve piggyback contract with WESCO Distribution, Inc. and authorize the Mayor to execute contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD Supply Waterworks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Water/Wastewater Material Alliance Extension Agreement No. 895</td>
<td>Contract sets pricing no predetermined amount to be spent. Any expenditure included in approved FY16 budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission approve piggyback contract with HD Supply Waterworks and authorize the Mayor to execute contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TCPN is a Cooperative Purchasing agency. Contracts are awarded utilizing industry best practices, processes and procedures, ensuring maximum value and absolute transparency of the process. Items purchased from this contract will be used to replenish stock in the Central Utilities Warehouse on an as needed basis.

Orlando Utilities Commission issued a formal solicitation to award this contract. New contract term will expire June 30, 2017.

Approval of contract shall constitute approval for all subsequent purchase orders made against contract.
subject

Special Event Banner Program update

motion | recommendation

Motion to approval policy change to include companies over 75 years in age and have demonstrated community value as a special event is requested.

background

On April 21, 2015, staff completed a business longevity study. It was determined that the city had close to 269 (8.4% of total) and 16 (.5% of total) businesses of 25 and 50 years respectively. Based on direction from the Economic Development Advisory Board (EDAB), staff moved forward with a program to recognize these businesses leading to the ‘Salute to Business’ event on July 23, 2015.

Moving forward, the city has an opportunity to mold EDAB’s research and event into an economic development program. In 2010-2011, the Economic Development/CRA department took control of the city’s banner program to showcase nonprofit events in the area. As it currently stands, longevity accomplishments are currently not part of eligible activities included in the program.

Adding language to include ‘longevity milestones’ can be a cost-efficient change that would showcase Winter Park’s cornerstone businesses, and provide an outlet for city/private sector collaboration. This activity can be pursued by both for-profit and non-profit firms. The requesting firm must show documentation of their milestone as well as “...promote the culture, history, health, safety, or general welfare of the City of Winter Park”. This language is currently in the program. Staff recommends the threshold for this milestone be at least 75 years. This rational nexus serves two
purposes. The first is to create a requirement that limits the potential for sign poles to be considered commercial signage. The second is to showcase firms with a history in Winter Park in a way the city’s current economic development programs mirror. Through the study, staff identified 4 businesses with this milestone and another 6 in the next ten years. The proposed modifications to the program state that this type of event will be a one-time, 30 day period per business.

This is an opportunity to add a different, but fresh, branch off the city’s economic development programs, with similar roots to the Business Recognition Program. Since 75 years in business is reached so infrequently, the revenues generated from the program could be used to pay for the banners used by the applicant. The program as it stands is self-funded and would continue to remain so with the proposed changes. Banner design would still need to be approved by staff and provide acknowledgement of the milestone on the banner. The Economic Development Advisory Board reviewed this item at their regularly scheduled meeting on July 19th.

**alternatives | other considerations**

**fiscal impact**

The program will continue to be self-funded
subject

Budget Discussion and Set Tentative Millage Rate

motion | recommendation

Adopt a tentative operating millage rate of at least 4.0923 mills. Adopt voted debt service millage of 0.1715 mills required to service debt on the General Obligation Bonds, Series 2011 (Public Safety Complex bonds).

background

The Commission must adopt and submit the tentative millage rate to the Property Appraiser by July 31, 2016. This is the rate the Property Appraiser will use in preparing the “Notice of Proposed Property Taxes” to all property owners in August 2016. Once the tentative millage rate is set, it may not be exceeded unless an extensive notification to property owners is undertaken. The final millage can be lower than the tentative millage without additional notification requirements.

The proposed budget presented to the Commission on July 11 was based on keeping the current operating millage at 4.0923. If the commission wants more flexibility during the budget process, they may wish to adopt a tentative millage rate higher than 4.0923. The combined operating and debt service millage represents a decrease of 2.4% from the combined millage in FY16 because the golf course bonds were paid off and the library bonds have not yet started.

alternatives | other considerations

If the Commission chooses, it can adjust the millage rate within certain voting approval requirements at various millage thresholds. Below are the simple majority, super majority, and unanimous voting millage thresholds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rolled-back millage rate</td>
<td>Simple majority</td>
<td>3.9240</td>
<td>$19.24M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current millage rate</strong>*</td>
<td>Simple majority</td>
<td><strong>4.0923</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20.07M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted rolled back rate - Maximum millage rate allowed with simple majority</td>
<td>Simple majority</td>
<td>5.6982</td>
<td>$27.94M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 10% above adjusted rolled-back rate</td>
<td>Super majority (four votes)</td>
<td>6.2680</td>
<td>$30.74M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10% above the adjusted rolled-back rate and up to 10 mills</td>
<td>Unanimous vote</td>
<td>6.2680 – 10.0</td>
<td>$4.73M for each mill added.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rate proposed in budget.

**fiscal impact**

Property tax revenue is the single largest contributor to General Fund revenues and small adjustments to the rate can have large impacts on total revenues. As a simple way of considering incremental increases every ¼ mill increase (+0.25) in the rate adds an additional $1.18 million in annual revenue. Property tax revenues have grown at an annualized rate of about 2% over the last 10 years.
This public hearing was tabled on July 11th. Since that time, it has been determined that a potential sale of the 30 x 242 walkway strip should be pursued. The City would retain ownership of the 60 x 60 street front patio/pergola but potentially sell the rear 7,200 sf of walkway that would be sold zoned as parkland and with a deed restriction that nothing could be built on that land. The action then to implement that process would be to APPROVE the Conditional Use but NOT APPROVE the Development Agreement with the maintenance provision. If for some reason the sale does not work out, the developers can return with the Development Agreement maintenance request. In the meantime, staff will advertise the required Notice of Intent to Dispose so that we can solicit proposals for this land. The City Commission can then accept a proposal or reject all proposals.

This public hearing involves the request by Morse and Pennsylvania, LLC to amend the previously approved Conditional Use for redevelopment of the property located at 652 West Morse Boulevard, just to the west of the Coop Restaurant. This amendment involves changing the proposed number of residential units to 10 in lieu of the approved 11 units, and to modify the approved architectural elements of the building, and the landscape and hardscape plan.

Planning and Zoning Board Recommendation:

Motion made by Tom Sacha, seconded by James Johnston to amend the Conditional Use approval granted on October 12, 2015 to redevelop the property located at 652 West Morse Boulevard in order to develop 10 residential units in lieu of the approved 11 residential units, and to modify the approved architectural elements, together with the original conditions of approval. Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.

Amendment of the Conditional Use:

The property is now zoned C-2, which allows a maximum of 17 units per acre. Based on this lot size of 29,036 square feet, the originally proposed eleven (11) units were the maximum number permitted. The applicant is requesting to amend this approval to build ten (10) units in lieu of the approved eleven (11) units. They have also decreased the total building coverage by 233 square feet, and reconfigured the layout of the buildings to allow for additional greenspace in-between the five buildings. This has reduced the floor area ratio (FAR) from the originally approved 139.7% to 133.8%.
The applicant has also made changes based on the Planning and Zoning Board recommendations from the September 1, 2015 meeting. The buildings, as you can see from the attached elevations, are terraced and stepped back from the exterior face of the lower floors. Also, an additional three parallel parking spaces were created with the rearrangement of Welbourne Avenue.

The architectural elements of the buildings have also changed (see attached renderings). The applicant also had discussions with the City’s Parks and Recreation department to receive approvals of their landscape and hardscape plan. Staff expressed the concerns that the front yard of these units are City property, and recommended changes to the plans to reflect that this is a shared space. All other details of the original Conditions Use are to remain the same.

**Planning Staff Recommendation:**

The planning staff recommendation was for approval of this amendment to the approved Conditional Use, which still maintains the three original conditions of approval from October 21, 2015. The Code requires, even with amendments, two public hearings for approval by the City Commission for three story buildings within the C-2 zoning.

**Planning and Zoning Board Minutes: May 3, 2016**

**REQUEST OF PHIL KEAN DESIGNS INC. TO:** AMEND THE CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL GRANTED ON OCTOBER 12, 2015, TO REDEVELOP THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 652 WEST MORSE BOULEVARD IN ORDER TO DEVELOP 10 RESIDENTIAL UNITS IN LIEU OF THE APPROVED 11 RESIDENTIAL UNITS, AND TO MODIFY THE APPROVED ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS.

Mrs. DeCiccio announced that she is the prior owner of the subject property, and no longer has an economic interest in the property.

Planning Manager Jeffrey Briggs presented the staff report and explained that this public hearing involves the request by Morse and Pennsylvania, LLC to amend the previously approved Conditional Use for redevelopment of the property located at 652 West Morse Boulevard, just to the west of the Coop Restaurant. He said that this amendment involves changing the proposed number of residential units to 10 in lieu of the approved 11 units, and to modify the approved architectural elements of the buildings. The applicant has also decreased the total building coverage by 233 square feet, and reconfigured the layout of the buildings to allow for additional green space in-between the five buildings. This has reduced the floor area ratio (FAR) from the originally approved 139.7% to 133.8%. He noted that the applicant has also made changes based on the Planning and Zoning Board recommendations from the September 1, 2015 meeting by terracing and stepping back from the exterior face of the lower floors. An additional three parallel parking spaces were created with the rearrangement of Welbourne Avenue. He said that the architectural elements of the buildings have also changed and the applicant is also working with the City’s Parks and Recreation department to receive approval of their landscape plan. All other details of the original Conditions Use remain the same.

Mr. Briggs summarized by stating that the scale of this project and the materials presented allows the City to combine the amendments to the Preliminary and Final Conditional Use approvals; and the final civil engineering and landscape plans can be administratively approved. However, the Code requires, even with amendments, two public hearings for approval by the City Commission for three-story buildings within the Central Business District. Staff recommended approval of the amendment to the Conditional Use approvals subject to the following conditions:
1. The electric transformer/switch gear and all backflow preventers shall be located where not visible from a public street and shall also be landscaped so as to be effectively screened from view.

