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 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 commend 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. The 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
   a. David Williamson, Central Florida Freethought Community
      Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Mayor's Report
   a. Week of the Family Proclamation

*times are projected and subject to change
5. City Manager's Report
   a. City Manager's Report

6. City Attorney's Report

7. Non-Action Items
   a. Update on Progress Point and Orange Avenue  20 minutes

8. Citizen Comments | 5 p.m. or soon thereafter (Items not on the agenda)

9. Consent Agenda
   a. Approve minutes of October 9, 2017.
   b. Purchases Over $75,000  5 minutes
      1. Approve PR18000141 to Intermedix Corp. for FY18 payment collection services for EMS billing. Amount: $100,000.
      2. Approve FY18 purchases from Core & Main, LP related to material utilized in the capital improvement of the Water/Wastewater Utility. Amount: $500,000.
      3. Approve FY18 purchases from Electric Supply of Tampa for underground wire/cable utilized in the citywide undergrounding program of the Electric Utility. Amount: $600,000.
      5. Approve PR18000099 to Waste Pro of Florida for FY18 residential, commercial & construction solid waste disposal. Amount: $3,030,000.
      8. Approve FY17 BPO Change Order to Florida Power & Light for Bulk Power. Amount: $10,460,000.
      9. Approve FY17 BPO Change Order to ENCO for Call Center Services. Amount: $105,000.
     10. Approve FY17 BPO Change Order to Heart Utilities for Undergrounding & Other Electric Services. Amount: $2,185,000.

   c. Piggyback Contracts  5 minutes
1. Approve Piggyback Agreement of OUC contract #3601-2 OQ for Purchase & Delivery of Padmount Switchgears for citywide undergrounding program. Amount: $275,000

d. Contracts 5 minutes
1. Approve Contract agreement with Magic Ice USA, Inc. for Winter in the Park. Amount: $84,750.

10. Action Items Requiring Discussion

a. City Manager Annual Review 10 minutes

11. Public Hearings

a. Request of Condev Land LLC for 650 North New York Avenue 30 minutes
- Ordinance - Amend the “Comprehensive Plan” Future Land Use Map to change from an Institutional Future Land Use designation to a Medium Density Residential Future Land Use designation on the First Church of Christ Scientist property at 650 North New York Avenue, in order to match the existing Multi-Family (R-3) Zoning. (1)
- Subdivision approval to divide or split the 2.38 acres of 650 North New York Avenue to create a northern parcel of 1.43 acres to be purchased by Condev Land LLC for use as a fee simple, 16-unit townhome project and to create a southern portion of 0.95 acres to be retained for potential reconstruction of the First Church of Christ Scientist.
- Conditional Use approval to construct a fee simple, three-story, residential townhouse project of 16 units in eight separate two-unit duplex buildings with an average individual townhouse unit size of approximately 4,700 square feet and a total combined project size for the eight separate duplex buildings of 68,394 square feet, on property zoned R-3.

b. Ordinance - Request of the City of Winter 10 minutes
Park to amend the "Subdivision Regulations" so as to establish minimum criteria and standards for the subdivision or split of lakefront portions of properties across the street from the principal residence (1)

c. Request of Deborah Crown and Brandon & Jennifer Lenox for subdivision or lot split approval to divide the lakefront portion of the property at 1486 Alabama Drive

d. Ordinance - W. Canton Avenue Easement Vacate
   Request to abandon an easement at 841 W. Canton Avenue, Winter Park, Florida.

e. Ordinance - FY 2017 Budget Amendments

12. City Commission Reports

Appeals and 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."
subject
Week of the Family Proclamation

motion / recommendation

background
This is presented each year to acknowledge "Week of the Family" which is the first full week of November.

alternatives / other considerations

fiscal impact
subject
City Manager's Report

motion / recommendation

background

alternatives / other considerations

fiscal impact
ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Upload Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Manager's Report</td>
<td>10/17/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminole County Ditch Drainage Improvement</td>
<td>The City of Winter Park has contracted services for dredging the drainage ditch behind the homes along the east side of Arbor Park Drive. Dredging will begin the week of October 16, 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Electric undergrounding | **Miles of Undergrounding performed**  
  Project E: 3.92 miles (Complete)  
  Project F: 1.54 miles (90% Complete)  
  Azalea Lane: 0.25 miles (Complete)  
  915 N Pennsylvania: 0.2 miles (Complete)  
  1666 Summer Way: 0.06 miles (Complete)  
  276 S. Orlando Ave “Glass Knife”: 0.1 miles (Complete)  
  McKean Cir phase1: .15 miles (90% Complete) half of the customers were on UG loop just before Irma  
  **TOTAL completed in FY17:** 6.05 miles |
<p>| Fairbanks transmission | All information required by Duke has been provided for contractors to begin the Fairbanks conversion. Expected start date of 1/1/18. |
| Orange Avenue corridor study | Stakeholder meetings finished. Staff will present findings at October 23rd Commission meeting. |
| Denning Drive | Phase 1 construction (from Orange Avenue to Fairbanks Avenue) began October 9 with demolition. Curb work and grading is underway and will be complete before the end of the year. Phase 2 (Fairbanks Avenue to Webster Avenue) is expected to begin January 2018 and be complete May 2018 during the dry season. Phase 3 (Webster to Solana) will follow directly behind phase 2 with entire project wrapped in early summer 2018. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenic Boat Tour ADA ramp</th>
<th>Construction of the new concrete ramp is underway and will substantially be complete by the end of October 2017 to meet the City’s obligation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Design</td>
<td>The design architect team is working on conceptual design and is expected to be available for internal review in October. The public unveiling that was scheduled for September 27 at the Alfond Inn has been rescheduled for November 1, 5:30 at the Civic Center. It is expected that the construction documents will be completed spring 2018.</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.
subject
Update on Progress Point and Orange Avenue

motion / recommendation

background
The purpose of this briefing is two-fold. The adopted Comprehensive Plan highlights a number of gateway corridors for study. Since the city owns a significant parcel along the Orange Avenue corridor, staff began examining Orange Avenue, as it exists today and the influence that Progress Point as well as other major potential redevelopment may have along the corridor. Staff intends to share these findings and ask direction from the City Commission on moving forward in this area.

Since the exchange of the property on Morse and Denning and Progress Point in 2011, the city has looked for opportunities to provide public benefit for this integral parcel on Orange Avenue. In 2012 and 2016, EDAB and P&Z discussed options at joint workshops. Two years ago, the city issued a Notice of Disposal for potential development on this site. At the end of that process, the Commission directed staff to ask the Orange Avenue property owners and merchants what types of uses they wanted to see on Progress Point. Staff held that meeting in November 2015. After that meeting and based on the findings from the city’s visioning process and the Comprehensive Plan, staff has expanded from simply looking at Progress Point to taking a longer view at the Orange Avenue corridor as a vital economic corridor within the city.

It is important to mention that the City has just about $600,000 invested in the acquisition of this property. So to the extent that some portion of the property is used for a public purpose and as a result sold for less than appraised value, the City will still be in a profitable position.

Staff has provided background information on Orange Avenue including an existing conditions analysis as well as a report by Logan Simpson documenting some focus group findings from area property owners, tenants and residents. A memo outlining significant points about the development potential of Progress Point and its possible impact on Orange Avenue is also included.
alternatives / other considerations

fiscal impact

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Upload Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange Avenue Existing Conditions Report</td>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Assessment for Orange Avenue</td>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memo on Progress Point Development Opportunities</td>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint P&amp;Z/EDAB Minutes</td>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focusing on Orange Avenue in Winter Park, this study identifies its composition, existing conditions, and examines ‘highest and best use’ opportunities from a zoning and development perspective. Its aim is to aid in the discussion regarding the corridor’s impact on the City.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Study Intent

Winter Park is widely considered a destination community throughout Central Florida. This has created a highly attractive retail market. As a response, it has also increased demand on transportation and land use needs. Orange Avenue serves as a primary connector within the city and joining to adjacent jurisdictions including Orlando and Orange County. This makes it a highly traveled and visible gateway. Mostly comprised of commercial properties, the study area’s analysis evaluates current conditions which may exacerbate new strategies for investment into the corridor, ultimately creating an attractive and vibrant space that is integral to the Winter Park experience.

Analysis

The study area, which is anchored by Fairbanks Avenue to the north and Orlando Avenue to the south (the TD Bank office building), totals 103 properties. Analysis was broken down into 11 different categories:

- Existing Conditions
- Sales Comparisons
- Employment
- Vacancy/Leasing Rates
- Current Use/Zoning
- Parcel Size
- Taxable Value
- Building Value
- Intensity
- Utilization
- Property Ownership

The data in this report is intended for informational purposes to be used in conjunction with discussion and other analysis.
PROJECT OVERVIEW

Existing Conditions

The area observed is in the City of Winter Park, Florida. Orange Avenue (SR 527) extends from Osceola and Orange counties. The northern terminus is at Fairbanks Avenue in Winter Park and the southern terminus is at Donegan Avenue near Kissimmee. The study scope looks at a particular segment of this road in Winter Park, from Orlando Avenue to Fairbanks Avenue. The map outlines this section in blue. The chart identifies some basic information regarding the study area. All property information has been gathered from the Orange County Property Appraiser.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>103</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>54.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Space (SQFT)</td>
<td>612,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Value</td>
<td>$31,450,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per SQFT</td>
<td>$51.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxable Value</td>
<td>$76,202,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total property tax collected</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX Floor Area Ratio (commercial)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX Floor Area Ratio (mixed-use)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sales Comparisons

Nine (9) properties have been sold in the past five (5) years, roughly 9% of the total study area. Price per acre has averaged $2,017,039 through this timeframe. The chart below itemizes these purchases.

The map organizes the sold properties by sale price with the lowest sales in green and highest in red. The green parcels have the highest sales price averaging over five million per purchase. They are called out for identification purposes. Only two properties were sold within the last year, this could be due to several factors including the two million average price per acre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
<th>Price Per Acre</th>
<th>Sale Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1341 N Orange Ave</td>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$2,978,056</td>
<td>7/1/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1353 Palmetto Ave</td>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>$255,000</td>
<td>$741,279</td>
<td>6/26/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360 N Orange Ave</td>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>$715,000</td>
<td>$2,090,643</td>
<td>12/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1320 S Orlando Ave</td>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>$2,694,301</td>
<td>9/10/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280 N Orange Ave</td>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$2,406,015</td>
<td>4/1/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816 N Orange Ave</td>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>$755,000</td>
<td>$2,706,937</td>
<td>12/30/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>784 N Orange Ave</td>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
<td>$1,906,008</td>
<td>12/30/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950 Minnesota Ave</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>$1,219,453</td>
<td>7/26/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1355 N Orange Ave</td>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$1,410,658</td>
<td>1/24/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**  
3.90  
$7,345,000  
$2,017,039 average

*Source: Orange County Property Appraiser*
Employment

There are a total of 154 firms in the study area with 43% of them falling under the Professional Services, Retail Trade and Finance and Insurance categories. As described by the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS), Other Services are generally defined as maintenance/repair shops, car washes, and personal care services. NAICS are generally accepted as the international classification for business taking over from the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes in 2007. The advantage of NAICS is that it allows for flexibility in classifications as new innovations in business are created.

Employment numbers have similar characteristics to their firm counterparts, but remain uniquely distinct. Based on ESRI Business Analyst data, there are a total of 1503 employees in the study area. Retail trade accounts for 22% of this total. Professional services and Accommodation and Food Service followed with 18% and 16% respectively.

It is not unusual to find accommodation, food service, and retail trade firms to have higher numbers of employees. More often, employers in these fields hire more part-time workers to accommodate shift changes throughout the day, flexibility with schedules, and in certain cases avoid additional overhead costs such as insurance and benefits.

Source: City of Winter Park
The city continues to see healthy lease and vacancy rates a whole. The graph below shows a comparison of these rates from the study area against Winter Park and Orlando. For vacancy, a healthy rate is considered to be less than 10%.

The retail sector of the study area remains very healthy. Given the small sample size, it was difficult to determine an appropriate leasing rate. However, this is also due in part to low vacancy at 1.8%. In comparison, Winter Park and Orlando’s vacancy rates were 6.4% and 5.8% respectively. Both values are considered to be very healthy. One stark contrast is the leasing rates between Orlando and Winter Park. According to CoStar, retail leasing for the city boasts $20.83 a foot compared to Orlando’s $13.90. It is another indicator of a strong local market.

Office space in the study area appears healthy as well. Its 4.6% vacancy rate is in line with the city’s 4.3%. By contrast, Orlando holds an 8.9% rate. Leasing rates are also healthy. The study area carries an asking price of $20.75 while the city and Orlando measure at $23.10 and $19.44. Overall, these are measures of a good market in the study area with a low vacancy rates and healthy leasing rates.
Current Use/Zoning

The chart below outlines the current zoning of the Orange Avenue corridor, tracking acreage and building sizes measured in square feet.