2. That a common area be provided in the rear (not in the right-of-way) for the placement of the 10 trash carts.

3. That a Development Agreement incorporate a mutual use and maintenance provision for the adjacent city park land property as well as the construction of the three offsite parking spaces.

Mr. Briggs responded to Board member questions and concerns.

Jacob Farmer, 135 North Knowles Avenue, was present to address concerns of the Board. No one else wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request. Public Hearing closed.

Motion made by Tom Sacha, seconded by James Johnston to amend the Conditional Use approval granted on October 12, 2015 to redevelop the property located at 652 West Morse Boulevard in order to develop 10 residential units in lieu of the approved 11 residential units, and to modify the approved architectural elements. Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.
DEVELOPER’S AGREEMENT FOR
MORSE BROWNSTONES – 652 WEST MORSE BOULEVARD

THIS AGREEMENT ("Agreement") entered into and made as of the ___ day of __________, 2016, by and between the CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, 401 S. Park Avenue, Winter Park, Florida, 32789 (hereinafter referred to as the "City"); MORSE AND PENNSYLVANIA, LLC and/or its successors and assigns, a Florida limited liability company (hereinafter referred to as "Developer"), 912 West Fairbanks Avenue, Winter Park, Florida 32789.

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, Developer is the owner and developer of that certain real property located at 652 West Morse Boulevard, lying within the municipal boundaries of the City, having Orange County Tax Parcel Identification Number 06-22-30-1168-11-030 and is more particularly described on Exhibit "A" attached to and incorporated into this Agreement (hereinafter referred to as "Property"); and

WHEREAS, the Developer desires to develop the Property with ten (10) residential townhomes totaling approximately 38,786 S.F. subject to a fee simple plat, as more particularly shown on Exhibit "B", the final site plan, attached to and incorporated into this Agreement by reference (hereinafter, the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, the Developer is the owner of the Property who will execute this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Developer desires to facilitate the development of the Project, in compliance with the laws and regulations of the City and of other governmental authorities, as well as provide assurances that the Project will be compatible with surrounding properties; and

WHEREAS, on October 12, 2015 the City Commission granted certain conditional use approvals and other zoning code exceptions, as modified by City Commission on July 25th, 2016 providing the approval for a Project referred to as Morse Brownstones and has approved the development of the Project, provided that Developer abide by the restrictions mutually agreed upon for the operation and future use of the Property, and that this Agreement shall set out the development entitlements, exceptions, conditions and terms of the City’s approvals; and

WHEREAS, this Agreement is not a statutory development agreement pursuant to Chapter 163, Florida Statutes (Florida Local Government Development Agreement Act), and is being entered into by the City pursuant to the City’s home rule authority as a condition of development approvals.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises and covenants herein contained, the City, and the Developer agree as follows:

SECTION 1. RECITALS
The above recitals are true and correct and form a material part of the Agreement.
SECTION 2. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Developer agrees to develop and maintain the Project and Property in accordance with the conditions of approval imposed by the City Commission concerning the October 12, 2015 approval as modified by City Commission on July 25th, 2016 of the conditional use and other zoning code exceptions, which are outlined as follows:

a. The Project consists of approximately 38,786 square feet of residential development which includes ten (10) townhomes of two and three stories in height that will be owned in fee simple. Developer shall submit (and obtain approval for) a final plat of the Property to be reviewed and approved by the City in accordance with applicable statutes and ordinances, and thereafter recorded in the Public Records of Orange County, Florida. As part of the final plat process, the Developer shall cause the formation of a Homeowners Association for the Project providing that each of the townhome unit owners shall be members of the homeowners association and each unit and unit owner subject to a set of declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions. The Project is further subject to the conditions outlined below.

b. The electric transformer/switch gear and all backflow preventers shall be located where not visible from a public street and shall also be landscaped so as to be effectively screened from view. Issuance of building permit by the City for this Project shall constitute compliance with this condition.

c. Changes to the Welbourne Avenue parking arrangement are approved for the creation of three parallel parking spaces by the Developer subject to further permitting from the City for the construction of the spaces.

d. That a common area be provided in the rear (not in the right-of-way) for the placement of the 11 trash carts. Issuance of building permit by the City for this Project shall constitute compliance with this condition.

e. Developer and the City shall work together to agree on a landscape and hardscape plan for the City-owned public space located to the west of the Property (being on a portion of real property having Orange County Tax Parcel Identification # 05-22-30-9400-44-010) (the “Park Area”). Developer, at its expense, will then make the improvements which shall be inclusive of a six foot wide sidewalk within the Park Area depicted on the approved landscape and hardscape plan (the “Park Improvements”). As part of the final platting of the Property, a use and maintenance agreement shall be drafted and executed between the City, Developer and the homeowners association for this Project providing for the Developer’s (until HOA turnover occurs) and the homeowners association’s non-exclusive licensed use and right and obligation to maintain the Park Improvements. Such use and maintenance agreement shall be in a form and with terms acceptable to the City, including without limitation, terms incorporating the provisions of this subsection g. Except for the Park Improvements, the Developer and homeowner’s association will not have the obligation to repair or replace any existing or future improvements, equipment, or facilities, on or under the Park Area; however, the homeowners association will be given the right, at its expense, to maintain sod and landscaping within the Park Area not otherwise originally installed by the Developer. If the Developer or homeowners’ association defaults in its obligation to maintain the Park Improvements, the City may deliver written notice of the default to Developer and the homeowners’ association giving the Developer or the homeowners’ association a forty-five (45) days opportunity to cure the default. If Developer or the homeowners’ association does not cure the default as provided in the preceding sentence, the City shall have the right to (x) self-maintain the Park Improvements, and charge the costs for the same to the homeowners’ association, or (y) terminate the use and maintenance agreement. Such use and maintenance agreement shall provide that the homeowners’ association and its members (i.e. unit owners) use of the Park Area is non-exclusive, subject to rules and regulations as may be imposed from time to time by the City, and that the homeowners association and its members shall not interfere with the City’s or public’s use and enjoyment of the Park Area and Park Improvements constructed thereon. At any time after the thirtieth (30th) year after the effective date of such use and maintenance agreement, if the City Commission determines that the Park Area would best serve the public interest with different purpose or improvements, the City may
terminate the use and maintenance agreement by giving one year written notice to the Developer and homeowners’ association. Upon termination of such agreement, the City may remove the Park Improvements, or any parts thereof, at the City’s expense. In no event shall certificates of occupancy be issued for the Project or any portion thereof unless and until the use and maintenance agreement is executed.

f. In addition to the requirements and obligations of the Developer herein, the development of the Property and the Project shall be subject to the City of Winter Park Code of Ordinances requirements and any other development orders, approvals and permits for the Project and Property, including the conditions of such development orders, approvals and permits.

SECTION 3. STORM WATER RETENTION
The Developer will be responsible for any modifications to the storm water retention area required for the Property to conform to the storm water retention requirements of the City and the St. Johns River Water Management District.

SECTION 4. AMENDMENTS TO THIS AGREEMENT
Amendments to this Agreement, if requested by the Developer, may be permitted if approved following review by the City in conformance with the City’s Land Development Code and other applicable requirements of the City.

SECTION 5. AGREEMENT TO BE BINDING
This Agreement, including any and all supplementary orders and resolutions, together with the approved development plan, the master sign plan, and all final site plans, shall be binding upon the Developer and their successors and assigns in title or interest. The provisions of this Agreement and all approved plans shall run with the Property and shall be administered in a manner consistent with Florida Statutes and local law.

SECTION 6. ENFORCEMENT
a. This Agreement may be enforced by specific performance by either party. In the event that enforcement of this Agreement by either party becomes necessary, then the prevailing party shall be entitled to a reimbursement from the opposing party for all costs and expenses, including attorney’s fees, and if necessary, both at trial and on appeal, incurred in enforcing or ensuring compliance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement. In the circumstance where the City is deemed a prevailing party subject to the terms and conditions of Section 6, such costs, expenses and fees shall also be a lien upon those portions of the Property that constitute the “Lienable Property”. Prior to the recording of the plat of the Project, the term “Lienable Property” shall mean all of the Property. After the plat of the Project is recorded, the term “Lienable Property” shall mean those portions of the Property constituting all property interests owned by the Project’s homeowners association.

b. In addition to the foregoing, the City shall be permitted without notice to immediately withhold the issuance of certificates of occupancy and building permits associated with the Project in the event Developer is in violation of any provision of this Agreement until such violation is cured to the City’s satisfaction. Further, if Developer or the homeowners’ association fails to timely pay the City any monies due pursuant to this Agreement, the City may record a Notice of Lien against the Lienable Property in the amount owed to the City. Interest on unpaid overdue sums shall accrue at the rate of eighteen percent (18%) compounded annually or at the maximum rate allowed by law if lower than 18%. A copy of such Notice of Lien shall also be delivered to the homeowners’ association and the Developer in the same manner as required under this Agreement for delivery of written notices. The recorded Notice of Lien shall constitute a lien upon the Lienable Property and the lien may be foreclosed upon for the benefit of the City any time after sixty (60) days after the Notice of Lien has been recorded in the public records. City may foreclose the lien in accordance with the procedures established in Chapter 702, Florida Statutes, or successor or other statute providing for lien foreclosure procedures. Developer or the homeowners’ association may obtain a release from the lien by paying the amount stated in the lien, plus accrued interest, plus attorney’s fees and costs incurred by the City in filing and collecting upon the lien.
SECTION 7. GOVERNING LAW; VENUE
This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Florida. The exclusive venue for purpose of litigation in any action to construe or enforce the provisions of this Agreement shall be in a court of competent jurisdiction in and for Orange County, Florida.

SECTION 8. EXECUTION/RECORDING
Prior to issuance of any plat approval, or any building or site permits for the Property and the Project, the City and Developer shall execute this Agreement. In the event the Developer fails to promptly execute this Agreement, then any development approvals and entitlements obtained concerning the Project, including without limitation, as set forth in this Agreement, shall be null and void. This Agreement shall be recorded, at Developer's expense, among the Public Records of Orange County, Florida no later than fourteen (14) days after full execution. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the same shall not constitute any lien or encumbrance on title to the Property and shall instead constitute record notice of governmental regulations, which regulates the use and enjoyment of the Property.

SECTION 9. TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE
Time is hereby declared of the essence as to the lawful performance of all duties and obligations set forth in this Agreement.

SECTION 10. SEVERABILITY
If any part of this Agreement is found invalid or unenforceable in any court, such invalidity or unenforceability shall not affect the other parts of this Agreement, if the rights and obligations of the parties contained herein are not materially prejudiced and if the intentions of the parties can be affected. To that end, this Agreement is declared severable.

SECTION 11. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS
Nothing herein shall limit the City's authority to grant or deny any development permit applications or requests subsequent to the effective date of this Agreement. The failure of this Agreement to address any particular City, County, State and/or Federal permit, condition, term or restriction shall not relieve Developer or the City of the necessity of complying with the law governing said permitting requirement, condition, term or restriction. Unless expressly authorized or granted herein, nothing in this Agreement shall constitute or be deemed to constitute or require the City to issue any approval by the City of any rezoning, Comprehensive Plan amendment, variance, special exception, final site plan, preliminary subdivision plan, final plat or subdivision plan, building permit, grading, stormwater drainage, engineering, or any other land use or development approval. These and any other required City development approvals and permits shall be processed and issued by the City in accordance with procedures with respect to same as otherwise set forth in the City's Code of Ordinances and subject to any conditions of approval thereof. This Agreement is approved under the City's home rule authority and is not a statutory development agreement under Chapter 163, Florida Statutes.

SECTION 12. SUBORDINATION/JOINDER.
Developer represents and warrants to City that in the event they acquire title to the property herein referenced that unless otherwise agreed to by the City, all liens, mortgages and other encumbrances not satisfied or released of record, must be subordinated to the terms of this Agreement or the lienholder join in this Agreement. It shall be the responsibility of the Developer to promptly obtain the said subordination or joinder, if necessary, in form and substance acceptable to the City Attorney, prior to the City's execution of the Agreement.

SECTION 13. NOTICE
Any notices required or permitted under this Agreement shall be addressed to the City, Owners and the Developer at the addresses listed in the first paragraph of this Agreement, or at such other addresses designated in writing by the party to receive notice. Notices shall be either: (i) personally delivered (including without limitation, delivery by UPS, Federal Express or other commercial courier service), in which case they shall be deemed delivered on the date of delivery; or (ii) sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, in which case they shall be deemed delivered on the date shown on the
receipt unless delivery is refused or intentionally delayed by the addressee, in which event they shall be
deemed delivered on the date of deposit in the U.S. Mail.

SECTION 14. MISCELLANEOUS

a. Nothing contained in this Agreement nor in any instruments executed pursuant to the
terms of this Agreement shall be construed as a waiver or attempted waiver by the City of its home rule
authority, police power, zoning authority and sovereign immunity under the Constitution and laws of the
State of Florida or any other privilege, immunity or defense afforded to the City or the City’s officials,
officers, employees and agents under the law.

b. This Agreement is entered into voluntarily by the Developer without duress and after full
review, evaluation and consideration by the Developer. Developer is represented by counsel, or
alternatively, has been afforded an opportunity to retain counsel for review of this Agreement.

c. The captions or section headings of this Agreement are provided for convenience only
and shall not be deemed to explain, modify, amplify or aid in the interpretation, or meaning of this
Agreement.

d. City and Developer are not partners and this Agreement is not a joint venture and nothing
in this Agreement shall be construed to authorize the Owners or Developer to represent or bind the City
to matters not expressly authorized or provided in this Agreement.

e. None of the parties shall be considered the drafter of all or any portion of this Agreement
for the purposes of interpreting all or any portion of this Agreement, it being recognized that all parties
have contributed substantially and materially to the preparation of this Agreement.

SECTION 15. TERM; EFFECTIVE DATE

This Agreement shall not be effective and binding until the latest date that this Agreement is
approved by and signed by all parties hereto. The Agreement will be effective for 50 years from the
Effective Date.

SIGNATURES TO FOLLOW
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Owner, Developer and the City have executed this Agreement as of the day and year first above written.

Witnesses

Name: ____________________________

Name: ____________________________

DEVELOPER

MORSE AND PENNSYLVANIA, a Florida Limited Liability Company

By: ________________________________
Name: Jacob Farmer
Its: Manager

Date: ______________________________

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF ORANGE

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this __ day of __________, 2016, by ________________, as ______________ of Virginia and Morse LLC. He (She) □ is personally known to me or □ has produced __________________________ as identification.

(NOTARY SEAL)

Notary Public Signature

(Name typed, printed or stamped)
CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA

ATTEST:

By: ________________________________
   Mayor Steve Leary

By: ________________________________
   City Clerk

STATE OF FLORIDA      )
COUNTY OF ORANGE      )

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this ___ day of __________, 2015, by Steve Leary, as Mayor of the City of Winter Park, Florida, who is personally known to me.

___________________________
Notary Public
Printed Name: _______________________
My commission expires: ______________
EXHIBIT "A"  Legal Description

The land referred to herein below is situated in the County of Orange, State of Florida, and is described as follows:

Lot 3, Block K, CAPEN'S ADDITION TO WINTER PARK, as recorded in Plat Book A, Page 95, Public Records of Orange County, Florida, less the following portion thereof, to wit:

Begin at the Northwest corner of said Lot 3; thence run North 90°00'00" East along the North boundary of said Lot 3 a distance of 60.00 feet; thence run South 00°45'09" East parallel with the West boundary of said Lot 3, a distance of 45.00 feet, thence run South 90°00'00" West 45.00 feet; thence run South 00°45'09" East 261.00 feet to the South boundary of said Lot 3; thence run South 90°00'00" West 15.00 feet to the Southwest corner of said Lot 3, thence run North 00°45'09" West 306.00 feet to the point of beginning.

AND

The Westerly 50 feet of the North 106 feet of Lot 2, Block K, CAPEN'S ADDITION TO WINTER PARK, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book "A", Page 95, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.

AND

The North 45 feet of the West 60 feet, less the West 40 feet thereof, Lot 3, Block K, CAPEN'S ADDITION TO WINTER PARK, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book "A", Page 95, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.

AND

A three foot (3') by four foot (4') tract of land lying in Lot 3, Block K, CAPEN'S ADDITION TO WINTER PARK, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book "A", Page 95, Public Records of Orange County, Florida, and more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of said Lot 3, Block K, CAPEN'S ADDITION TO WINTER PARK, for a point of reference; thence East, 40.00 feet along and with the South right-of-way line of Morse Boulevard and the North line of said Lot 3; thence S 00°45'09" E, 3.00 feet to the Point of Beginning; thence continue S 00°45'09" E, 3.00 feet; thence West, 4.00 feet; thence N 00°45'09" W, 3.00 feet; thence East, 4.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

LESS

The South 19 feet of the North 64 feet of the West 40 feet, less the West 15 feet thereof, Lot 3, Block K, CAPEN'S ADDITION TO WINTER PARK, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book "A", Page 95, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.

LESS

The East 8.5 feet of the South 50 feet, Lot 3, Block K, CAPEN'S ADDITION TO WINTER PARK, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book "A", Page 95, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.
AND LESS

A tract of land lying in Lot 3, Block K, CAPEN'S ADDITION TO WINTER PARK, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book "A", Page 95, Public Records of Orange County, Florida, and more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Southwest corner of said Lot 3, Block K, CAPEN'S ADDITION TO WINTER PARK, for a point of reference; thence East, 15.00 feet along and with the South line of said Lot 3 to the Southwest corner of the tract being described and the Point of Beginning; thence North, parallel to the West line of said Lot 3, 15.00 feet to the Northwest corner of the tract being described; thence East, parallel to the South line of said Lot 3, 6.00 feet; thence South, parallel to the West line of said Lot 3, 9.00 feet; thence East, parallel to the South line of said Lot 3, 24.00 feet; thence South parallel to the West line of said Lot 3, 6.00 feet to the South line of said Lot 3; thence West, along and with the South line of said Lot 3, 30.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.
EXHIBIT "B"  Site Plan of the Project
**Subject:** Request for Conditional Use for a Seven Unit Townhouse Project at 741 and 751 Minnesota Avenue.

This public hearing involves a Conditional Use request by Wekiva Capital Partners, LLC, (contract purchasers) at 741 and 751 Minnesota Avenue to redevelop these now vacant properties with seven individual two-story, townhouse buildings.

**Planning and Zoning Board Recommendation:**

Motion made by Tom Sacha, seconded James Johnston to approve the request subject to the site plan modifications concerning interior walkways, agreed to by the applicant, and the following conditions:

1. That any electric transformers or trash bins shall be located where not visible from a public street or adjacent properties, and shall also be landscaped so as to be effectively screened from view.
2. That additional landscaping shall be placed along the railroad right-of-way and in-between the buildings.
3. That the front entry shall have decorative pavers from behind the sidewalk until the front 30 foot front setback.

Motion carried unanimously with a 4-0 vote.

**Summary:** These properties are zoned R-2, and are located to the north of the Azalea Lane Recreation Center, and east of the railroad tracks that intersect Minnesota Avenue. This request is for Conditional Use approval to develop a cluster housing project that consists of seven, two-story units of 1,512 square feet each. This property is 30,958 square feet in size, and the R-2 zoning permits one unit for each 4,000 square feet of land, thus permitting the requested seven units.