To a certain extent, larger acreage values will in turn provide greater numbers of building square feet. This is evident in the O-1 and C-3 zoning categories. They account for 89 of the total 103 parcels (86%), 43 acres, and 574,632 square feet of building space along the Orange Avenue corridor.
**Taxable Value**

The tax base of Winter Park is largely residential. However, this is not the case for most of the city’s highest traveled roads. Orange Avenue is no exception. The highest burden in this area falls on large parcel, commercial developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxable Value</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Parcel %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$1M</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M - $2M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2M - $4M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4M - $8M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8M +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, the TD Bank office building accounts for over $12 million in taxable value on its own. The parcels with the highest tax valuation are highlighted in green. 89% of parcels are valued at less than $1 million making it an interesting contrast to the large commercial properties in green.
Building Value

A look at building values can also be beneficial providing additional insight into assessments from a taxable and redevelopment perspective. They also correlate closely with taxable values in that the largest valuations are on the biggest parcels. Contrary to this, 98 parcels, or 95% of them are valued at less than $1 million suggesting land values contribute significantly to total taxable values in the corridor. In essence, this supports the argument there is demand for property in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Value</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Parcel %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$500K</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500K - $1M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1M - $2M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2M - $4M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4M +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Map of Orange Avenue Corridor Study showing building values]
Parcel Size

Parcels within the Study Area range in size up to six acres. Approximately 91% of parcels are less than one acre. Only nine parcels exceed one acre. The largest parcel is just over six acres. As you can see from the map below, the area is predominantly colored red, which are parcels less than one acre in size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Parcel %</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Acreage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.55%</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>21.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2 - 0.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.23%</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>37.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.41 - 0.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.70%</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>19.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.61 - 0.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>15.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81 - 0.99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intensity (FAR)

Intensity or floor area ratio (FAR), describes the building’s total floor area divided by the total area of the parcel. In essence, it is the density of a building on a property. In zoning, FAR can be used to limit the amount of construction in a certain area. For example in the C-3 zoning district, properties are limited to no greater than 45% development of the parcel. In specific cases, a mixed-use project can increase FAR to 60%.

The map outlines the intensity of each parcel in the study area. 34% of properties are identified to have very low intensity. Also of note are the 20 properties that attempt to maximize their building space. These properties are scattered along the corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Parcel %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15 - 0.30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30 - 0.45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45 +</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Utilization**

Utilization identifies property efficiency. In short, it explains FAR (intensity) on a scale of 0-1. 47% of parcels remain low given current conditions.

Throughout the study area, there are clusters of red and orange (low utilization) are of particular interest. This may have also been observed by the market as private sector developers are seeking redevelopment in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilization</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Parcel %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 0.25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25 - 0.50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50 - 0.75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75 +</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Property Ownership

Identifying property ownership can be a valuable tool for redevelopment. Property owners who own multiple, contiguous parcels can have a greater impact on an area due to their larger market share. The map has identified 6 owners with multiple properties, as well as 3 owners with larger properties, the City of Winter Park being one of those owners. From the map, the SUS Properties are identified as the Jewett Orthopedic Clinic and DI Partners is largely the RV dealership on Fairbanks Avenue. Even though several of these properties can be more intensely developed by FAR standards, this remains unlikely in the near term.
Increasing FAR

A theoretical description of maximizing FAR is described in the bar graph below. Increasing all 103 parcels to their max 0.45 FAR elevates square footage by 457,299 square feet, or 75%. If a maximum FAR of 0.60 is applied, this value increases by 812,916 square feet, or 133% over the baseline. It is also interesting to add in theoretical situations, for instance if the City were to create a special overlay district for the Orange Avenue corridor that allowed for 2.0 FAR. This would elevate square footage by a significant amount at 4,142,336 square feet.

An increase in square footage also affects building value. The chart below displays building values in existing conditions, and at 0.45 and 0.60 FAR respectively. It also displays the potential increase if building values per square foot were to increase. Widely considered the crown jewel of Winter Park, Park Avenue, is an interesting comparable valued at $80 per square foot.
ANALYSIS

Maximizing Property Ownership

Owners with multiple properties/large property ownership account for 44% (269,473 square feet) of the total building square footage of the study area. Applying the same methodology of maximizing FAR for these properties alone, total building square footage elevates 241%, 321% and 1,069% over the base line respectively.

Following the same format with building value, maximizing FAR increases the study area’s valuation by over $30 million at the 0.60 mark and over $134 million at the 2.0 mark. Assuming land value and exemptions remain constant, this equates roughly to an additional $17M in taxable value or $69,569 in ad valorem revenue. This does not include other revenue sources such as impact fees, permits and utility charges.
Considerations

Given the data, the following considerations are provided:

1) **Planning Tools**: Increasing the FAR of Orange Avenue is a strategy that would increase the commercial tax base considerably. This would require appropriate social and political will to execute.

2) **Identify Interested Parties**: Using the multiple property ownership map, identifying parcels that are both under one ownership group and underutilized may be a good starting point for redevelopment. If possible, positive social/capital investments on these parcels may be magnified across the corridor.

3) **Economic Development Tools**: Another opportunity may lie in incentivizing redevelopment that is commensurate with the charm and experience of Winter Park. These may include façade grant programs with private owners or, capital improvement programs coordinated with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT).

4) **‘Singles vs. Home Runs’**: The total transformation of Orange Avenue at maximum FAR is highly unlikely. As an alternative, identify properties that require facilitation for redevelopment rather than complete overhaul.

Direction & Discussion:

The purpose of this analysis is for informative purposes only. It is recommended that this information be used in conjunction with discussion and direction from city officials, boards and the City Commission.
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PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Orange Avenue Corridor Assessment is a proactive planning effort to serve as a pilot project for other corridors throughout Winter Park. The Assessment has asked the public to envision what the Corridor could consider in the face of coming development such as city-owned Progress Point, growth and change. This Assessment is a result of direction provided by the plan guidance provided by Winter Park Comprehensive Plan, Vision Winter Park and the Orange Avenue Existing Conditions Study and seeks to utilize extensive public outreach to understand the desires of the community in regards to the aesthetics of the Orange Avenue Corridor.

What it is and what it is not

The Orange Avenue Corridor Assessment is a planning process that focused primarily on gathering input from residents, business owners and property owners invested in the future of the Orange Avenue Corridor in the face of the development of Progress Point, a city-owned catalyst site along the Corridor, adaptive reuse occurring along the Corridor, and change spurred by economic success and population growth. It is an Assessment that is a direct result of the Comprehensive Plan, and is a pilot project to guide the evolution of other important corridors throughout the City.

The Assessment is a summary of public input that focused on the presentation and discussion regarding a range of details and amenities that are applicable and could be accommodated along Orange Avenue. Through these discussions a set of Guiding Principles have been developed that will serve as the foundation for design guidelines and standards to be developed for this Corridor.

Goals

Through the Vision and Comprehensive Plan, the ultimate goal is to create unique corridors throughout the City. Through this planning process, the Assessment will help City staff:

• Transform ideas into regulatory guidance for the Corridor.
• Attract complementary development to the Corridor and City as a whole.
• Shape development along the Corridor to fit the desired future character.
• Serve as a pilot project for other corridors within Winter Park.
• Support local businesses to create an environment to meet both the City’s and business owners’ vision.
The combination of dialogue with the community and polling results of the workshops and plan hub with internal staff and consultant discussion have given insight into what design elements the public would like to see in the evolution of Orange Avenue. The following Guiding Principles are the results of these conversations, and will be utilized in the future development of design guidelines and standards to guide the evolution of the Corridor.

1. A building scale of one- to four-stories is appropriate along the Corridor to maintain a neighborhood feel.

   **Strategy 1a.** Height of buildings around major intersections, such as at the three-way intersection of Denning Drive, Minnesota Avenue, and Orange Avenue; the intersection of Orange Avenue and Fairbanks Avenue; and the intersection of US 17-92 and Orange Avenue should be increased and used to create gateways to Winter Park.

2. High-quality design standards and guidelines for the Corridor are necessary to preserve and maintain the existing character and high quality development, while encouraging a desired mix of uses.

3. Landscaping, trees and shading are integral to implement an improved pedestrian experience and feel of the Corridor.

   **Strategy 3a.** Integration of landscaping, plazas, and urban open space is difficult to envision along Orange Avenue to a greater extent; there is the opportunity to create these spaces creatively through utilizing alley spaces, integration of these amenities into larger redevelopment projects, and through additional landscaping treatments along the street edge.
4. Variety in architectural and surfacing textures and materials along the Corridor is important to both preserve the character of the Corridor while creating a destination.

**Strategy 4a.** Use of different colors and materials, such as brickwork, is preferred to create a unique character and identity along the Corridor, and should be used to indicate multiple modes of transportation.

5. Improving the bicycle and pedestrian environment is critical to safety, accommodating alternative modes of transportation, and creating a vibrant Corridor.

**Strategy 5a.** Mid-block pedestrian crossings are preferred to slow speeds and encourage patrons on Orange Avenue to linger and visit multiple locations.

**Strategy 5b.** Use of public art and creation of urban spaces should be implemented to brand the Corridor and create notable landmarks and places for visitors.

6. Parking considerations should be made with improvements and coming developments.

**Strategy 6a.** On-street parallel parking is difficult with current speeds and traffic counts along the Corridor. Alternatives such as angled, on-street parking should be explored, with considerations to parking offered behind buildings and parking garages, and integrated into redevelopment projects.

7. An eclectic mix of land uses should be prioritized, specifically at the Progress Point site.

**Strategy 7a.** A balance of daily needs, entertainment, and retail (restaurant, cafes, etc.) should be identified to serve both the resident and tourist populations that visit the Corridor.

**Strategy 7b.** Mixed-use redevelopment is preferred at catalyst sites to maintain a diverse mix of land uses, including office/residential uses to support commercial uses along the Corridor.

8. Integration of green space, such as a linear park along Palmetto Avenue, is desired.

**Strategy 8a.** Orange Avenue has limited potential to incorporate green, open, and urban space to a greater extent; Palmetto Avenue should be leveraged as an opportunity to provide green space that residents desire.
The Orange Avenue Corridor Assessment builds on policy guidance from the following plans to determine the character, design, and experience of Orange Avenue.

**PLAN GUIDANCE**

The Winter Park Comprehensive Plan influences the Orange Avenue Corridor through its Future Land Use (FLU) designations, planning areas surrounding the Corridor, and transportation goals and policies. Goals of the Comprehensive Plan include maintaining the traditional scale and character while encouraging development that fosters pedestrian connectivity and appropriate design and landscaping. FLU designates Orange Avenue as a mix of office/professional and commercial, which is consistent with the existing mix and directs the uses of future development. These FLUs allow 17 dwelling units/acre, which support an increase in density along the Corridor. Goals of balancing business creation and growth while maintaining an exceptional quality of life is outlined through this Plan, with a focus on planning processes and regulations that ensure quality development. This specific stretch of Orange Avenue is also identified as a location for a Gateway Plan and design study as it serves as a major transportation corridor leading into the City. The location of two Planning
Areas: Planning Area F, Mead Garden Virginia Heights and Planning Area J, U.S. Highway 17-92 Corridor, also directs the future of Orange Avenue in regards to prohibiting certain business types (i.e. new or used car sales, resale stores or pawn shops, tattoo businesses, etc.) as well as the consideration for design guidelines for the Orange Avenue Corridor to protect and maintain scale and appearance.

The transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan also outlines the necessity for a balanced, safe and multimodal transportation system. This element states that the City will create a Mobility Plan that will alter the hierarchy of modes and incorporate implementation guidelines including complete streets criteria, an interconnected street network, pedestrian and bicycle circulation, transit opportunities, the provision of a bicycle circulation system and the development of a regional trail system. As part of this section of the Plan, Level of Service (LOS) standards for Orange Avenue require 85 - 100% sidewalk coverage, 50 - 84% paved shoulder/bicycle lane/trail coverage and/or sharrows, and four transit vehicles during peak hours in peak directions.
This planning effort involved extensive public outreach that included government, city institutions, community leaders, non-profits, businesses, and residents to establish a Vision for Winter Park, which subsequently informed the development of the Winter Park Comprehensive Plan. Through this process, four guiding Vision Themes were determined, and are used to inform this Plan:

- Cherish and sustain Winter Park’s extraordinary quality of life.
- Plan our growth through a collaborative process that protects our City’s timeless scale and character.
- Enhance the Winter Park brand through a flourishing community of arts and culture.
- Build and embrace our local institutions for lifelong learning and future generations.