**Project Summary:** The project total size is 10,584 square feet which is a floor area ratio (FAR) of 34.2% versus the maximum R-2 FAR of 55%. The maximum building lot coverage (footprint) is 35%, and the project is proposing 17.1%. The maximum impervious coverage is 65%, and this project is proposing 53%, which includes a swimming pool towards the rear of the property. Building height of these buildings is proposed at slightly less than the Code permits at 29 feet. Thus, the project is well below the maximum densities of building area that would be permitted under the R-2 zoning. Parking is being provided per Code (two and a half spaces per unit) as well as providing space for bike parking.
The project is meeting or exceeding the required setbacks with the exception of one corner of the building closest to the railroad tracks where the code requirement is ten feet but the applicant is requesting a variance to allow a five foot setback due to the property configuration and the large railroad right-of-way that exists beyond the property line.

**Tree Preservation/Landscaping:** The applicant is removing six unprotected trees as well as eight protected from the site. As required by Code, nine three inch caliper trees are required for replacement of the protected trees, which are shown on the attached landscape plans as well as additional landscaping.

**Storm Water Retention:** The project is providing onsite storm water retention. At this preliminary stage, that plan has not been engineered but will be located in the rear (north) portion of the property. There is ample area in this portion of the property to accomplish the required retention.

**City Architect Analysis:** To further enhance the aesthetic appeal of this development, the City Architect met with the applicant and discussed specific observations and concerns regarding the proposed development. Those suggestions were incorporated into the plans or are represented by the conditions of approval.

**Planning and Zoning Board Summary:** The key element for conditional use requests is compatibility with the scale and character of the surroundings. This portion of Minnesota Avenue, east of the railroad tracks are mostly low and medium density residential townhomes, and this property is on the edge of the transition to the west of the railroad tracks to office and commercial properties. The P&Z Board felt that the scale and architectural style of these cluster homes will provide an attractive and aesthetic appeal to Minnesota Avenue. Minor changes to the sidewalks or walkways within the project were discussed and agreed to by the applicant including shifting the front sidewalk closer to the street at least five feet to improve the landscape area between the walk and the front porches and removing the walkway behind Units #3 & #4 as it is not necessary. Otherwise, the design as individual homes versus a single large building is much more compatible with the adjacent neighborhood.
REQUEST OF WEKIVA CAPITAL PARTNERS, LLC FOR: CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO BUILD A SEVEN UNIT CLUSTER HOUSING PROJECT OF TWO-STORY HOUSES OF APPROXIMATELY 1,500 SQUARE FEET, IN EACH HOUSE, AT 741 AND 751 MINNESOTA AVENUE, ON PROPERTY ZONED R-2, PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS AND FOR A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, IF REQUIRED.

Planning Manager Jeffrey Briggs presented the staff report and explained that the public hearing involves a request by Wekiva Capital Partners, LLC, who have a contract to purchase 741 and 751 Minnesota Avenue. These properties are zoned R-2, and are located to the north of the Azalea Lane Recreation Center, and east of the railroad tracks that intersect Minnesota Avenue. This request is for Conditional Use approval to develop a cluster housing project that consists of seven, two-story units that measure 1,512 square feet each. He reviewed the project’s site and zoning parameters, FAR and building heights, tree preservation and landscaping, storm water retention. He discussed both the planning staff and city architect analysis of the project. He summarized by stating that the project is located on the edge of a neighborhood, and on the edge of the transition to office and commercial developments. The project meets all the development standards of the R-2 zoning district, albeit with one small setback variance to the railroad tracks and will have an attractive architectural appearance that is compatible with the surrounding residential properties. Staff also indicated that it is preferable to have this development of individual single family homes versus an attached townhouse project. Staff recommended approval of the request subject conditions.

Ryan Rinardo, Klima Weeks, 385 Douglas Avenue, represented the applicant. He agreed with the recommendations of staff. He responded to Board member questions and concerns and was agreeable to the suggestions offered by Board members, in particular by Mr. Slocum. These included minor changes to the sidewalks or walkways within the project including shifting the front sidewalk closer to the street at least five feet to improve the landscape area between the walk and the front porches and removing the walkway behind Units #3 & #4 as it is not necessary.

No one else wished to speak to this item. The Chairman closed the public hearing.

The P&Z Board members voiced support of the request and agreed that having individual single family homes was much preferable to an attached townhouse project. The members were also in support of the suggestions made by Mr. Slocum that were agreed to by the applicant.

Motion made by Tom Sacha, seconded James Johnston to approve the request subject to the site plan modifications concerning interior walkways, agreed to by the applicant, and the following conditions, as recommended by staff:

1. That any electric transformers or trash bins shall be located where not visible from a public street or adjacent properties, and shall also be landscaped so as to be effectively screened from view.

2. That additional landscaping shall be placed along the railroad right-of-way and in-between the buildings.

3. That the front entry shall have decorative pavers from behind the sidewalk until the front 30 foot front setback.
THE STANDARD

PRELIMINARY CONDITIONAL USE SUBMITTAL
JUNE 01 2016

OWNER / DEVELOPER:
WEKIWA CAPITAL PARTNERS, LLC
225 W. CANTON AVENUE, SUITE 200
WINTER PARK, FL 32789
CONTACT: CHRISTOPHER D. HUGHES
PH: (407) 622-2069
FAX: (407) 622-2192
E: CHRISH@WEKIWACAPITAL.COM

PROJECT TEAM

CIVIL ENGINEER:
KLIMA WEEKS CIVIL ENGINEERING, INC.
385 DOUGLAS AVENUE, SUITE 2100
ALTAMONTE SPRINGS, FL 32714
CONTACT: RYAN A. RENARD, P.E.
PH: (407) 478-6750
FAX: (407) 478-8749
E: RENARD@KLIMAWEKS.COM

ARCHITECT:
LAMAR DESIGN, INC.
1326 PALMETTO AVENUE
WINTER PARK, FL 32789
CONTACT: TOM LAMAR, M. ARCH
PH: (407) 945-5260
E: TOM@LAMAR-DESIGN.COM

SURVEYOR:
AccuMap SURVEYING, LLC
2919 MONTFICHET LANE
WINTER PARK, FL 32789
CONTACT: DONALD A. HORNE
PH: (407) 657-2968
FAX: (407) 657-7933

LOCATION MAP

SUBMITTED TO:
CITY OF WINTER PARK

UTILITY COMPANIES:
WATER: CITY OF WINTER PARK
SEWER: CITY OF WINTER PARK
ELECTRIC: CITY OF WINTER PARK

SITE PLAN MODIFICATION LIST (WAIVERS):
1. SECTION 58-67-2(1) (Part 1) for properties over 65 feet in width:
Cluster housing side yard setback is shown in the General Development Standards table as 10 feet.
Request: The developer is requesting that the minimum side yard setback along the railroad tracks be reduced down to five feet (5).

PRELIMINARY CONDITIONAL USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QT</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C0.0
WHEREAS, this project will require the removal of trees, which may impact the environment and the visual aesthetics of the area; and

NOW, THEREFORE, the County of Orange, to ensure the mitigation of the impact, shall require the applicant to submit a mitigation plan for the removal of trees.

This Ordinance shall be in effect immediately and shall remain in effect until revoked or amended by the County of Orange.
Subject: Request for Conditional Use Approval for an Orchard Supply store at 1111 S. Orlando Avenue and 1240 Miller Avenue.

Oppidan Holdings LLC is the contract purchaser of the 2.4 acre property adjacent to Orlando Avenue between Miller and Indiana avenues, addressed as 1111 S. Orlando Avenue and 1240 Miller Avenue, zoned C-3 and O-2. This request is for Conditional Use approval to redevelop this property with a new Orchard Supply Hardware store of 32,355 square feet in size. Orchard Supply is a boutique hardware store that is a subsidiary of Lowe’s. This is a Conditional Use because the building size exceeds 10,000 square feet.

Planning and Zoning Board Recommendation:

Motion made by James Johnston, seconded by Tom Sacha to approve THE “PRELIMINARY” AND “FINAL” CONDITIONAL USE subject to:

1. That the project is approved with the building signage as presented and in consideration of the exception provided for wall signage, that the Orlando Avenue primary sign be limited to monument signage with non-interior illumination and dimensions as presented by staff in lieu of a pole/pylon sign.

2. That the project’s landscape plan be supplemented by adding infill street oak trees in the street right-of-way parkway areas appropriately spaced along the Miller and Indiana street frontages and that the on-site oak trees be increased in size to 4 inch caliper.

3. That the loading and service area screen walls for the dumpsters and loading dock be of comparable decorative design materials to the main building.

4. That in consideration for the parking variance, the applicant shall endeavor to secure off-site leased parking for their employees, and said lease may be discontinued after six months of operation if conditions are such that ample customer parking is available.

5. The electric transformer/switch gear and all backflow preventers shall be located where not visible from a public street and shall also be landscaped so as to be effectively screened from view.

In addition to the following conditions offered by the applicant:

1. Staff Conditions 1, 3 & 5
2. Reduced Site Lighting Heights to 16’ Max.
3. Enhanced Landscape Buffer as Presented by the Applicant
4. No Idling Delivery Trucks; No Beeping on Fork Lifts; No Trash Pick-Up until after 7am and No Deliveries until after 9:00 am
5. Contribute $3000 to Harper Place HOA for Speed Bumps and Landscaping
6. No Employee On-Street Parking Adjacent to Townhomes

Motion carried unanimously with 4-0 vote.
Summary: The 2.4 acre “development parcel” is the combination of these two properties at 1111 S. Orlando Avenue and 1240 Miller Avenue which now holds the former Eat More Produce building, an Antique Store and warehouse storage uses. The project would demolish all the buildings and improvements for a complete redevelopment of the combined site. To the north, across Miller Avenue is the Krispy Kreme with some business uses and residential units further west. To the south is the three story Commerce National Bank office building. Across Orlando Avenue is other commercial development. To the west are the 20 two-story residential condominiums of Harper Place.

Current Development Request: The application package for “preliminary and final” conditional use approval includes the final site plan, architectural perspective images of the main building facades, final landscape and storm water retention design, signage, lighting and photometrics. A traffic impact report and parking demand analysis has also been submitted.

The Orchard Supply Hardware Store is 32,355 square feet under roof with another 2,678 square feet of open air landscape garden sales area. The project meets the C-3 development standards in terms of density and intensity, landscaping, storm water retention, etc. Based on the 2.4 acres, the project has a 31% building lot coverage and FAR (well within the 45% maximum FAR).

The City’s parking requirements are based on one space per 250 sf for the 26,547 square feet of retail commercial floor space; one space per 1,000 sf for the 3,947 square feet of warehouse area and one space per 500 sf for the 4,512 of covered and open landscape garden area. The total parking required is 119 spaces. The plan proposes 96 spaces so a variance of 23 spaces (19.3%) is requested. The applicants believe that the nature of their business and the significant amount of floor area covered by inventory reduce the need for parking well within the amount of parking provided. The applicants have provided a parking study that cites a survey from 2013 by Kimley Horn of two Orchard Supply stores in California. That survey observed maximum parking rates of 1.10 cars per 1,000 square feet versus the blended Winter Park requirement of 3.40 cars/spaces per 1,000 square feet. Based upon the 96 parking spaces to be provided, that would result in a blended ratio of 2.74 cars/spaces per 1,000 square feet.

Building Heights: The proposed retail building is one-story but given the interior floor to ceiling heights desired and the parapets heights needed to screen rooftop mechanical, the visible heights generally compare to two-story buildings at 29 feet in height.

Landscaping and Tree Preservation: Overall the impervious coverage of the site will be at the code maximum of 85%. There is one existing oak tree on the site to be removed. There are several oak trees along the property/right-of-way line along Miller Avenue that are to be saved and incorporated into the landscape program. A specific detailed landscape plan with types, sizes, quantities, etc. is provided. Significant new tree plantings are to be done to buffer the adjacent townhomes from this commercial building.

Storm Water Retention: The site currently has no storm water retention. The redevelopment of this property will retrofit the site to conform to the storm water retention requirements of the City and St. Johns River Water Management District. The storm water design and calculations have been submitted. The location of the storm water retention area has been purposefully selected to be adjacent to the neighboring townhouse development. That then provides separation from the townhouses from the traffic circulation and also provides space and opportunity for new trees (oaks & cypress) to help provide a buffer between the two developments.
Traffic Impact: The applicant has submitted a traffic study addressing the traffic generation and impacts from this project and included are the summary pages with this staff report. The proposed project will generate 1,796 trips per day. Of those cars, about 25% are passer-by trips meaning that they are cars that were already on Orlando Avenue that may be stopping by on their way to work or their way home or on other business trips. The remaining 75% of the traffic are destination cars that are going specifically to Orchard Supply. Traffic generation from this property could be lower, for example, if it were alternatively developed as an office building but traffic generation could also be much higher if it were to be developed as retail and restaurant space especially if that included drive-thrus.

There are three options to exit onto Orlando Avenue via Indiana Avenue, Miller Avenue and the internal driveway. The fact that there are options, much like at Publix to the north, avoids stacking at a single exit and thus reduces the incentive to take alternate exit options to the west toward the adjacent neighborhood. These exits operate a level of service “C” during the peak hours which is interesting given that Orlando Avenue itself operates at level of service “F” during those same peak hours. The reason is that the traffic lights at Minnesota and Orange Avenue provide red light gaps that allow turning movements from the site and from Indiana/Miller Avenues on those cycles.

Site and Urban Design: The site plan layout and urban design conforms generally to the desires of the City to locate buildings toward the frontage of the property on Orlando Avenue. The main entrance faces the parking lot, but a secondary entrance to the store is directly off Orlando Avenue thru the garden shop, so there is a direct pedestrian connection from Orlando Avenue into the store. The location of the storm water retention area adjacent to the neighboring residential townhouses also provides space for landscape buffer and moves the traffic and parking away from that common property line. The original plans showed a 6 foot screen wall and landscaping, but at the neighbors request that wall height was increased to 8 feet.

Project Signage: The project’s signs are part of the submittal package. The wall signs proposed are compatible with the scale of the building but technically the code only allows one wall sign per street frontage. In light of this minor exception requested, the City is proposing a change to the main building signage on Orlando Avenue. Rather than a 25 foot tall, 85 square foot pylon sign, the staff (City Architect) is suggesting that we substitute a monument sign, per the dimensions and materials as shown in the attached drawing. It is the same size but with a stone material base and other elements of the building architecture. Staff believes that this alternate sign will be more attractive but also be more visible as is at eye level with motorists passing by. Surface lighting should also be used here, instead of internal illumination.

Conditional Use Process: Winter Park’s conditional use process provides the opportunity for major projects to combine the “Preliminary” and “Final” conditional use approvals if they provide all of the information required for both. The applicants have satisfied that requirement. The applicants also have reached out to the adjacent neighbors and met with them to review the plans. Several important redesigns have been made and conditions of approval agreed upon in order to make the project compatible with those residential neighbors.
REQUEST FOR OPPIDAN HOLDINGS LLC FOR: CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL TO BUILD A ONE STORY, ORCHARD SUPPLY HARDWARE RETAIL STORE OF APPROXIMATELY 32,355 SQUARE FEET IN SIZE ON THE 2.4 ACRE PROPERTY ADJACENT TO ORLANDO AVENUE BETWEEN MILLER AND INDIANA AVENUES, ADDRESSED AS 1111 S. ORLANDO AVENUE AND 1240 MILLER AVENUE, ZONED C-3 AND O-2, PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS AND FOR A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, IF REQUIRED.

Chairman Johnston announced that Planning Manager, Jeff Briggs has a conflict of interest in this manner, as a tenant of the property seller and thus would not be participating. Planner Allison McGillis presented the staff report and stated that Oppidan Holdings LLC is the contract purchaser of the 2.4 acre property adjacent to Orlando Avenue between Miller and Indiana avenues, addressed as 1111 S. Orlando Avenue and 1240 Miller Avenue, zoned C-3 and O-2. This request is for Conditional Use approval to redevelop this property with a new Orchard Supply Hardware store 32,355 square feet in size. She noted that the applicant is requesting both preliminary and final approval of the plan at this time. She explained that the City’s conditional use process provides for major projects to combine the “Preliminary” and “Final” conditional use approvals if they provide all of the information required for both and that the applicants have satisfied that requirement. Orchard Supply is a boutique hardware store that is a subsidiary of Lowe’s. This is a Conditional Use because the building size exceeds 10,000 square feet. She provided an overview of the project including site design, neighborhood context, FAR, building heights, parking, landscaping/tree preservation, storm water retention, traffic impact, and architecture. Ms. McGillis provided details on the parking variance requested and the staff’s suggestion that the applicant rent off-site spaces for the first six months when traffic to the store would be the greatest. For the project signage, the staff is recommending that the applicant substitute a monument sign versus the proposed pylon sign, per the plan presented by the City.

She summarized by stating that the proposed project is being built in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and C-3 zoning with the one primary exception of the variance for parking. The overall layout and design is consistent with the desires of the planning staff and has been done in a manner sensitive to its location adjacent to residential townhomes. There are some conditions suggested by staff that can help make this project more of a success through modifications to the landscape package and signage.

Staff recommended approval of the “preliminary” and “final” conditional use subject to:

1. That the project is approved with the building signage as presented and in consideration of the exception provided for wall signage, that the Orlando Avenue primary sign be limited to monument signage with non-interior illumination and dimensions as presented by staff in lieu of a pole/pylon sign.
2. That the project’s landscape plan be supplemented by adding infill street oak trees in the street right-of-way parkway areas appropriately spaced along the Miller and Indiana street frontages and that the on-site oak trees be increased in size to 4 inch caliper.
3. That the loading and service area screen walls for the dumpsters and loading dock be of comparable decorative design materials to the main building.
4. That in consideration for the parking variance, the applicant shall endeavor to secure off-site leased parking for their employees, and said lease may be discontinued after six months of operation if conditions are such that ample customer parking is available.
5. The electric transformer/switch gear and all backflow preventers shall be located where not visible from a public street and shall also be landscaped so as to be effectively screened from view.
Rebecca Wilson, 214 North Eola Drive, Orlando, Florida, represented the applicant. She introduced members of the development team. She used a power point presentation to provide details of the Orchard Hardware Store company history, and details of the project, and review of the current zoning and dynamics of the property and surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Wilson also discussed the meeting that have been held with the neighbors of the adjacent townhouses at Harper Place.

Peter Sutch CPH Engineers, discussed separation from the existing residential, project architecture, site design, ingress/egress and site circulation for the property, service, parking, and landscaping. He said that two meetings were held with the Harper Place HOA and as a result of those meetings, the developer agreed to the provide the following enhancements to the buffer: increase screen wall from 6’ to 8’; increase dumpster and loading screen wall height from 6’ to 8’; flare end of walls and provide landscaping to face townhomes; add more trees along the common property line landscape buffer by reducing the spacing of the live oaks; change understory from crape myrtle to palms for immediate and year round foliage; and pre-cast concrete wall with molded stacked stone design and decorative columns. He stated that they agree to the staff request to install a monument sign versus the proposed pylon sign. In addition, he said that the applicant also agreed to the following concessions with the Harper Place HOA: enhanced architecture; enhanced buffer; increased screen wall heights; loading restrictions; limitation on idling of delivery trucks; remove fork lift beepers; payment for Harper Place speed bumps; limitation on employee on-street parking; and a trash pick-up time restriction.

Attorney Wilson completed the applicant’s presentation. She stated that regarding the staff proposed conditions of approval, the applicant agrees to the following: staff conditions 1, 3 & 5; reduced site lighting heights to 16’ max.; enhanced buffer as presented; no idling delivery trucks; no beeping on fork lifts; contribute $3000 to Harper Place HOA for speed bumps and enhanced landscaping; no employee on-street parking adjacent to townhomes; trash pick-up after 7am. With regard to staff condition #2, the applicant proposes to plant more trees than staff is requiring. She requested that proposed condition be deleted.