This study evaluates the existing conditions along Orange Avenue from Fairbanks Avenue to US 17-92 to provide considerations for this Plan and others moving forward. From the study of this data, the following considerations were found:

- **Planning Tools:** Increasing the FAR of Orange Avenue would increase the commercial tax base considerably, but would require social and political will to execute.

- **Identify Interested Parties:** Identifying parcels that are either under one ownership group or underutilized should be a starting point for redevelopment. As feasible, possible social/capital investments on these parcels may be magnified across the Corridor.

- **Economic Development Tools:** Another opportunity should be to incentivize redevelopment that is commensurate with the charm and experience of Winter Park. These could include façade grant programs with private owners or capital improvement programs coordinated with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT).

- **‘Single vs. Home Runs’**: The total transformation of Orange Avenue at a maximum FAR is highly unlikely. As an alternative, identify properties that require facilitation for redevelopment rather than a complete overhaul.
Great Streets, by Allan Jacobs, evaluates the world’s best streets and the physical characteristics that make them great. Five broad categories are used to determine what qualities contribute to the streets’ greatness. Each of these criterion focuses on a different aspect of the street in question, from physical qualities of a corridor to the feeling it evokes to those experiencing it:

- A Defined Street
- Physical Comfort
- Unique Character
- Qualities that Engage the Eye
- Places for People to Walk and Bike with Leisure

### Identifying Memorable Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st St., Sanford, FL</td>
<td>Sanford</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Ave., St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood Ave., Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Dr., Miami Beach, FL</td>
<td>Miami Beach</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St., Bar Harbor, ME</td>
<td>Bar Harbor</td>
<td>ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State St., Bristol, VA</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville Ave., Dallas, TX</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St., Nantucket, MA</td>
<td>Nantucket</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Main St., Greenville, SC</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Dr., St. Petersburg, FL</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central St., Woodstock, VT</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>VT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St., St. Helena, CA</td>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St., Keene, NH</td>
<td>Keene</td>
<td>NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant St., Winter Garden, FL</td>
<td>Winter Garden</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Gaines St., Tallahassee, FL</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paseo, Palm Desert, CA</td>
<td>Palm Desert</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Canyon Dr., Palm Springs, CA</td>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norrebrogade, Copenhagen, DE</td>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway, Gatlinburg, TN</td>
<td>Gatlinburg</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway, Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th St., Grand Junction, CO</td>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Ave., Fort Collins, CO</td>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
<td>CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santana Row, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St., Branson, MO</td>
<td>Branson</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway, Colombus, GA</td>
<td>Colombus</td>
<td>GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Ave., Tempe, AZ</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biscayne Blvd., Miami, FL</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway, Nashville, TN</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katella Ave., Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>Anaheim</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GREAT STREETS ANALYSIS

These criteria were utilized to identify five corridors that represent similar yet diverse aspects, allowing the audience to initiate conversations about the design elements of each.

A DEFINED STREET

Great streets are defined by vertical (height of buildings, walls or trees) and horizontal (length and spacing between vertical) boundaries. Categories evaluated tailored to Orange Avenue include: presence of a median, right-of-way width, number of lanes, length of the corridor, beginning and end elements, and building enclosure.

PHYSICAL COMFORT

Great streets are comfortable and offer climate control and protection from the elements. Categories evaluated tailored to Orange Avenue include: presence of on-street parking, landscaping, and level of safety.

UNIQUE CHARACTER

Great streets include contributing physical qualities (streetscape and public places), factors including accessibility and topography and other variables including density and land uses. Categories evaluated tailored to Orange Avenue include: eclectic land use mix, creative industry and sustainability features, and building heights of one- to four-stories.

QUALITIES THAT ENGAGE THE EYE

Great streets include an appropriate level of visual complexity including different surfaces to keep the eye engaged. Categories evaluated tailored to Orange Avenue include: theming and design features, arts and culture, and plazas and places.

PLACES TO WALK AND BIKE WITH LEISURE

Great streets are often great places to walk, include walkways that permit people to walk at varying paces, and that are safe, primarily from vehicles. Categories evaluated tailored to Orange Avenue include: presence of sidewalks and bicycle lanes, pedestrian-orientation, and transit options.
MEMORABLE CORRIDORS

The following five corridors were used to illustrate the elements from the Great Streets Analysis. Additionally, staff from each corridor’s respective city was interviewed regarding the history, successes, challenges, and mechanisms that contributed to the evolution of the corridors, to use as lessons learned for future design and development of Orange Avenue. In addition to these first-hand accounts, key elements of each corridor were emphasized through a visual preference polling exercise to be discussed by residents, property owners and businesses owners of Winter Park to determine what is applicable and desired along Orange Avenue.

Similar in right-of-way width to Orange Avenue, 1st Street in Sanford, Florida was the number one corridor that arose from the Great Streets analysis. This downtown corridor is event-centric in its design, and utilizes differing materials, wayfinding signage, plazas, gathering spaces and smart design to create a vibrant pedestrian environment.

Centered on the brick street, the corridor utilizes differing patterns and textures of brick to signify crosswalks, mid-block crossings for pedestrians and at-grade pedestrian infrastructure with bollards to create a sense of safety. At-grade sidewalks, roads and parallel parking infrastructure are utilized on perpendicular streets. This is the only corridor that emphasizes through design the importance of perpendicular access for its success. Not only is wayfinding signage geared toward vehicular traffic, but also those walking and biking to navigate amenities and businesses along the corridor.

Plaza spaces, alleyways converted to serve the needs of businesses, and amenities such as electric hookups to serve vendors at the frequent events held along this corridor supports Sanford’s event-centric downtown. Corner treatments with wide overhangs on buildings oriented toward the corridor also create these ‘third spaces’ desired by residents and visitors and gives the corridor a unique identity. These types of corner treatments can be seen in other areas such as Brooklyn, New York, where they serve as gathering spaces, and allow flow in and out of anchor businesses.

Parallel on-street parking also contributes to the feeling of enclosure that the orientation and setbacks of the buildings create, with gutters utilized for stormwater drainage and management separating the on-street parking from the travel lanes.
The Maryland Avenue corridor located in the Central West End neighborhood of St. Louis is an excellent example of utilizing a variation of building scales and lush landscaping to create enclosure along the corridor. The use of public art, ornate lighting, difference in materials and varying road orientation also contributes to a unique urban space.

This corridor utilizes public art, such as the world’s largest chess piece, as not only an identifiable landmark along the corridor but also as a draw for visitors and a unique identifier for the neighborhood. Lush landscaping and ornate lighting fixtures also contribute to this brand enhance the feeling of enclosure from building orientation and minimal setbacks.

On-street parking along Maryland Avenue utilizes both angled and parallel parking that creates space for public amenities, plazas and ‘third spaces.’ Maryland Avenue also changes its road orientation to contribute to these urban spaces. This variation also slows traffic through the corridor. To activate other areas along the corridor for public use, intersection treatments with large corners are implemented to offer the ‘plaza feel’ and engage the eye for both pedestrians and vehicles.

Elmwood Avenue’s features are unique from the other memorable corridors with the presence of sharrow and dedicated bicycle lanes, the quirky, funky architectural character, the use of minimal landscaping and the use of terraces and interesting rooflines to create spaces in an area lacking large plazas. Street trees and large sidewalk infrastructure help create urban space along buildings with varying setbacks, outdoor seating and patios, and landscape planters while still offering a sense of safety through on-street parallel parking.

Differing architectural styles and new construction are seamlessly integrated into the existing urban fabric, providing a feeling of quirkiness that attracts people to the area. The corridor also effectively maintains its provision of basic needs and services, such as cleaners, for the residential areas surrounding this commercial corridor and the residences that are located above. In addition to the mix of land uses, second- and third-stories utilize terraces and spaces that can be utilized in inclement weather allowing Elmwood Avenue to be a vibrant destination year-round.
Ocean Drive, with a rich history and architectural character, focuses on the value of green spaces and the preservation of unique identity through regulatory mechanisms.

This corridor utilized heavy historic preservation regulations to maintain its nautical art deco style buildings, and design guidelines and ordinances limiting unwanted uses and to preserve the unique mix of land uses. Accessory uses on the ground-floor of restaurants/cafes are a critical piece in the character of Ocean Drive, and preserving these elements has allowed the corridor to continue to succeed over time. Outdoor seating has been key with a balance of outdoor public space and amenities paired with expansive sidewalks that allow free flow of foot traffic.

A linear public park also contributes significantly to the corridor’s character, as it provides the gathering space and public amenity that the commercial strip may lack with large plazas and urban spaces.
In addition to its similar features to the other memorable corridors of on-street parking and buildings offering enclosure of the street, Main Street features varying setbacks to accommodate parking needs, lower building scale with roof lines that create visual interest and use of corner treatments and public amenities to create space.

Historic architecture with building heights up to three-stories accommodates scale in a way that emphasizes the character of the corridor. Bollards are utilized to separate pedestrians from vehicles and emphasize the activation of the pedestrian environment without the provision of large, expanded sidewalks and landscape buffers. Stone walls and landscaped hedges provide a transition from public space to private properties.

On-street and off-street parking areas provide for increased parking demand at certain times of year for an area with a strong tourism draw, but also creates a feeling of openness along the corridor. Alleyways between buildings also have potential to serve as enhanced urban spaces as the corridor evolves. Gathering spaces and strategically-located parks and plazas are also implemented along the corridor.

Main Street is unique with an eclectic mix of commercial businesses, private residences and tree-lined sidewalks. This corridor strikes a balance between provision of needs and services for the surrounding residential area while still serving its tourist population in a harmonious way. This corridor has been successful through a combination of the influence of the Bar Harbor Village Association and the establishment of a Design Review Board; since its inception the Town has implemented trash pickup, a beautification board, and the involvement of the local government with strong codes and regulations to preserve the scale and character of the corridor.
To glean input from the public about how they would like to see Orange Avenue evolve in the face of coming development, growth and change, two visual preference polling workshops and a weeklong Plan Hub were hosted by the City of Winter Park. Workshop invitations were sent to every establishment within a 1,500-foot radius of the study area in an effort to encompass residents, property owners and business owners, and a press release was issued to encourage citywide participation. These events, which yielded input from over 50 community representatives, featured a presentation on the Great Streets Analysis. It then led into a visual preference polling exercise where participants were asked to delve into the characteristics and key elements that appealed to them. Discussion about specific likes and dislikes followed to identify those desired elements for the Orange Avenue Corridor.
What We Heard

Over the course of the workshops and Plan Hub, the three most memorable corridors were:

1. MARYLAND AVENUE | ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI: 40%
2. 1ST STREET | SANFORD, FLORIDA: 18%
3. ELMWOOD AVENUE | BUFFALO, NEW YORK: 16%
ounded in the design elements of the corridor that were preferred by participants, the following key design principles of **Maryland Avenue** were identified:

- Strive for a variation of height and setbacks.
- Utilize changes in façade texture and surface materials.
- Implement lush landscaping to enhance comfort, create unique urban spaces and serve as defining elements.
Overwhelmingly, the most desired element from this corridor is landscaping at 43%, followed by street scale and urban form at 20%. The mature street trees with a canopy (65%), lush landscape buffers (15%), and use of planters and plantings (10%) were among the favorite contributing factors of this corridor. The small, unique urban spaces created by the landscaping features were attractive to participants, in addition to the corner landscaping serving as defining elements of the street.

Building scale and height (36%) and architectural character (21%) were identified as the two most defining features of street scale and urban. The seamless integration of building scale and landscape, varied heights of buildings and changes in facade texture help create a destination. While the consistent three- to four-story building height may not be applicable to Orange Avenue, a variation in height and setback would help to achieve the same effect.
Founded in the design elements of the corridor that were preferred by participants, the following key design principles of 1st Street were identified:

- Think critically about the design and quality of a corridor’s perpendicular streets to connect surrounding neighborhoods and encourage people to linger.
- Ensure a mix of land uses and business types complementary to the pedestrian environment to attract foot traffic.
- Leverage building scale, height and architectural character to preserve the Corridor’s history and create unique public space.
- Apply different textures and/or patterns within surfacing materials to achieve an identifiable and safe multimodal corridor.
- Connect public transportation options to expand use of the Corridor.

“THE SCALE OF THE BUILDINGS NOT ONLY PRESERVES ITS RICH HISTORY AND CHARACTER, BUT ACCOMMODATES A LARGE AMOUNT OF PEOPLE.”
Through discussions on 1st Street, **street scale and urban form** was the element identified most (38%); followed by **hardscape, theming and amenities** (23%); and **land uses and business types** (23%).

The use of **building height** to accentuate the character of the corridor (36%), and **street size and scale** along with its ability to create places to linger and **host social interaction** (27%) were among the primary reasons participants identified this corridor as memorable. Participants were drawn to the inviting spaces along the corridor that were appropriate for lingering, as well as sitting and relaxing. The presence of and accessibility to public transportation was also identified as a consideration when designing and planning for the success of a corridor.

One of this corridor’s greatest strengths is its creation of public spaces due to its event-centric nature. **Outdoor seating** (38%), **plazas** (31%) and the use of **varying patterns and materials** (15%) were all noted as key elements.

The importance of both passive and interactive outdoor space was emphasized by participants to spur social interaction and continuous use. Additionally, perpendicular streets are designed at a high level, contributing to the corridor’s character and connecting surrounding neighborhoods to the amenities, uses and spaces. Participants stated that these connections are critical to the Orange Avenue Corridor.
Founded in the design elements of the corridor that were preferred by participants, the following key design principles of Elmwood Avenue were identified:

- Utilize varying setbacks, including setbacks at upper-stories to create usable space, promote the movement of pedestrians and engage the eye.
- Promote an eclectic and authentic feel through architectural character and preservation standards.
- Implement bicycle infrastructure to accommodate alternative access to the Corridor.
- Maintain an eclectic mix of uses and business types.
The two resounding elements participants preferred within Elmwood Avenue were street scale and urban form (50%) and land uses and business types (19%). Its eclectic character was attributed to the authentic style and uses of the buildings.

Participants identified architectural character (42%) and varied building setbacks (25%) as key contributing factors. The terracing of upper stories and the setbacks of the buildings themselves create space that can be utilized throughout the changing seasons, promote the movement of pedestrians along the corridor and provides the opportunity for gathering through the integration of plazas and urban spaces.

Although the highlight of this corridor was not landscaping, participants identified the unique use of setbacks and their definition of public spaces and the pedestrian experience as key features. Building scale and height (25%) was identified as equally as important as the variation in setbacks, as one- to four-story buildings were integrated among original construction, adaptive reuse and new developments.

The presence of bicycle infrastructure was also noted by participants as a feature Orange Avenue currently lacks, and would be a welcome addition to the Winter Park area as the weather allows for it year-round.

"This corridor gives a feeling of being authentic, eclectic, and funky."
Founded in the design elements of the corridor that were preferred by participants, the following key design principles from Ocean Drive and Main Street were identified:

- Utilize parks and green space in combination with a mix of uses to stimulate an active corridor.
- Consider building height as a tool to create strong gateway features.

Polling discussions focused most on elements of the previous corridors, but limited conversations focused on desirable elements of Bar Harbor’s Main Street and Miami Beach’s Ocean Drive.

Characteristics of Ocean Drive that appealed to participants included the strong emphasis on parks and green space, outdoor seating, a strong pedestrian environment, and accommodating of bicycle traffic.

Use of distinctive lighting and street furniture on Main Street in Bar Harbor was a preferred feature, as well as the building scale. However, the building enclosure to the street was not desired, as participants were drawn toward a more open feeling with ample public space. Participants also preferred a stronger mix of uses along the corridor, rather than it being primarily retail-dominated. Height was discussed surrounding this corridor, and participants stated that height could help create a gateway into Winter Park.
These polling exercises have given insight into what design elements the public would like to see in the evolution of Orange Avenue. The following Guiding Principles have been drafted from these conversations.

1. A building scale of one- to four-stories is appropriate along the Corridor to maintain a neighborhood feel.

   **Strategy 1a.** Height of buildings around major intersections, such as at the three-way intersection of Denning Drive, Minnesota Avenue, and Orange Avenue; the intersection of Orange Avenue and Fairbanks Avenue; and the intersection of US 17-92 and Orange Avenue, should be increased and used to create gateways to Winter Park.

2. High-quality design standards and guidelines for the Corridor are necessary to preserve and maintain the existing character and high quality development, while encouraging a desired mix of uses.

3. Landscaping, trees and shading are integral to implement an improved pedestrian experience and feel of the Corridor.

   **Strategy 3a.** Integration of landscaping, plazas, and urban open space is difficult to envision along Orange Avenue to a greater extent; there is the opportunity to create these spaces creatively through utilizing alley spaces, integration of these amenities into larger redevelopment projects, and through additional landscaping treatments along the street edge.
4. Variety in architectural and surfacing textures and materials along the Corridor is important to both preserve the character of the Corridor while creating a destination.

**Strategy 4a.** Use of different colors and materials, such as brickwork, is preferred to create a unique character and identity along the Corridor, and should be used to indicate multiple modes of transportation.

5. Improving the bicycle and pedestrian environment is critical to safety, accommodating alternative modes of transportation and creating a vibrant Corridor.

**Strategy 5a.** Mid-block pedestrian crossings are preferred to slow speeds and encourage patrons on Orange Avenue to linger and visit multiple locations.

**Strategy 5b.** Use of public art and creation of urban spaces should be implemented to brand the Corridor and create notable landmarks and places for visitors.

6. Parking considerations should be made with improvements and coming developments.

**Strategy 6a.** On-street parallel parking is difficult with current speeds and traffic counts along the Corridor. Alternatives such as angled, on-street parking should be explored, with considerations to parking offered behind buildings and parking garages, and integrated into redevelopment projects.

7. An eclectic mix of land uses should be prioritized, specifically at the Progress Point site.

**Strategy 7a.** A balance of daily needs, entertainment, and retail (restaurant, cafes, etc.) should be identified to serve both the resident and tourist populations that visit the Corridor.

**Strategy 7b.** Mixed-use redevelopment is preferred at catalyst sites to maintain a diverse mix of land uses, including office/residential uses to support commercial uses along the Corridor.

8. Integration of green space, such as a linear park along Palmetto Avenue, is desired.

**Strategy 8a.** Orange Avenue has limited potential to incorporate green, open, and urban space to a greater extent; Palmetto Avenue should be leveraged as an opportunity to provide green space that residents desire.
October 13, 2017

Ms. Dori Stone
Mr. Kyle Dudgeon
401 South Park Avenue
Winter Park, FL 32789

Progress Point

Dear Dori and Kyle:

Several weeks ago, you asked my opinion(s) about the benefits, if any, which might be realized from the development of Progress Point. Your inquiry stems from the property’s location in the Orange Avenue corridor, now the focus of a study that could result in a substantial change of form and appearance for the area.

I believe the major fiscal and planning considerations involved in the reuse of the property center on the differences associated with a relatively lower density concept and one embracing a higher density or intensity of use. Generally speaking, I strongly endorse the idea of a mixed use development on the Progress Point property.

SUMMARY

Such as my views are, it should be clearly stated they are exclusively mine as a real estate and economic professional. These opinions have not been discussed with members of either the Economic Development Advisory Board (EDAB) nor with the Planning and Zoning Board. As you know, these are committees on which I currently serve or have formerly served. I share my comments, anticipating at some future point, they may become available to others more directly engaged in implementing policy stemming from your various studies.

My major comments supporting the sale of Progress Point for a mixed use purpose are summarized below. I have tried to place each in the context of a generalized timeframe. My rationale for this analysis follows over the next several pages.

- Immediate Term
  - An immediate sale triggers the release of proceeds for City use. For years, the property has been an idle, non-income producing asset. From previous inquiries or documents a figure ranging in value from $3,000,000 - $5,000,000 might be possible. Regardless of the actual figure, the dollars become available at once for targeted reinvestment in priority activities or to supplement City reserves.
  - A transaction of any sum, even if the property momentarily remains vacant, produces tax receipts based on the value attributed to the transaction price. As developed, it adds a material sum to the City’s
tax receipts. A more valuable development, whatever its composition, will add incremental receipts.

- Having noted the above, let me also observe increased intensity will not necessarily yield greater land value in the short term. There are many cost implications of higher intensity development that, in most economic models, flow backward onto the cost of the land. At the same time, this is a short term phenomenon that should change over time with land elsewhere in the corridor yielding greater value as the area’s form changes.

- As to the property’s potential sales price, appraisals should be a benchmark for a property’s value, not a definitive measure. Appraisals reflect many assumptions and adjustments which, though rational, are subjective and speculative. They will not accurately reflect the financial particulars of every possible use for the property.

- In the case of City owned properties, the “value” of a transaction might be measured by corollary actions and benefits – taxes, activity, immediacy, and other spillover effects - as well as the actual dollars received from the immediate sale.

- While it can’t be concluded definitively that a larger concept would boost the City’s employment, there is some logic to believe that a bigger, rather than a smaller, development could potentially increase the number of jobs in this community. I made that point several months ago in reference to the now withdrawn proposal to develop an assisted living facility on the property.

- **Mid Term**

  - Any development in the corridor signals the City’s heightened interest in its vision or expectations for the corridor. Developers and existing property owners will respond accordingly if they perceive value is associated with a more beneficial form.

  - If the content is mixed use, it may encourage the assemblage of other properties to replicate the concept.

  - If a moderately higher density concept is encouraged, whatever its ultimate composition, there may be an emerging rationale for pooled parking strategies which seem financially difficult, if not impossible, to justify now.

- **Long Term**

  - While I am of the opinion that greater intensity or density doesn’t necessarily create greater land value today, I am strongly of the opinion added value will occur over time.
I further believe that the value of Progress Point if developed more intensely today will spill over into the transactional and taxable value of other properties nearby, generating additional benefit.

ANALYSIS

As you know, I have attended a number of public presentations and committee meetings centered on the City’s recently outlined corridor plans. These events have generated discussion about the form of development that might be implemented in several key locations.

Specific to the planning underway, I am especially sensitive to those actions involving various real estate holdings owned or controlled by the City itself. These holdings are limited and their use and reuse are worthy of careful deliberation.

In the context of the planning now occurring, I wanted to share my thoughts about the various options being considered for the Progress Point property in particular. This parcel of approximately 3.7 acres is among the largest undeveloped and underutilized properties along Orange Avenue. Because of its location and its City ownership, its future deployment has several implications for the rest of the Orange Avenue corridor and the rest of the City for which it can serve as a gateway.

As of today, Winter Park’s real estate economy is among the region’s most productive. As well as having some of the highest residential values per square foot (PSF) – in some cases these same homes also exhibit some of the highest values without regard to their size – Winter Park’s non-residential market segments are doing well when compared with the rest of Orange County.

As shown in the Co Star data summarized in the table below, the City is modestly behind the County in terms of its retail occupancy but ahead in terms of its office and industrial occupancies. Retail absorption here retained its relative share of the space absorbed in the County, and the office market actually exceeded the community’s share.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inventory SF</th>
<th>% Capture of County SF</th>
<th>Occupied SF</th>
<th>Occupancy %</th>
<th>% Capture of County Occupied SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>74,762,340</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71,709,862</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Park</td>
<td>5,416,720</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>5,137,276</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>62,522,529</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58,287,921</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Park</td>
<td>5,956,033</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>5,710,662</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>101,738,807</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96,978,613</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Park</td>
<td>3,125,184</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3,086,122</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar; GAI

Table 1.0 : Regional Non-residential Inventory
While the percentages above say nothing about the condition of these structures, their actual function, or their locations within the City, the figures summarized suggest the City’s many non-residential buildings are effectively fully occupied. Viewed in the aggregate, the data are an indicator that the community is well positioned to be very deliberate in the way it evaluates any residential and non-residential development being proposed.

Inferentially, this data has very direct implications for my further comments about Progress Point. By virtue of its location and size, Progress Point can support a variety of residential and/or commercial development opportunities. What those are, or might be, should be considered very carefully for their immediate and longer term impacts on this area discretely and the larger City generally.

Over a period of several years, a number of concepts have been floated for Progress Point, all with some limitations. These were judged primarily in terms of their bid-price and appearance with less consideration for their potential to influence broader change in the near or longer term. As a member of EDAB, I had expressed the opinion that a proposal previously submitted for the City’s consideration had measureable job impact, possibly more than other options. It is not clear how those comments were ultimately reflected in the Commission’s own evaluation process.

Regardless of past actions, with the ongoing planning effort now occurring along Orange, it is the appropriate time to explore how development of that site may affect other decisions or strategies. Stated somewhat differently, there are values both on and off site to consider together, and the corridor plan being completed can be the source of guidance going forward.

For the most part, the major policy decision in the meetings or briefings I have attended center on achievable intensity/density permissible within Winter Park. While it is premature to indicate what scale I think is preferable for Progress Point, a simple extrapolation argues that which might be realized is something 2.0 to 3.0 times larger than allowed currently under zoning. Within that multiple, some combination of uses will fit comfortably, allow a complement of surface parking, remain financially feasible, and generate interest among various segments of the development community.