The following neighbors spoke concerning the request: John Greacen, 1102 Schultz Avenue; Robet Mc Adam, 611 Genius Drive (represented his parents that live at 1251 Indiana Avenue); David Hochstadt, 1259 Indiana Avenue; Mike Sherman, 1241 Miller Avenue; Donna Colado, 327 Beloit Avenue; and Jim Sherris, 1278 Miller Avenue. The neighbors expressed concern with noise control and lighting; preserving the maximum number of trees, limiting delivery hours, employee parking (no employee parking in front of the residential units); location of loading and unloading zones; ingress/egress and management of the shopping carts. The neighbors expressed that they did not want to have the same issues as the neighbors of Trader Joe’s grocery store when it opened.

Mrs. Wilson rebutted by stating that she does not feel that Orchards can be compared to Trader Joe’s because it is a hardware store and not a grocery store. She said that the loading dock has been completely redesigned in an effort to alleviate noise disturbance. Delivery hours will be limited to between 9 a.m. – 5 p.m.

The Chairman closed the public hearing.

Chairman Johnston opened the Board discussion. He stated that he supports the application and is excited about the project, especially given the current conditions of the property. He agreed with the concessions offered by the applicant and what has been done to mitigate noise. The Board members present expressed their agreement with his comments. They expressed no opposition to the deletion of condition number 2 considering the applicant has committed to adding more trees at the 3-inch caliper.
Motion made by James Johnston, seconded by Tom Sacha to approve THE “PRELIMINARY” AND “FINAL” CONDITIONAL USE subject to:

1. That the project is approved with the building signage as presented and in consideration of the exception provided for wall signage, that the Orlando Avenue primary sign be limited to monument signage with non-interior illumination and dimensions as presented by staff in lieu of a pole/pylon sign.

2. That the project’s landscape plan be supplemented by adding infill street oak trees in the street right-of-way parkway areas appropriately spaced along the Miller and Indiana street frontages and that the on-site oak trees be increased in size to 4 inch caliper.

3. That the loading and service area screen walls for the dumpsters and loading dock be of comparable decorative design materials to the main building.

4. That in consideration for the parking variance, the applicant shall endeavor to secure off-site leased parking for their employees, and said lease may be discontinued after six months of operation if conditions are such that ample customer parking is available.

5. The electric transformer/switch gear and all backflow preventers shall be located where not visible from a public street and shall also be landscaped so as to be effectively screened from view.

In addition to the following conditions offered by the applicant:

1. Staff Conditions 1, 3 & 5
2. Reduced Site Lighting Heights to 16’ Max.
3. Enhanced Landscape Buffer as Presented by the Applicant
4. No Idling Delivery Trucks and No Beeping on Fork Lifts, No Trash Pick-Up until after 7am and No deliveries until after 9:00 am.
5. Contribute $3000 to Harper Place HOA for Speed Bumps and Landscaping
6. No Employee On-Street Parking Adjacent to Townhomes

Motion carried unanimously with 4-0 vote.
Sign sized as submitted

Orchard
SUPPLY HARDWARE

Proposed Alternative Corner Identity Sign

E. Weios, City Architect
City of Winter Park 17 June 2010
## TRADEMARK SKATEBOARD SPECIFICATIONS

Manufacture and install one (1) 18"-6" OAH trademark skateboard sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Specification/Material</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard</td>
<td>.125&quot; Aluminum</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>PMS 3435 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>.125&quot; Aluminum w/ rout out copy</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>PMS 3435 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy &quot;Supply Hardware&quot;</td>
<td>No 10&quot; push thru copy w/ vinyl applied 1st surface</td>
<td>3M</td>
<td>White #3630-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy &quot;est. 1931&quot;</td>
<td>No acrylic backed copy w/ vinyl applied 1st surface</td>
<td>3M</td>
<td>Bright Green #3630-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back</td>
<td>.125 Aluminum</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>PMS 3435 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>©</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td></td>
<td>White 7725-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
* Back of sign to be finished as it will be visible.

## CHANNEL LETTER SPECIFICATIONS

Manufacture and install one set of channel letters to be mounted on trademark skateboard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Specification/Material</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>Acrylic</td>
<td>R &amp; H</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returns</td>
<td>.063 aluminum</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>PMS 3435 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimcap</td>
<td>3/4&quot; trimcap</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
* Back of sign to be finished as it will be visible.

## NURSERY LETTER SPECIFICATIONS

Manufacture and install one (1) set of internally-illuminated channel letters on non-illuminated trademark skateboard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Specification/Material</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>.125&quot; Aluminum</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>PMS 3435 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returns</td>
<td>.125&quot; Aluminum</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>PMS 3435 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back</td>
<td>.125 Aluminum</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>PMS 3435 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>White acrylic</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returns</td>
<td>.063 aluminum</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>PMS 3435 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimcap</td>
<td>3/4&quot; trimcap</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
* Back of sign to be finished as it will be visible.
Pylon Sign Specifications

Manufacture and install one (1) double face, internally illuminated pylon sign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Specification/Material</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet</td>
<td>Fabricated aluminum</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>PMS 3435 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faces</td>
<td>1/2&quot; Aluminum w/ rout out copy</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>PMS 3435 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy &quot;Orchard&quot;</td>
<td>1/2&quot; Acrylic push thru copy with vinyl</td>
<td>3M</td>
<td>White #3630-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>applied 1st surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy &quot;Supply Hardware&quot;</td>
<td>1/2&quot; Acrylic push thru copy with vinyl</td>
<td>3M</td>
<td>White #3630-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>applied 1st surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy &quot;est. 1831&quot;</td>
<td>Acrylic backed copy with vinyl</td>
<td>3M</td>
<td>Bright Green #3630-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>applied 1st surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@</td>
<td>Vinyl</td>
<td>3M</td>
<td>White 7725-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>LED</td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pylons</td>
<td>Square tubes</td>
<td>Painted (satin)</td>
<td>SW Cobble Brown 6082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pylon Elevation - Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

Square Footage Shown: 5'-3" x 17'-7 1/4" = 91.42 sq. ft.
**D-Series Size 2**

**LED Area Luminaire**

**Specifications**
- **EPA:** 11.1 ft² (1.0 m²)
- **Length:** 40" (101.6 cm)
- **Width:** 15" (38.1 cm)
- **Height:** 7-1/4" (18.4 cm)
- **Weight:** 36 lbs (16.3 kg)

**Ordering Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>100C</th>
<th>700</th>
<th>40K</th>
<th>T5M</th>
<th>MVOLT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS2 LED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEDs</strong></td>
<td>Forward optics</td>
<td>80C (8 LEDs)</td>
<td>700 mA</td>
<td>100C (10 LEDs)</td>
<td>1200 mA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90C 90 LEDs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drive current</strong></td>
<td>530</td>
<td>320 mA</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700 mA</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30K</td>
<td>3000 K</td>
<td>40K</td>
<td>4000 K</td>
<td>50K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 C</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Color temperature</strong></td>
<td>30K</td>
<td>3000 K</td>
<td>40K</td>
<td>4000 K</td>
<td>50K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voltage</strong></td>
<td>MVOLT</td>
<td>120 V</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>240 V</td>
<td>240 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mounting</strong></td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Square pole mounting</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Round pole mounting</td>
<td>SPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other options</strong></td>
<td>PLM</td>
<td>Right rotated optics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control options</strong></td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Motion sensor, 15-30° mounting height</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Control & Shields**
- **Controls & Shields**
- **Design**:
- **Input Voltage**:
- **Output Voltage**:
- **Power Factor**:
- **Efficiency**:

**Tenon Mounting Slipper**

**NOTES**
- 1. Rotated optics option (R90 or R90V) required for 100V.
- 2. Included in all options.
- 3. Available in all options.
- 4. Available in all options.
- 5. Available in all options.
- 6. Available in all options.
- 7. Available in all options.
- 8. Available in all options.
- 10. Available in all options.
- 11. Available in all options.
- 12. Available in all options.

---

**Catalog Number**
- **Type L1**

**Notes**
- **Introduction**
  - The modern styling of the D-Series is striking yet unobtrusive - making a bold, progressive statement even as it blends seamlessly with its environment.
  - The D-Series distills the benefits of the latest in LED technology into a high performance, high efficacy, long-life luminaire. The outstanding photometric performance results in sites with excellent uniformity, greater pole spacing and lower power density. The Size 2 is ideal for replacing 400-1000W metal halide in area lighting applications with energy savings of up to 80% and expected service life of over 100,000 hours.

---

**VERIFIED FINISH**
- **Finish**:
- **DBKX**: Dark bronze
- **DBLX**: Black
- **DNAD**: Natural aluminum
- **DWDK**: White
- **DBBED**: Textured black
- **DNDX**: Textured natural aluminum
- **DHWGD**: Textured white

---

**Verification**
- **HSE**: House-side shield
- **S**: Single fixture (120, 277, 347V)
- **D**: Double fixture (120, 240, 480V)
- **L90**: Left rotated optics
- **R90**: Right rotated optics

---

**Conclusion**
- **Final Notes**
- **Additional Information**
- **Resources**
- **Contact Information**
D-Series Size 2
LED Wall Luminaire

Specifications
Luminaire
Width: 18-1/2” (47.0 cm)
Depth: 10” (25.4 cm)
Height: 7-5/8” (19.4 cm)

Back Box (BBW)
Width: 5-1/2” (14.0 cm)
Depth: 1-1/2” (3.8 cm)
Height: 4” (10.2 cm)

Introduction
The D-Series Wall luminaire is a stylish, fully integrated LED solution for building-mount applications. It features a sleek, modern design and is carefully engineered to provide long-lasting, energy-efficient lighting with a variety of optical and control options for customized performance.

With an expected service life of over 20 years of nighttime use and up to 76% in energy savings over comparable 400W metal halide luminaires, the D-Series Wall is a reliable, low-maintenance lighting solution that produces sites that are exceptionally illuminated.