Having offered an opening rationale for greater intensity/density, let me immediately offer a caveat: materially greater intensity does not necessarily create more value in the underlying property in the short term. Armed with existing appraisals attesting a specific value for Progress Point property, it is attractive to conclude increased intensity would, by itself, justify receiving a higher bid price. That could happen.
Should it happen, a concept would most likely center on a single use. In today's market, that would probably mean a very high density residential concept, almost certainly multi-family rental. For the moment, this kind of development activity has accessible lenders and capital partners, most willing to accept the added challenges of denser development which also include the cost of structured parking.

Excepting the case of residential, I believe that structured parking – within the currently required parking ratios for specific uses - is the biggest financial hurdle for new development in Winter Park. It will be especially burdensome on smaller sites along Orange or Fairbanks. At some point, height may also become an issue because elevators and different services must be introduced into the building program.

Over time, however, the value relationship between land and structure will change, and the City as the taxing authority will always benefit from this altered relationship. Described somewhat differently, while intensity or density will not necessarily create value for the City today, viewed over the extended term the relationships between cost and value improve commensurately over time.

Effectively, the City as an institution can retain a long term outlook toward land value that a merchant developer cannot. Still, there are limits to this position because the economy, as it has, will continue to go through ebbs and flows. The property needs to be positioned quickly to take advantage of the current cycle. Acting now to extract the highest value and encourage the most desired form is, I believe, in the community's interest.

Recognizing cost, value, and policy considerations as I have briefly introduced them, my preference is for a moderate sized [3-6 stories] mixed use concept for Progress Point integrating those uses which are, in today's context, the most valuable. In my mind, these will include residential, retail, and possibly office uses with the square footage allocation to be determined according to financial feasibility.

I think it is important we understand that by regional standards, even in today's attractive real estate environment, the scale envisioned at Progress Point will be a relatively small project with a modest number of potential developers sufficiently experienced to implement it. Given prevailing densities and uses in the broader market – whatever the concept is – it is not likely to accommodate a sufficient number or residential units, retail square footage, or office square footage to attract developers interested in building a project of any substantive value comprised of only a single use. Anything more than a fairly small project comprised of predominantly a single use will require specific expertise. To be clear, this expertise exists but it is not prevalent in this region for many reasons.
Given the many reasons and rationale outlined, I strongly endorse an approach for Progress Point which materially increases the property’s intensity/density and encourages it to be developed as a mixed use concept.

I hope these comments are helpful toward achieving these goals.

Sincerely,

Owen M. Beitsch, PhD, AICP, CRE
Senior Director
A joint work session with the City’s Planning and Zoning Board and the Economic Development Advisory Board was held on November 29, 2012. The purpose of the joint work session was to give both Boards the opportunity to discuss options and preferred uses on the City’s Progress Point site. Both Boards have expressed a desire to be included in the early planning/disposition of the property since it was acquired in early 2012.

Staff has been fielding development options on the property since the acquisition in early 2012 and was seeking direction on the next steps prior to taking options to the City Commission.

Staff reviewed the current O-1 zoning and the Office future land use designation and what is permitted under these uses at this time. Staff also reviewed the three alternatives that were prepared as part of the swap as well as reviewing the possibilities that were designed as a potential PD-1 zoning and land use on the site.

Jeff Oris with Planning and Redevelopment Consultants, Inc. facilitated the discussion about the property and the various options available to the city. The discussion began with a review of potential public uses. These include:

- Library
- Post office
- City Administration
- Public Recreation (tennis)
- Educational
- Community Playhouse/Arts
- Permanent Farmer’s Market
- Open Space/Park Mitigation
The private uses under consideration include:

- Commercial/Retail – design, mixed dining/retail, stand along restaurants
- Hotel
- Assisted Living
- Apartments
- Office
- Educational facilities
- Some type of joint public/private partnership

Uses that are not preferred are gas stations, stand-alone drug stores or any type of drive through food service.

Much of the discussion centers on the type of development pattern. All the Board members present felt that a pedestrian friendly development approach, with some type of a public thoroughfare or canopy would be beneficial to making Orange Avenue more walkable and tying it into the downtown area. Additionally, the option of more intensity with a parking structure was also discussed as well as a preference to two to three stories in height. The Board members also discussed the potential to realign Palmetto Avenue adjacent to the railroad tracks when development occurs to consolidate the properties. Keeping with the pedestrian theme, several board members felt that the project should encourage a sense of a public gathering place – providing a piazza of sorts along Orange Avenue.

The opportunity for a public/private joint development is also available on the site. Both Boards agreed that there are several policy issues that need to be addressed by the Commission:

- Keep the property until the market improves
- Decide if there is a public use of the property, or best to return it to a private use
- Decide when to sell the property
- If selling is the option, what process is used
- Should the city decide to sell, what should the development look like
  - The city should set the development standards
  - The city could rezone to a PD-1 designation as part of the terms
  - The city could require some public component of the deal, whether it’s a use or a sense of place

Both Boards are interested in participating in further discussions regarding the redevelopment of the site, subject to a decision by the City Commission to either keep or sell the property.
Chair John Caron called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. in the Commission Chambers of City Hall.

Present representing Economic Development Advisory Board: Chair John Caron, March Reicher, Steve Flanagan, John Gill, and Kelly Ollinger,

Present representing the Planning and Zoning Board: Chair James Johnston, Peter Gottfried, Tom Sacha, Randall Slocum, Shelia De Ciccio, Robert Hahn, Ross Johnston, and Peter Weldon.

Also Present: Mayor Steve Leary. Staff: Planning Manager Jeff Briggs, CRA Manager Kyle Dudgeon, and Recording Secretary Lisa Smith.

Planning Manager, Jeff Briggs explained that the purpose of today’s meeting is to have a discussion on the Progress Point property located at 1150 North Orange Avenue. Mr. Briggs used a power point presentation to provide details of the subject property i.e., zoning possibilities, current conditions of the subject property, and design characteristics along the Orange Avenue corridor. He explained that on September 14, 2015, the City Commission requested that the P&Z Board advise them on what will be the best fit for the corridor on the subject property. The P&Z Board held its meeting on Tuesday, November 3rd. He noted that public notice was provided to property owners along the Orange Avenue Corridor. He provided a summary of the discussion that occurred at the November 3rd P&Z Board meeting. He explained that at that meeting it was the recommendation of the P&Z for the best fit as: 1) want to see retail/restaurant/designer row on Orange Avenue frontages; 2) two stories on Orange Avenue and three stories on Palmetto Avenue; 3) acceptable for other office/residential/senior use in rear; and 4) public/private partnership parking scenario.

He said that since the P&Z meeting, ROC Seniors Group has submitted a letter to the City Commission with a request to take a pause in the review of their proposal to allow for more time for the City to decide on what to do about formulating a public/private parking solution. Also, the Jewett Clinic has submitted an unsolicited offer to purchase the property between Palmetto Avenue and the railroad. They desire to use that land as a parking lot for Jewett’s current and future needs at the price of $25/square foot based on giving the city back an easement to be used for parking by the City at night and on weekends.

CRA Manager Kyle Dudgeon provided an overview of the process that the city went through with regard to the bidding process for the property. He explained that the process went through the same process that the city goes through for the notice of disposal. The notice included a property description and what the city hopes to get on the property. He said that 35-40 were received via VendorLink on the placeholder list. From that the deadline was set for anyone interested in submitting and the one proposal was received from Roc Seniors Group.

Discussion ensued among the Board members concerning the development potential and value of the property, marketing of the property, the pros/cons of abandoning Palmetto Avenue, the necessary infrastructure changes and associated costs of abandoning Palmetto, the pros/cons of rezoning the property to PD, other zoning and future land use options that will work for the city. Mr. Gottfried said that he feels that in order for the city to get
the highest and best use out of the property it should be rezoned to PD and either realign or close Palmetto Avenue, and also understand the pros/cons of a public/private partnership for parking. He did not feel that an assisted living facility is going to allow for the highest and best use of the subject property for the city, but rather office. He also said that he feels that there should be active marketing on the subject property. Mr. Weldon expressed concern with pulling together all the dynamics that will affect what happens on the property specifically parking management; traffic impact and development alternatives. Mr. Hahn agreed with the comments both of their comments. Mr. Flanagan stated that he feels before any decisions are made, it is important to resolve what the zoning is for the subject property and whether Palmetto is in or out, and then decide how to get it out to the real estate community. Mr. Flanagan suggested that the City entertain a brokered sale which was agreed to by others.

Mayor Leary provided insight with regard to the discussion held at the City Commission level as far as closing Palmetto Avenue. He explained that the neighboring property owners were in favor of realigning Palmetto Avenue versus a total closure. He noted that they did express that there needs to be flexibility to allow ingress/egress for their customers. With regard to public parking, he stated that the neighboring property owners have expressed interest in participating in a public/private venture and are also willing to purchase parking spaces to fund it.

Mr. Briggs summarized the discussion and direction that he heard from the Board meeting discussions and consensus was that EDAB and P&Z recommended that the City: (1) determine there is any interest in the public/private partnership as that will determine how to move forward; (2) Determine the development options for the property to include alternative preferred development plans and their traffic impacts, etc., so that there would be some advance agreement on what a broker could promise and what the City’s expectations were; and (3) enlist the help of a commercial real estate broker to help market the property and determine from the marketplace which site plan option is viable. There was consensus amongst the Board members that this aptly summarized their recommendations.

There was no further business. Meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Smith
Recording Secretary
subject
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REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COMMISSION
October 9, 2017

The meeting of the Winter Park City Commission was called to order by Mayor Steve Leary, at 3:30 p.m. in the Commission Chambers, 401 Park Avenue South, Winter Park, Florida. The invocation was provided by Building Director George Wiggins followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Members present:**
- Mayor Steve Leary
- Commissioner Pete Weldon
- Commissioner Greg Seidel
- Commissioner Sarah Sprinkel
- Commissioner Carolyn Cooper

**Also Present:**
- City Manager Randy Knight
- City Clerk Cynthia Bonham
- City Attorney Kurt Ardaman

**Approval of agenda**

Motion made by Commissioner Sprinkel to approve the agenda; seconded by Commissioner Seidel and carried unanimously with a 4-0 vote. Commissioner Cooper was not present for the vote.

**Mayor’s Report**

Mayor Leary commented about the City witnessing a lot lately between natural disasters, senseless tragedies, taking of lives, and individuals who took their own lives. He thanked our City employees who showed compassion and concern in dealing with all they have dealt with recently and wanted them to know that they have their support and appreciate them being out there in front and supporting our entire city.

**City Manager’s Report**

City Manager Knight showed a video of our debris pickup process including the chipper brought in to start grinding up the 30,000 cubic yards of tree debris collection so far. He believed there to be about another 30,000 cubic yards out on the streets. He reported they have all their vehicles working seven days a week bringing debris to the staging area located near the Public Works compound. He reported they should finish the first pass over the next two weeks and at the end of 60 days to have the second and final pass completed.

Commissioner Cooper asked about the schedule for undergrounding transmission lines on Fairbanks Avenue. City Manager Knight reported they are scheduled to begin in January 2018 but still have not seen the bid documents from FDOT. It is estimated to take about nine months to complete.
City Attorney’s Report

Attorney Ardaman spoke about the Villa Tuscany public hearing on this agenda. He reported that the Ravaudage partial road reimbursement issue will hopefully be on the next agenda.

Non-Action Items

No Items.

Consent Agenda

a. Approve the September 15, 2017 and the September 25, 2017 minutes.
   SEPTEMBER 25 MINUTES PULLED FOR DISCUSSION. SEE BELOW.

b. Approve the following purchases:
   1. Purchase Order to South Seminole & North Orange County Wastewater for Operational Maintenance Interlocal Agreement - Commission approve Purchase Order. Amount: $1,017,000
   2. Purchase Order to City of Altamonte Springs for Wholesale Sewer Treatment - Commission approve Purchase Order. Amount: $235,000
   3. Purchase Order to City of Orlando for Asbury Sanitary Sewer - Commission approve Purchase Order. Amount: $575,000
   4. Purchase Order to City of Orlando for Iron Bridge Sanitary Sewer - Commission approve Purchase Order. Amount: $2,650,000
   5. Purchase Order to Airgas, Inc. for Liquid Oxygen for the Water Treatment Facilities - Commission approve Purchase Order. Amount: $160,000
   6. Purchase Order to Odyssey Manufacturing Co. for Sodium Hypochlorite for the Water Treatment Facilities


Motion made by Commissioner Sprinkel to approve the Consent Agenda; seconded by Commissioner Seidel.

No public comments were made.

Consent Agenda Item ‘a’ - Minutes of September 25, 2017

Commissioner Weldon pulled the minutes to discuss changes he wanted to see regarding the millage discussion.

Motion amended by Commissioner Weldon to include his adjusted minutes from the last meeting that were taken almost verbatim, seconded by Commissioner Cooper. Mayor Leary stated we do not need to get to that level of detail in the minutes but are happy to correct typos. Commissioner Sprinkel disagreed with continuing to change minutes.
Upon a roll call vote to include Commissioner Weldon’s verbatim comments, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Sprinkel, and Cooper voted no. Commissioner Weldon voted yes. The motion failed with a 4-1 vote.

Motion amended by Commissioner Weldon to change the 16% and 17% to FY2016 and FY2017; seconded by Commissioner Cooper (and 17% to 18% should be FY2017 to FY2018). 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.

Upon a roll call vote to approve the main motion as amended, Mayor Leary and Commissioners Seidel, Sprinkel, Cooper and Weldon voted yes. The motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.

Action Items Requiring Discussion

a. Holiday Banner Pilot Program

Kyle Dudgeon (Planning/CRA Department) addressed the City events during the holiday and the increase in demand of resources from Winter Park and associated hard costs. He presented the holiday sponsorship banner program that is a pilot program that provides a limited window when merchants can purchase additional exposure throughout the holiday season. Mr. Dudgeon summarized the program and answered questions. Commissioner Sprinkel expressed her concern with adding more signs throughout the City. Mr. Dudgeon clarified they would be replacing banners already going up and they are suggesting to have one logo on each banner. Commissioner Cooper asked and staff confirmed that the banner program would continue to include the City’s not for profit institutions.

Upon discussion, motion made by Mayor Leary to approve the pilot program; seconded by Commissioner Seidel. 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.

Public Hearings:


Attorney Ardaman read the resolution by title.

Motion made by Commissioner Cooper to adopt the resolution; seconded by Commissioner Sprinkel. 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.

b. AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA VACATING AN EASEMENT LOCATED AT 841 W. CANTON AVENUE, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, ASRecorded in OFFICIAL RECORDS BOOK 1859, PAGE 55, OFFICIAL RECORDS BOOK 1859, PAGE 90 AND OFFICIAL RECORDS BOOK 1859, PAGE 579, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF ORANGE COUNTY, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN PLAT BOOK O, PAGE 140; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, RECORDING AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE. First Reading

This item was tabled until the next meeting with a 5-0 vote.

c. Request for extension of Vehicle Sales Agreements at 1891, 2250, 2286, and 2324 West Fairbanks Avenue

Planning Manager Jeff Briggs explained the request. The property owners of 1891 West Fairbanks (Frank Ray) and 2250, 2286 and 2324 West Fairbanks (Jim Veigle) were asking for Commission approval to extend the period of vehicle sales permitted on these properties which expired on September 30, 2017. These owners would like as long a period as possible but recognize that the agreement for vehicle sales at the Orlando RV properties (860 West Fairbanks (former Holler Chevrolet)), 805 West Fairbanks (former Holler truck lot across the street) and 710 West Fairbanks (former Holler Corvette on corner of Capen Avenue) expires in December 2018. They wished to be consistent with this approval. Mr. Briggs stated staff recommended that these be phased out over the next 90 days so they can redevelop those properties but that the Commission can extend it longer.

Motion made by Commissioner Cooper to extend all vehicle sales agreements for 1891, 2250, 2286 and 2324 West Fairbanks Avenue until December 31, 2018 that is consistent with the two large parcels of property that we would like to have redeveloped (also have the property owners and their tenants sign an amendment to the agreement that clarifies their use ends on this date); seconded by Commissioner Sprinkel.

Commissioner Cooper stated the undergrounding will happen within the next year so she believed the request to wait until after the undergrounding was reasonable. She stated all property owners need to be on notice now that December 31, 2018 is the last date so there is no anticipation that they can come back asking for another extension. Planning Director Dori Stone addressed plans for W. Fairbanks Avenue that they can review with the Commission and what ULI accomplished.

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.
d. Request for Conditional Use approval to construct a 29,801 square foot, two-story, memory care facility consistent with the submitted revised site plan at 1298 Howell Branch Road, zoned R-3. Request for approval of Mediated Settlement Agreement in Section 70.51, Florida Statutes proceeding between Villa Tuscany Holdings, LLC and the City regarding the same property in conjunction with the conditional use approval.

Planning Manager Jeff Briggs addressed the project background from March that was denied and the mediated settlement process that staff was involved with that resulted in revised plans being produced this evening for Commission consideration following the required advertisement and notice to surrounding property owners. He summarized what has changed on the plan from March: the building has gone from 3 stories to 2 stories in height (from 35’ to 31’); the parking has been moved from a 25’ setback to Lake Temple to a 50’ setback; and the building has been shifted over to the east closer to the unnamed pond/sinkhole (at the bottom of the sinkhole there is aquatic plants that gave it a wetland designation). He explained there is a 50’ setback in our code for buildings from the wetland area; they are asking for a variance to be 15’ from the sinkhole (a 35’ variance). He stated they decreased the number of beds (from a parking requirement of 29 spaces to 27 spaces (25 on the plan and prospectively a variance of two parking spaces that their attorney will address).

Attorney Rebecca Rhoden of the Lowndes Drosdick Doster Kantor and Reed Law Firm, provided a PowerPoint presentation consisting of the property location, zoning, surrounding properties, the proposal and background of the denial in March, mediation and the mediated settlement agreement being considered this evening, the changes made to the building in the mediation agreement, the changes in the parking lot location setback from the lake, reduction of beds and units, and reduction of the setback from the sinkhole. She stated the project meets all setback requirements from Lake Temple and the only relief being requested is the setback from the sinkhole located on the eastern portion of the property. She addressed the parking space requirement and the spaces they are requesting.

Ms. Rhoden provided a rendering of the building as seen from Howell Branch Road and the view the residential neighborhood located across Lake Temple will have when completed. She asked for approval of the mediated settlement agreement and to issue the request for conditional use permits. She introduced the principles of Villa Tuscany in attendance.

Upon questioning by Commissioner Seidel, Planning Manager Briggs explained what our code allows and what can practically be built.

**Motion made by Commissioner Sprinkel to deny both the conditional use approval and the mediated settlement agreement, seconded by Commissioner Cooper.**
The following spoke in opposition:

Barry Render, 2630 Via Tuscany
Nancy Freeman, 1055 Tuscany Place
David Danziger, 1049 Tuscany Place
Kevin Robinson, 3024 Temple Trail

At this time, Mayor Leary asked for a show of hands for those opposing (there were several) and in favor of the request (3-4 in favor) as not everyone spoke.

Robert Hallback, 1160 Howell Branch Road
Sara Danziger, 1049 Tuscany Place
Jim Bogner, 1009 Tuscany Place
Joan Cason, Woodcrest Drive
Ali Weber, 303 Sandlewood Trail
Anna Cowin, 1020 Via Merano Court
Jim Kragh, 1024 Tuscany Place
Attorney Paul Rosenthal, representing Mr. Render
Dennis Woodson, 2923 Cove Trail
Jen Adams, 2507 Sweetwater Trail

Attorney Rhoden responded to comments made by the public.

Commissioners Weldon and Seidel disclosed their conversations prior to the meeting with staff. Commissioner Cooper disclosed her conversation with residents and staff. Mayor Leary spoke with residents. Commissioner Sprinkel had no prior conversations with residents or staff.

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.

City Commission Reports:

Commissioner Seidel – Commissioner Seidel spoke about the difficulty with not being able to discuss the Villa Tuscany project with others because of mediation.

He asked about the library schedule and if the presentation has been rescheduled. City Manager Knight stated the revised budget will be addressed with Pizzuti this week with staff but do not have a rescheduled presentation from Adjaye Associates. He addressed being excited with the project moving forward.

Commissioner Sprinkel – Commissioner Sprinkel agreed with the mediation process and Sunshine Law. She addressed Mead Garden having to cancel their event on Saturday and the rescheduled date of January 13. She expressed concerns with reading the newspaper and the press regarding cable and fiber. She asked for clarification as to where we are in the process because of the paper indicating
otherwise as to where she believed the City was. Mayor Leary commented that Mr. Maxwell contacted him about writing a fiber optics article and indicated to Mr. Maxwell that they are expediting the plan of what they are currently doing with attaching all City assets which is all they have approved to date. He indicated to Mr. Maxwell that he did not know what the future holds for a City-wide cable service but could be addressed if the residents are interested. Commissioner Sprinkel agreed with the budget for fiber that connects City assets but believed a lot more discussion needs to happen to go further than that. Mayor Leary stated he is not aware of any City staff investigating moving forward with a cable service in the City.

Commissioner Sprinkel announced the Winter Park High School homecoming this week and the Autumn Art Festival next week.

PUBLIC COMMENTS (ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA)

Donna Colado, 327 Beloit Avenue, spoke in agreement with the four-way on New York Avenue and Morse Boulevard and that is needs to remain.

Continuation of Commission Reports:

Commissioner Cooper – Commissioner Cooper spoke about conversations that were anticipating more about fiber than they had made decisions on and that connecting City resources made sense. She stated they need to be open about the cost for a total plan for the City but that she is not in agreement yet.

She stated the West Fairbanks Avenue design standards needs to be discussed further because of reaching the end of the agreements with the businesses having non-conforming uses along Fairbanks.

Commissioner Cooper spoke about her preference to have had discussions at the dais and not a mediation process regarding the Villa Tuscany project and believed if they were able to get a code compliant project from the applicant that they could have moved forward. She concluded she believed the State Statutes could be improved.

Commissioner Weldon – Commissioner Weldon spoke about the frustration that citizens have at times because they do not understand the scope of what the Commission is subject to under the Sunshine Law and how they interact as Commission members. He clarified that he supports the City connecting our City facilities to fiber and that they have only agreed to that at this point and has no intent to endorse a funding source until the undergrounding project is completed.

He spoke about the treatise sent on the CRA spending and wanted direction from the Commission because he did not want to see anything being done piecemeal in terms of how CRA dollars are spent. He stated he hoped to find a consensus within
the community (residents, staff and Commission) on where they can go with these dollars in the future to make sure they are spent wisely.

Mayor Leary – Mayor Leary spoke about Mr. Maxwell’s fiber article who reached out to him as to his thoughts on this. He stated that Mr. Maxwell is clear that the City is not proceeding at this time with a fiber optic network for residential cable services but is always open to investigating any type of service level improvement for the residents, businesses and all stakeholders in the City. He again thanked staff for their hard work over the last few weeks.

The meeting adjourned at 5:41 p.m.

______________________________
Mayor Steve Leary

ATTEST:

______________________________
City Clerk Cynthia S. Bonham, MMC
subject
Purchases Over $75,000

1. Approve PR18000141 to Intermedix Corp. for FY18 payment collection services for EMS billing. Amount: $100,000.
2. Approve FY18 purchases from Core & Main, LP related to material utilized in the capital improvement of the Water/Wastewater Utility. Amount: $500,000.
3. Approve FY18 purchases from Electric Supply of Tampa for underground wire/cable utilized in the citywide undergrounding program of the Electric Utility. Amount: $600,000.
5. Approve PR18000099 to Waste Pro of Florida for FY18 residential, commercial & construction solid waste disposal. Amount: $3,030,000.
8. Approve FY17 BPO Change Order to Florida Power & Light for Bulk Power. Amount: $10,460,000.
9. Approve FY17 BPO Change Order to ENCO for Call Center Services. Amount: $105,000.
10. Approve FY17 BPO Change Order to Heart Utilities for Undergrounding & Other Electric Services. Amount: $2,185,000.

motion / recommendation
Commission approve items as presented.

background
Competitive pricing was obtained for these purchases.

alternatives / other considerations
N/A

fiscal impact
Total expenditures included in approved budget.

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Upload Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchases Over $75,000</td>
<td>10/17/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Purchases over $75,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vendor</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>background</th>
<th>fiscal impact</th>
<th>motion</th>
<th>recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intermedix Corp.</td>
<td>PR18000141</td>
<td>for FY18 EMS Billing and Collection services.</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY18 budget. Amount: $100,000</td>
<td>Commission approve PR18000141 to Intermedix Corp. for FY18 payment collection services for EMS billing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A formal solicitation was issued to award this contract (RFP-2-2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Core &amp; Main, LP</td>
<td>Purchases related to material utilized in the capital improvement of the Water/Wastewater Utility.</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY18 budget. Amount: $1,000,000</td>
<td>Commission approve FY18 purchases from Core &amp; Main, LP related to material utilized in the capital improvement of the Water/Wastewater Utility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchases will be made utilizing the City’s piggyback agreement of Orlando Utilities Commission Alliance #895-OQ. The agreement is valid through June 30, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchases will be made utilizing the City’s piggyback agreement of Gainesville Regional Utilities Contract #2015-002-A. The agreement is valid through February 28, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchases will be made utilizing the City’s piggyback agreement of Jacksonville Electric Authority Contract #157126. The agreement is valid through August 23, 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A formal solicitation was issued to award this contract (RFP-7-2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Fiscal Impact</td>
<td>Motion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Power &amp; Light</td>
<td>BPO Change Order for Bulk Power</td>
<td>Total increase: $75,000. New Amount: $10,460,000</td>
<td>Commission approve Change Order to Florida Power &amp; Light for Bulk Power.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCO</td>
<td>BPO Change Order for Call Center Services</td>
<td>Total increase: $50,000. New Amount: $105,000</td>
<td>Commission approve Change Order to ENCO for Call Center Services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart Utilities</td>
<td>BPO Change Order for Undergrounding &amp; Other Electric Services</td>
<td>Total increase: $325,000. New Amount: $2,185,000</td>
<td>Commission approve Change Order to Heart Utilities for Undergrounding and Other Electric Services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This adjustment is to make final FY17 year-end payment. Overall bulk power and transmission budget was not exceeded.