Ordering Information
EXAMPLE: DSXW2 LED 30C 700 40K T3M MVOLT DDBTDX

Series | LEDs | Drive Current | Color Temperature | Distribution | Voltage | Mounting | Control Options |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
DSXW2 LED | 20C | 350 mA | 30K | T25 Type III Short | MVOLT | Shipped included (crimp) | Photocell, button type

Other Options
Shipped installed
SF Single fuse (120, 277, 347V) |
DF Double fuse (208, 240, 480V) |
HS House-side shields |
SPD Separate surge protection

Shipped separately
BW Bird-detector spikes |
WG Wire guard |
VG Vandal guard

Finish (required)
DBXID Dark bronze |
DBXLB Black |
DNAXID Natural aluminum |
DWHXID White |

NOTES
1. MVOLT driver operates on any line voltage from 120-277V (50/60 Hz). Specify 120, 208, 240 or 277 v option only with ordering with fuse (SF, DF options), or photocell (PE option).
2. Available with 30 LED/70mA options only. DSXW2 LED 30C 700. DMG option not available.
3. Also available as a separate accessory; see Accessories information.
4. Photocell (PE) requires 208, 240 or 277 voltage option. Not available with motion/ambient light sensors (PR or PRHIR). See Table Sensor Guide for details. Dimming driver standard. Not available with PE (PE option) or DCR. Ambient sensor disabled when ordered with DCR. Separate (ACR) required.
5. Single fuse (SF) requires 120, 277 or 347 volt option. Double fuse (DF) requires 208, 240 or 480 volt option.
6. See the electrical section on page 3 for more details.

Accessories
Ordered and shipped separately
DLEU2T 5.5 RJ Photocell -55C freeze-dock (120-377V) |
DLEU2T 5.5 COL RJ Photocell -65C freeze-dock (120-377V) |
DLED2T 5.5 COL RJ Photocell -65C freeze-dock (120-377V) |
SCU Shutter control |
DBXMK U Bird detector spikes |
DBXMKU U Bird detector spikes (comes per light engine)

For 3/4” NPT side-entry conduit

One Lithonia Way • Conyers, Georgia 30094 • Phone: 800.279.8041 • www.lithonia.com
© 2012-2016 Acuity Brands Lighting, Inc. All rights reserved.
Memo

Date: June 1, 2016

To: Mr. Jeff Briggs - Planning Manager
City of Winter Park

From: Sandra Gorman, P.E.
CPH Inc.

Re: Parking Demand Analysis
Proposed Orchard Supply Hardware Store
NWC Orlando Ave and Indiana Ave.
Winter Park, Florida

CPH Job No.: 07404

A parking demand analysis has been performed for the proposed Orchard Supply Hardware Store to be located at northwest corner of Orlando Avenue and Indiana Avenue in the City of Winter Park. The parking analysis has been requested to compare the actual parking demand for an Orchards Supply Hardware Store relative to the parking requirements of the City of Winter Park.

For the purpose of determining parking demand, the City of Winter Park Land Development Code has a very limited number of commercial/retail uses identified; specifically, Furniture and Appliance Store (1 space/400 SF), Office/Showroom/Warehouse (1 space/350 SF office/showroom + 1 space/700 SF storage), and General Business/Retail Commercial (1 space/250 SF).

Based on a meeting with City staff on May 24, 2016, it was determined the City would calculate required parking for the proposed hardware store according to the following ratios: 1 space/250 SF for indoor sales floor, 1 space/1000 SF for warehouse/storage, and 1 space/500 SF for the roofed garden center. Table 1 summarizes number of parking spaces calculated to be required by the City of Winter Park.
Table 1 - City Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size (KSF)</th>
<th>Rate (per KSF)</th>
<th>Total Number of Required Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>28.547</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse/Storage</td>
<td>3.947</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Center</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total required spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the proposed Orchard Supply Hardware Store, this equates to a weighted parking ratio of 1 space/284 SF or 3.5 spaces/1000 SF required by the City.

The Institute of Transportation Engineers has collected and published parking demand analysis for multiple land uses including a variety of retail land uses. The ITE Parking Generation 4th Edition includes parking requirements for both Hardware/Paint Store as well as Home Improvement Superstore. In addition to the hardware specific retail uses, it also includes parking demand for a variety of other retail uses. Weekday peak hour average and 85th percentile rates range from 1.78 spaces/1000 SF to 5.23 spaces/1000 SF. Table 2 below summarizes a sample of the variety of retail parking ratios studied by ITE.

Table 2 – ITE Retail Parking Generation Rates – Weekday Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Average Parking Rate (per KSF)</th>
<th>85th Percentile Parking Rate (per KSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount Superstore</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware/Paint Store</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Parts Store</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket - Suburban</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Superstore</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Improvement Superstore</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon the land use descriptions provided by ITE, Hardware/Paint Store is the most appropriate for the proposed Orchard Supply Hardware Store. However, the ITE database for the Hardware/Paint Store land use category consisted of only two study sites. To supplement this data, a 2015 parking study by Kimley Horn and Associates (KHA) was conducted to determine the parking demand at two different Orchard Supply Hardware locations in California. According to the study, parking accumulation was collected in 30-minute intervals at the Orchard Supply Hardware stores on a weekday, September 10, 2015 (Thursday) and a weekend day September 12, 2015, (Saturday) from 7:00 A.M. to 9:00 P.M. Table 3 summarizes the observed maximum parking demand at the studied Orchard Supply Hardware locations.
Table 3 - Observed Parking Demand at Existing Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Site Location</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Observed Maximum Peak Parking Demand</th>
<th>Rate (per KSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster City, CA Orchard Supply Hardware</td>
<td>64,988</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moraga, CA Orchard Supply Hardware</td>
<td>41,115</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 3, actual observations identified a peak maximum parking demand of 1.10 spaces/1,000 SF for the Orchard Supply Hardware stores studied.

The next closest land use category in ITE's Parking Generation Handbook, 4th Edition is Home Improvement Superstore. Although similar to Hardware/Paint Store in the sale of certain items, Home Improvement Superstores are typically much larger in size with a greater inventory and catering to contractors in addition to residents. ITE identified an average parking demand of 2.23 spaces/1,000 SF for Home Improvement Superstore, higher than the maximum parking demand of 1.10/1,000 SF observed at the existing Orchard Supply Hardware Stores. Table 4 summarizes the parking generation estimated for the project based on 4th Edition of ITE Parking Generation.

Table 4 - ITE Parking Generation-4th Edition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size (KSF)</th>
<th>Rate (per KSF)</th>
<th>Average Peak Period</th>
<th>Average Peak Period Parking Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>Home Improvement Super Store</td>
<td>32.355</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the only Orchard Supply Hardware Stores available for study by KHA were located in California, KHA supplemented the Orchard Supply Hardware parking demand data by observing a Lowe's Home Improvement Store at 1001 West Oakland Park Boulevard, Oakland Park, Florida. Parking demand data was collected by KHA on a weekday, September 3, 2015 (Thursday) and a weekend day September 5, 2015, (Saturday) from 7:00 A.M. to 9:00 P.M. Parking data was collected in 30-minute intervals. The study site consisted of a 138,341 square-foot store inclusive of a landscape nursery. The maximum parking demand observed was 152 occupied spaces, which corresponds with a parking demand ratio of 1.10/1,000 SF. The KHA parking data for the Orchard Hardware Supply Stores in California as well as the Lowe's is attached.

Table 5 summarizes the parking requirements for the proposed Orchard Supply Hardware Store based on the observed data from the Kimley Horn study as well as the appropriate land uses from ITE.
Table 5 - Calculated Parking Demand at Proposed Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Rate (per KSF)</th>
<th>Total Number of Required Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed Orchard Supply Hardware</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(maximum observed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed Lowe’s Home Improvement Store</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(maximum observed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE Hardware/Paint Store</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(average rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE Home Improvement Superstore</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(average rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Winter Park Orchard Supply Hardware project proposes to provide a minimum ratio of 2.8 spaces/1,000 SF. When compared to the parking demand projected for similar uses by ITE and observed parking demand of existing, operating locations or Orchard Supply Hardware, the proposed parking is 47% more than required by ITE for a Hardware/Paint Store, 155% more than required for actual operating Orchard Supply Hardware Stores and the observed Lowes, and 26% more than projected by ITE for Home Improvement Superstores.

Based upon the ITE and actual observed demand, the 96 spaces proposed for the Winter Park Orchard Supply Hardware Store are anticipated to be more than adequate to support the proposed use.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Sandra L. Gorman, P.E.
Senior Traffic Engineer
Traffic Impact Statement
For Submittal to City of Winter Park

Orchard Supply Hardware Store# O7404
Northwest Corner of Orlando Avenue
and Indiana Avenue
Winter Park, Florida

Prepared for:
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CPH Project Number O7404

June 2016
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Landscape Architects
Surveyors
Construction Management
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Executive Summary

A new Orchard Supply Hardware is proposed to be developed on the west side of Orlando Avenue, north of the Indiana Avenue intersection in Winter Park, Florida. CPH has prepared a Traffic Impact Statement for submittal to the City of Winter Park to address the impacts of the project.

Access to the project is proposed through three driveways including one driveway located on Orlando Avenue, one on Indiana Avenue, and one on Miller Avenue.

The project is anticipated to generate 169 PM peak hour driveway trips (79 entering/90 exiting), an increase of net trips of about 13% from the existing commercial on the site. Based upon the driveway analysis, all driveways are anticipated to continue to operate at acceptable levels of service with addition of the project. The trip potential of the property developed at a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.45 is estimated to be 359 PM peak hour trips (172 entering/187 exiting). The proposed project is projected to generate approximately 47% of the maximum entitlement trip potential.
Introduction

The existing commercial development at the northwest corner of Orlando Avenue and Indiana Avenue is proposed to be redeveloped into an Orchard Supply Hardware store. The existing commercial development is currently 24,253 square feet and will be replaced by an Orchard Supply Hardware store no larger than 34,989 square feet.