Approval of contract shall constitute approval for all subsequent purchase orders made against contract.
## Piggyback Contracts

1. Approve Piggyback Agreement of OUC contract #3601-2 OQ for Purchase & Delivery of Padmount Switchgears for citywide undergrounding program. Amount: $275,000

### motion / recommendation
Commission approve item as presented.

### background
A formal solicitation was issued to award this contract.

### alternatives / other considerations
N/A

### fiscal impact
Total expenditure included in approved FY18 budget.

##### ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Upload Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piggyback Contracts</td>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>Stuart C. Irby Company</td>
<td>Piggyback agreement of OUC contract #3601-2 OQ for the purchase and delivery of padmount switchgears to be utilized in the citywide undergrounding program.</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY18 budget. Amount: $275,000</td>
<td>Commission approve piggyback agreement with Stuart C. Irby Company for padmount switchgears.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orlando Utilities Commission issued a formal solicitation to award this contract. The agreement is valid through February 28, 2018.
**subject**
Contracts

1. Approve Contract agreement with Magic Ice USA, Inc. for Winter in the Park. Amount: $84,750.

**motion / recommendation**
Commission approve items as presented.

**background**
Formal solicitations were issued to award contracts.

**alternatives / other considerations**
N/A

**fiscal impact**
Total expenditures included in approved FY18 budgets.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Upload Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>Magic Ice USA, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contract agreement to provide all equipment and staffing necessary for the installation, operation and removal of a temporary ice skating rink during Winter in the Park.</td>
<td>Total expenditure included in approved FY18 CRA budget. Amount: $84,750</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission approve contract agreement with Magic Ice USA, Inc. and authorize the Mayor to execute the contract.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Leidos Engineering, LLC   |      | Amendment 1 to RFQ-15-2016 renewing the contract for substation consultation services for an additional year. | Total expenditure included in approved FY18 budget. Amount: As-needed basis |        | Commission approve Amendment 1 with Leidos Engineering, LLC and authorize the Mayor to execute the amendment. A formal solicitation was issued to award this contract. |

3. UC Synergetic, LLC       |      | Amendment 1 to RFQ-15-2016 renewing the contract for substation consultation services for an additional year. | Total expenditure included in approved FY18 budget. Amount: As-needed basis |        | Commission approve Amendment 1 with UC Synergetic, LLC and authorize the Mayor to execute the amendment. A formal solicitation was issued to award this contract. |
**subject**
City Manager Annual Review

**motion / recommendation**
Approve the amount, if any, of the merit increase for the City Manager.

**background**
Annual increase may be up to 3% as per the FY18 Annual Budget.

Some commissioners have chosen not to submit annual review forms.

**alternatives / other considerations**

**fiscal impact**
subject
Request of Condev Land LLC for 650 North New York Avenue

- Ordinance - Amend the “Comprehensive Plan” Future Land Use Map to change from an Institutional Future Land Use designation to a Medium Density Residential Future Land Use designation on the First Church of Christ Scientist property at 650 North New York Avenue, in order to match the existing Multi-Family (R-3) Zoning. (1)
- Subdivision approval to divide or split the 2.38 acres of 650 North New York Avenue to create a northern parcel of 1.43 acres to be purchased by Condev Land LLC for use as a fee simple, 16-unit townhome project and to create a southern portion of 0.95 acres to be retained for potential reconstruction of the First Church of Christ Scientist.
- Conditional Use approval to construct a fee simple, three-story, residential townhouse project of 16 units in eight separate two-unit duplex buildings with an average individual townhouse unit size of approximately 4,700 square feet and a total combined project size for the eight separate duplex buildings of 68,394 square feet, on property zoned R-3.

motion / recommendation
Recommendation to approve the Future Land Use amendment, subdivision and re-plat for fee-simple ownership, and Conditional Use with one condition:

1. That any electric transformers/backflow preventers, 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.

background
The entire 650 North New York Avenue property measures 2.28 acres, and is zoned Medium Density Residential (R-3). The divided/split property that Condev Land, LLC is purchasing to develop the townhomes is the north 62,292-square feet (1.43 acres) which is about 63% of the overall site. Based on 17/units per acre maximum density, this permits the 16 units proposed.

The Future Land Use designation of the entire property is Institutional, which was based on the use of the property as a church. To be consistent with the R-3 zoning
and proposed multi-family development, the applicant is also requesting that the Future Land Use designation be changed to Medium Density Residential for the portion they are purchasing.

**Proposed Project:** These 16 new units will be developed as eight separate, three-story, two-unit duplex buildings. The individual townhome unit size is approximately 4,700-square feet, which yields a total project size of 68,394-square feet and a floor area ratio (FAR) of 110%, which is the maximum permitted in R-3 for three-story buildings. The project has 25,080 square feet of building lot coverage, which is at the code maximum of 40%. The maximum impervious coverage is 70%, and this project is at 69% (42,960 square feet).

The R-3 zoning code states that the maximum building height is 35 feet. The project is proposing a roof height of 35 feet, with exceptions for the chimneys and an additional one foot six inches for mechanical screening bringing the overall height to 36 feet six inches. The R-3 zoning code is silent to allowances for mechanical screening, so the excess height for the mechanical screening requires a variance. However, staff is in support of this small variance. Having the AC compressors on the roof, screened from view via this small variance is preferred versus having the AC compressors on the ground where they will be much more visible.

The applicable policy in the Comprehensive Plan that relates to this project with regard to building heights, is shown below:

**Policy 1-5.4.6: Promote Appropriate Scale and Height for Medium Density Multi-Family Development.** Except within the Central Business District geographical area, multi-family residential development within areas designated Medium Density Residential shall not exceed two stories in height unless approved via conditional use by the City Commission. In addition, such third floors must be entirely contained within a sloping roof having a maximum 12:12 roof slope.

This policy means that except within the Central Business District geographical area, multi-family residential development within areas designated R-3, shall not exceed two stories in height unless approved via conditional use by the City Commission, which is why this request involves a conditional use. This site is just north of the CBD boundary. In addition, such third floors must have a maximum 12:12 roof slope (45 degree angle) for the third floor. This project achieves the intent of this policy to not have vertical three-story walls with an alternative method of compliance. Starting at the second floor eave height, the project is setback at a 45 degree angle, with terracing and enhanced setbacks for the third floor, such as in wedding cake manner, for the third floor walls facing streets or other properties. When the roof slope height reaches the maximum roof height, then the project is utilizing a flat roof. Staff feels that this alternative method achieves the same intent of the Comprehensive Plan policy. The design staggers and provides a wedding cake like setback for the third floors that eliminate the three story vertical walls that was intended by this Policy.

As is typical, the City looks at the details of the electric transformers/backflow preventers and trash bin areas, with special attention needs to be paid to the placement of these items and how they can be screened from view. This is often difficult since they are required to be up at street front locations. Currently, these
elements are proposed to be internal to the project and screened from the street or surrounding properties. As these plans are not final engineering drawings, if these items were to be moved to a location where they were visible from the street or adjacent properties, this would quickly diminish the visual appeal of the development. There are conditions recommended to address these circumstances.

**Traffic Circulation/Parking:** Parking is being provided per Code (two and a half spaces per unit) via two-car garages for each unit, and eight parallel spaces on the south side of the property. The applicant is also creating seven parallel spaces within the City right-of-way along Whipple Avenue for additional visitor parking above the code requirements. The access for the garages for these townhomes is via an internal driveway.

**Tree Preservation:** The project is attempting to save as many oak trees as possible throughout the project. As you can see on the site plan, the internal driveway accessed from New York Avenue is pinched at the entrance to save an existing 18” oak. Several other oak trees on the edges of the project are also being preserved. The applicant has provided a preliminary landscape schedule for compensation of the trees to be removed and added landscaping.

**Storm Water Retention:** This project will have an underground storm water system that will meet the requirements of the St. John River Water Management District as well as City Code.

**Other Approvals:** This project is intended to be developed as fee simple townhouses pursuant to a replat (not as a condominium). To the extent that a “subdivision approval” is required, then this process provides that approval. This fee simple/replat marketing approach is what is occurring on most multi-family residential projects in today’s market environment.

**Planning and Zoning Board Summary:** The key word within our Conditional Use code standards is “compatibility”. The P&Z Board felt that this project is located on the edge of the downtown Winter Park area, adjacent to the Winter Park golf course. It provides an adequate transition from the downtown area to the more residential area to the north, and has an attractive architectural appearance that is compatible with the surrounding properties. It was also noted that this is very similar in density and height to the townhouse project now under construction, to the east, at 633-651 North Park Avenue.

**Planning and Zoning Board Minutes – October 3, 2017:**

**REQUEST OF CONDEV LAND LLC TO:** Amend the future land use map to change from an institutional to medium density residential on the First Church of Christ Scientist property at 650 North New York Avenue, to match the existing multi-family (R-3) zoning.

**REQUEST OF CONDEV LAND LLC FOR:** Subdivision approval to divide the 2.38 acres of the First Church of Christ Scientist property at 650 North New York Avenue to create a northern parcel of 1.43 acres to be used for a fee simple 16 unit townhouse project and to create a southern portion of 0.95 acres for potential reconstruction of the First Church of Christ Scientist.
REQUEST OF CONDEV LAND LLC FOR: CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL FOR A THREE STORY, TOWNHOUSE PROJECT OF 16 UNITS IN EIGHT SEPARATE TWO-UNIT DUPLEX BUILDINGS, ON PROPERTY ZONED R-3.

Board member, Ray Waugh, recused himself from this item as his company, LandDesign, is contracted with Condev to provide landscape architectural services for the project.

Senior Planner, Allison McGillis, presented the Staff Report. She explained that Condev Land, LLC (prospective purchaser) is requesting the following:

1. Change of the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use designation to Medium Density Residential at 650 North New York Avenue, to match the existing Multi-Family (R-3) zoning.
2. Subdivision approval to divide/split 2.28 acres of the First Church of Christ Scientist property at 650 North New York Avenue to create a northern parcel of 1.43 acres to be purchased by Condev Land, LLC, and leave the remaining 0.95 acres to be retained for potential reconstruction of the First Church of Christ Scientist.
3. Conditional Use for a three-story, 16-unit residential townhouse project.

Mrs. McGillis explained that the 16 new units will be developed as eight separate, three-story, two-unit duplex buildings. The individual townhome unit size is approximately 4,700-square feet, which yields a total project size of 68,394-square feet and a floor area ratio (FAR) of 110%, which is the maximum permitted in R-3 for three-story buildings. She noted that the project is meeting the remaining code requirements with respect to impervious coverage, lot coverage, setbacks and storm water retention.

Mrs. McGillis stated that the R-3 zoning code states that the maximum building height is 35 feet. The project is proposing a roof height of 35 feet, with exceptions for the chimneys and an additional one foot six inches for mechanical screening. She noted that unlike commercial districts, the (R-3) zoning code is silent for allowances for mechanical screening, so the excess height for the mechanical screening requires a variance. However, staff is in support of this small variance.

Mrs. McGillis reviewed issues related to traffic and parking, tree preservation, storm water retention. He noted that the project is intended to be developed as fee simple townhouses pursuant to a replat (not as a condominium).

Mrs. McGillis mentioned that the main reason there is a conditional use for this request is that this project is three stories in height. She noted that the Comprehensive Plan states that, except within the Central Business District geographical area, multi-family residential development within areas designated R-3, shall not exceed two stories in height unless approved via conditional use by the City Commission, which is why this request involves a conditional use and this project is just outside of the CBD boundary. In addition, such third floors must have a maximum 12:12 roof slope (45 degree angle for the third floor. This project achieves the intent of this policy to not have vertical three-story walls with an alternative method of compliance. Starting at the second floor eave height, the project is setback at a 45 degree angle, with terracing and enhanced setbacks for the third floor, such as in wedding cake manner, for the third floor walls.
facing streets or other properties. Staff feels that this alternative method achieves the same intent of the Comprehensive Plan policy to eliminate three story vertical walls.