Figure 1 illustrates the project location and Figure 2 is a site plan of the proposed development.

Access to the project is proposed through three driveways including one driveway located on Orlando Avenue, one on Indiana Avenue, and one on Miller Avenue.
Figure 1
Site Location Map
Orchard Supply Hardware
Winter Park, Florida
Subject: Request for an Ordinance to Dissolve the Ravaudage Community Development District (CDD).

The City has received a request from the Board of the Ravaudage Community Development District (CDD) to dissolve that entity. Attached are the Ordinance (which has been reviewed and approved by the City Attorney) and the other backup materials provided by the applicant.

Summary:

The City Commission adopted Ordinance No. 2916-13 on April 8, 2013, establishing the Ravaudage Community Development District, pursuant to Chapter 190, Florida Statutes. However, at this time the Board of Supervisors of the District adopted Resolution 2016-04 approving dissolution of the District and submitted a “Petition to Dissolve Ravaudage Community Development District” dated June 1, 2016 to the City, requesting that the District be dissolved pursuant to Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes.

Staff Recommendation:

The staff has no objection to dissolving the CDD if it has turned out to have no meaningful purpose for the developers of Ravaudage.
ORDINANCE NO. _____-____

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, GRANTING THE PETITION OF THE RAVAUDAGE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND DISSOLVING THE RAVAUDAGE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT PURSUANT TO SECTION 190.046(9), FLORIDA STATUTES; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS; FURTHER, PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida (the “City”), adopted Ordinance No. 2916-13 on April 8, 2013, establishing the Ravaudage Community Development District (the “District”), pursuant to Chapter 190, Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of the District adopted Resolution 2016-04 approving dissolution of the District and submitted a “Petition to Dissolve Ravaudage Community Development District” dated June 1, 2016 (the “Petition”) to the City, requesting that the District be dissolved pursuant to Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the Petition, the record and public hearing for the adoption of this Ordinance, the City determined that the statements within the Petition were true and correct, that the dissolution of the District was appropriate under Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes, and that, as of the date of the adoption of this Ordinance, the District has no further outstanding financial obligations, and no further operating or maintenance responsibilities.

WHEREAS, dissolution of the District pursuant to Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes, serves the public interest that any independent special district created pursuant to state law not outlive its usefulness and the dissolution of the District will not prevent the provision of basic community development services to the area.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA:

SECTION 1. Legislative Findings. The Board hereby adopts the “WHEREAS” clauses stated above as true and correct legislative findings in support of this Ordinance.

SECTION 2. Authorization. That the City authorizes the dissolution of the Ravaudage Community Development District and is authorized to adopt this Ordinance under the authority granted by the provisions of Chapter 166, Florida Statutes, Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes, and other applicable provisions of law.

SECTION 3. Findings. That it is determined that:

A. The District Board of Supervisors has petitioned the City to dissolve the Ravaudage Community Development District.

B. The information provided in the Petition to the City is true and correct.
C. The District has provided information to the City that, as of the date of adoption of this Ordinance, it has no further outstanding financial obligations, nor any further operating or maintenance responsibilities.

D. The District has provided information to the City that, as of effective date of adoption of this Ordinance, the District is not responsible for, nor is the District the owner of, any public improvements.

SECTION 4. Dissolution of District. That the City Commission grants the Petition and dissolves the Ravaudage Community Development District.

SECTION 5. Severability. That if any clause, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, word or provision of this Ordinance is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional or invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, whether for substantive, procedural, or any other reason, such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct and independent provision and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance.

SECTION 6. Conflicts. That all ordinances or parts of ordinances, resolutions or parts of resolutions in conflict with this Ordinance, are repealed to the extent of such conflict.

SECTION 7. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall be effective immediately upon its passage and adoption by the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida.

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.

ATTEST:

Mayor Steve Leary

City Clerk Cynthia S. Bonham, MMC
BEFORE THE BOARD OF CITY COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA

PETITION TO DISSOLVE RAVAUDAGE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

Petitioner, Ravaudage Community Development District, a community development district established by Ordinance Number 2916-13 by the City Council of the City of Winter Park, Florida on April 8, 2013 pursuant to the "Uniform Community Development District Act of 1980," Chapter 190 of the Florida Statutes, (hereinafter "Petitioner") hereby petitions the Board of City Commissioners of Winter Park, Florida, to dissolve the established Ravaudage Community Development District (hereinafter "CDD" or "District"). In support of this petition, Petitioner states:

1. Establishment. The District was established by City Council of the City of Winter Park, Florida Ordinance Number 2916-13, effective April 8, 2013 pursuant to the "Uniform Community Development District Act of 1980," Chapter 190 of the Florida Statutes. The District is approximately 47.5 acres in size and is located entirely within the unincorporated boundaries of the City of Winter Park, Florida. A location map, and a metes and bounds description of the existing boundaries of the District are attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

2. Authority. Section 190.046(9) of the Florida Statutes provides that:

"If a district has no outstanding financial obligations and no operating or maintenance responsibilities, upon the petition of the district, the district may be dissolved by a nonemergency ordinance of the general-purpose local governmental entity that established the district or, if the district was established by rule of the Florida Land and Water Adjudicatory Commission, the district may be dissolved by repeal of such rule of the commission."

3. As of the proposed date of dissolution, the District will not have any outstanding financial obligations and does not have any operating or maintenance responsibilities. For example, the District does not presently own any real property or infrastructure improvements; the District has never issued bonds, notes or other debt instruments; and the District has never levied debt service special assessments levied against the assessable real property located within the District. Further, as an organizational matter, the District does not anticipate providing any future planned community development district services or improvements, or providing any financing for the same.

4. Instead, any remaining expenses associated with the District, including the expenses associated with this dissolution and the continued administrative operation of the District during the pendency of this dissolution are being funded under an agreement between the District and Benjamin Partners, Ltd. and Sydgan Corporation, collectively ("Developer"), the prior landowner within the District, pursuant to the Developer Funding Agreement dated April 26, 2016, the form of which was approved as part of Resolution 2014-04 and an executed copy of which is attached as Exhibit 5. Any outstanding fees due to District Staff, including the
District Manager and District Counsel, shall be paid before the adoption by the City of a non-emergency ordinance dissolving the District. As such, all outstanding obligations have been paid.

5. Accordingly, on April 28, 2016, the District’s Board of Supervisors, during a duly noticed public meeting, adopted Resolution 2016-04, which among other things authorized the dissolution of the District, approved the form of the Developer Funding Agreement, and directed the District Manager and District Counsel to submit Resolution 2016-04 and this Petition to the Board of City Commissioners. A draft copy of the minutes of the April 28, 2016 public meeting is attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and a copy of Resolution 2016-04 is attached hereto as Exhibit 3.

6. As part of Resolution 2016-04, the District’s Board of Supervisors determined that it is in the best interest of the District and the owners of the lands located within the District that the District be dissolved. The Board further found that any future planned community development services to be provided to the lands within the District may be provided by and through the Developer, by a property owner’s association and by other governmental entities, or other means in a manner as efficiently as the District; at a level of quality equal to the level of quality to be delivered to the users of those services by the District; and at an annual cost that would be equal to or lower than an annual assessment amount that could be levied by the District. Additionally, the dissolution of the District will have no negative or adverse impacts on any of the landowners within the District, or any third parties. Petitioner has obtained written consent from the developer and majority landowner of the real property located within the District, as evidenced by Exhibit 4 attached hereto. The proposed ordinance dissolving the District will not have an adverse impact on small business, and is not likely to directly or indirectly increase regulatory costs in excess of $200,000 in the aggregate in this state within one (1) year after the implementation of the ordinance.

7. Supervisors. The current members of the District's Board of Supervisors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Bellows</td>
<td>425 W. New England Avenue, Winter Park, FL 32789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Jaffee</td>
<td>P.O. Box 941842, Maitland, FL 32794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick J. Knight</td>
<td>P.O. Box 948255, Maitland, FL 32751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier E. Omana</td>
<td>1027 Stetson Street West, Orlando, FL 32804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Maher</td>
<td>631 W. Morse Blvd., Suite 200, Winter Park, FL 32789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the above named Supervisors will continue to serve until such time as the District is dissolved by Ordinance of the Board of City Commissioners or until any successors may be elected or appointed.
8. **Official District Records.** Upon adoption of the ordinance dissolving the District, the District will cause all official records of the District to be transferred to the Florida Secretary of State in accordance with Florida public records laws.

9. **Notice of Hearing.** The District will provide notice of publication of the final hearing of the City Ordinance to dissolve the District to allow for public comment.

10. **Notice of Dissolution.** Upon adoption of the ordinance dissolving the District, the District will cause notice of adoption of said ordinance to be transmitted to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity, and will further cause to be recorded in the Official Records of Orange County, Florida, a Notice of Dissolution.

**WHEREFORE,** because the District has no outstanding financial obligations and no operating or maintenance responsibilities and accordingly has met the requirements for dissolution as provided in Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes (2013), and for the other reasons herein stated, Petitioner respectfully requests the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Winter Park, Florida to:

a. Consider this Petition and provide for notice of proposed ordinance to dissolve the District and schedule a public hearing thereon, if requested, in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 120, Florida Statutes;

b. Grant the petition and adopt an ordinance dissolving the District pursuant to Section 190.046(9), Florida Statutes;

c. Grant other such relief as appropriate.

**RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,** this 1st day of June 2016.

**LATHAM, SHUKER, EDEN AND BEAUDINE**

By: Jan Carpenter, Esq.
Florida Bar No. 767158
111 N. Magnolia Avenue, Suite 1400
Orlando, FL 32801

By: Andrew d’Adesky, Esq.
Florida Bar No. 0117586
111 N. Magnolia Avenue, Suite 1400
Orlando, FL 32801
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