Mrs. McGillis presented rendered views of the project showing the corners of Wipple Avenue and New York Avenue and renderings along Wipple Avenue. She summarized by stating that the location of this project is on the edge of the downtown Winter Park area, adjacent to the Winter Park golf course. Staff feels this provides adequate transition from the downtown area to the more residential area to the north, and has an attractive architectural appearance that is compatible with the surrounding properties.

Staff recommendation is for approval of the Future Land Use Amendment, Subdivision re-plat for fee simple ownership, and Conditional Use with the following condition: (1) that any electric transformers/backflow preventers, 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.

Mrs. McGillis answered questions from the Board.

Steven Wennerstrom, Chairman of the Board for First Church of Christ Scientist, addressed the Board. Mr. Wennerstrom explained that the majority of the church voted in favor. He gave a brief history of how and why the church decided to move forward with this development. John Passione, 1513 Huntersville Place, Oviedo, FL from First Church of Christ Scientist also explained the process that the congregation followed to come to this point and the desire to build a new modern Church facility.

Scott Webber, Director of Designs at ACI Architects, 955 N. Pennsylvania Avenue, Winter Park FL, gave a presentation showing the different facets of the townhome project and reiterated the information given by Mrs. McGillis in the Staff Report. He reviewed issues related to tree preservation, parking and style concepts for the design and architecture, explaining that the overall design encompassed a lot of styles influences of buildings and other structures throughout Winter Park.

Chris Gardner, Condev Land LLC, 1270 North Orange Avenue, Winter Park, FL, answered questions from the Board regarding parking and construction management.

The Board heard public comments from: Bunny Simmerson, 383 Sylvan Drive, Winter Park, FL; Ronald Richards, 383 Sylvan Drive, Winter Park, FL; in opposition to the request as Church parishioners.

Chairman Johnston explained that this was a Zoning approval in terms of code compliance and compatibility of the development. This is not a forum to decide whether this choice to sell and rebuild or renovate the existing Church is the best choice. That is a matter for the Church congregation to decide. The Board members then voiced their support for the request as it was deemed compatible with the area, in compliance with Code and architecturally a well-designed project.

Motion made by Laura Walda, seconded by Sheila De Ciccio, to amend the Future Land Use map to change from an Institutional to Medium Density Residential on the First Church of Christ Scientist property at 650 North New York Avenue, to match the existing Multi-Family (R-3) Zoning.

Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.
Motion made by Laura Walda, seconded by Sheila De Ciccio, for subdivision approval to divide the 2.38 acres of The First Church of Christ Scientist property at 650 North New York Avenue to create a northern parcel of 1.43 acres to be used for a fee simple 16 unit townhouse project and to create a southern portion of 0.95 acres for potential reconstruction of The First Church of Christ Scientist.

Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.

Motion made by Laura Walda, seconded by Sheila De Ciccio, for conditional use approval for a three story, townhouse project of 16 units in eight separate two-unit duplex building, on property zoned (R-3) with one condition:

- That any electric transformers/backflow preventers, 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.

Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.

alternatives / other considerations
N/A

fiscal impact
N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Upload Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance</td>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backup Materials Part 1</td>
<td>10/10/2017</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backup Materials Part 2</td>
<td>10/10/2017</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORDINANCE NO. ________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA AMENDING CHAPTER 58, “LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE”, ARTICLE I “COMPREHENSIVE PLAN” FUTURE LAND USE MAP SO AS TO CHANGE THE FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF INSTITUTIONAL TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ON A PORTION OF THE PROPERTY AT 650 NORTH NEW YORK AVENUE, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED HEREBIN PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

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

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

WHEREAS, the Winter Park Planning and Zoning Commission, acting as the designated Local Planning Agency, has reviewed and recommended adoption of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment, having held an advertised public hearing on October 3, 2017, provided for participation by the public in the process, and rendered its recommendations to the City Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Winter Park City Commission has reviewed the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment and held advertised public hearings on October 23, 2017 and on November 13, 2017 and provided for public participation in the process in accordance with the requirements of state law and the procedures adopted for public participation in the planning process.

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

SECTION 1. That Chapter 58 “Land Development Code”, Article I, “Comprehensive Plan” future land use plan map is hereby amended so as to change the future land use map designation of Institutional to Medium Density Residential on the property at 650 North New York Avenue, being more particularly described as follows:

LOTS 8 THROUGH 13 AND NORTH 28.75’ OF LOTS 14 THROUGH 19, BLOCK B, INCLUDING THE VACATED ALLEY WITHIN BLOCK B; PER THE PLAT OF STOVINS SUBDIVISION, BLOCK 5, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK “A”, PAGE 120 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

Property Tax ID # 06-22-30-8332-02-080
SECTION 2. Severability. If any Section or portion of a Section of this Ordinance proves to be invalid, unlawful, or unconstitutional, it shall not be held to invalidate or impair the validity, force, or effect of any other Section or part of this Ordinance.

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

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

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida, held in City Hall, Winter Park, on this _____ day of ______________, 2017.

Mayor  ___________________________________________________________________________  Mayor Steve Leary

Attest:

_____________________________________________________________________________

City Clerk
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FOR
CONDEV CONDITIONAL USE APPROVAL

CONDEV
650 N. New York Ave., Winter Park, FL
1.1 DRAWINGS INDEX & LEGENDS

ARCHITECTURAL SYMBOLS & TAGS:

- FLOOR PLAN
- ELEVATION
- SECTION
- DETAIL
- ELEVATION HEIGHT

ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN - FIRST LEVEL

- COVER PAGE
- DRAINAGE AND GRADING PLAN

ARCHITECTURAL SYMBOLS & TAGS:

- ELEVATION HEIGHT TAG
- DRAWING SCALE
- DRAWING TITLE
- SHEET NUMBER
- SHEET NUMBER
- SECTION
- DETAIL
- SHEET NUMBER

1.2 GENERAL INFORMATION

- ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN - FIRST LEVEL

CONDEV
650 N. New York Ave., Winter Park, FL

DRAWINGS INDEX & LEGENDS
CONDEV PROPERTIES AT WINTER PARK, FLORIDA

650 N. NEW YORK AVE - WINTER PARK, FL

SEPTEMBER 6, 2017

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

OWNERS:
CONDEV COMPANIES
1270 N. ORANGE AVENUE
WINTER PARK, FL 32789
(407) 679-3120

LOCATION MAP:

PROJECT LOCATION

LOCATION MAP:

AVCON PROJECT NO.

DATE

2017.099.14

06/07/2017

REVISIONS

NO.   DATE      DESCRIPTION      SHEETS

REV 0

PROJECT TEAM:

FEMA FIRM MAP:

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAPS

MUNICIPALITY: ORANGE COUNTY, FL

MAP NUMBER: 1209500255F

EFFECTIVE DATE: SEPTEMBER 25, 2009

FLOOD ZONE: ZONE "X" UNSHADED AREA DETERMINED TO BE OUTSIDE THE 0.2% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOODPLAIN.

PROJECT LOCATION

AVCON PROJECT NO.

2017.099.14

06/07/2017

REV 0

REVISIONS

NO.   DATE      DESCRIPTION      SHEETS

REV 0

PROJECT TEAM:

ARCHITECT
ACI ARCHITECTS
955 NORTH PENNSYLVANIA AVE
WINTER PARK, FL 32789
(407) 740-8405

CIVIL ENGINEER
AVCON, INC.
5555 EAST MICHIGAN STREET, SUITE 200
ORLANDO, FL 32822
(407) 599-1122

SURVEYOR
IRELAND & ASSOCIATES SURVEYING, INC.
1301 S. INTERNATIONAL PARKWAY, SUITE 201
LAKE MARY, FL 32746
(407) 678-3366

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
LAND DESIGN
100 S. ORANGE AVENUE
ORLANDO, FL 32801
(407) 207-7800

AVCON PROJECT NO.

2017.099.14

06/07/2017

REV 0

REVISIONS

NO.   DATE      DESCRIPTION      SHEETS

REV 0

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

OWNERS:
CONDEV COMPANIES
1270 N. ORANGE AVENUE
WINTER PARK, FL 32789
(407) 679-3120

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

ACI ASSOCIATED CONSULTING INTERNATIONAL FL 32789 USA
PHONE: (407) 740-8405

This document contains copyrighted material information belonging exclusively to ACI, Inc. Any unauthorized use, disclosure, dissemination, or duplication of any of the information contained herein may result in liability under applicable laws.
C-300 Drainage & Grading Plan

LEGEND

- PROPOSED WATERLINE
- EXISTING WATERLINE
- PROPOSED STORMLINE
- EXISTING STORMLINE
- PROPOSED STORM PIPE
- EXISTING STORM PIPE
- PROPOSED SANITARY PIPELINE
- EXISTING SANITARY PIPELINE
- PROPOSED DRAINAGE MANHOLE
- EXISTING DRAINAGE MANHOLE
- SAMPLE POINT
- EXISTING DRAINAGE ELEVATION
- EXISTING SANITARY ELEVATION

CIVIL CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

Phase:

Project No.:

No. Date Issue/ Revision

Site Benchmark Information

Avcon, Inc.

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

ACI, Inc.  Any unauthorized use, disclosure, dissemination, or duplication of material information belonging exclusively to ACI, Inc. may result in liability under applicable laws.

The design and engineer hereby agree to indemnify and hold harmless the owner, developer and any and all their agents, representatives, employees, contractors and licensees from any and all claims, demands, costs, losses, expenses and damages, including but not limited to, attorney fees, resulting from the use of the plans, specifications, or any part thereof, and any violation of any applicable laws, regulations, or ordinances, of any part thereof.

This document contains copyrighted material of ACI, Inc. or its subsidiaries, and is protected by United States copyright laws.

Any unauthorized use, disclosure, dissemination, or duplication of material information belonging exclusively to ACI, Inc. may result in liability under applicable laws.

This engineer is registered as an engineer in the state of Florida.

FL P.E. #70599

FL AA0002940

MIKE KERNS, P.E.

ENGINEERS & PLANNERS

CONSULTING

ASSOCIATED

CONDEV AT

AVCON, INC.

500 N. PENNSYLVANIA AVE.
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REVISION LEVEL

Date
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SHEET NUMBER

DRAINAGE & GRADING PLAN

HINT NOTE

EXISTING WATER MAIN LOCATED ON NEW YORK AVE HAS BEEN SCALED FROM BEST AVAILABLE INFORMATION AT THE TIME THESE PLANS WERE PREPARED. CONTRACTOR SHALL FIELD LOCATE THE WATER MAIN AND CONTACT THE ENGINEER-OF-RECORD IMMEDIATELY IN WRITING IF LOCATION IS DRastically DIFFERENT THAN SHOWN ON THESE PLANS.
ELEVATION AT WHIPPLE AVENUE

5' 10' 2'-6"

WEST ELEVATION AT NEW YORK AVENUE

5' 10' 2'-6"

NOTE: SOUTH ELEVATION SIMILAR

NOTE: REFER TO ENLARGE ELEVATIONS FOR BUILDING HEIGHTS AND MATERIALS ON SHEET 6.1.

EXTERIOR FINISHES KEY NOTES:

- Private Gate to Trellis
- Covered Walk
- Carport
- Screened Porch
- Metal Railings
- Carports
- Metal Railings
- Gatehouse
- Aluminum Screen
- Exterior Finishes
- Exterior Finishes
- Exterior Finishes
- Exterior Finishes
- Exterior Finishes
- Exterior Finishes
- Exterior Finishes
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STREET ELEVATION
5.1 EXTERIOR FINISHES

SCALE: 01

ENLARGED NORTH ELEVATION 1/4"=1'-0"

ELEMENTS OF ARCHITECTURAL STYLE

CONDEV
650 N. New York Ave., Winter Park, FL

EXTERIOR FINISHES

AGENDA PACKET PAGE 108
ENLARGED NORTH ELEVATION

NOTE: REFER TO SHEET 5.1 FOR TYPICAL FINISH MATERIALS.
ENLARGED WEST ELEVATION

EXTerior finishes KEY NOTES:

- GROUNDS AND LTD TERRACE
- WALLS AND SHADE VELVET
- DRAPERY AND SHEERS
- MARBLE/GRANITE
- GENERAL GLASS
- ARCHITECTURAL JEWELRY
- BRICK/STONE EXPANSION
- PLASTER/TILE
- FURAERING/STAINS
- VARIOUS STAINS
- GENERAL HARDWARE
- GENERAL FINISHES
- GENERAL大陸

NOTE: REFER TO SHEET 5.1 FOR TYPICAL FINISH MATERIALS.

CONDEV
650 N. New York Ave., Winter Park, FL

ENLARGED WEST ELEVATION

OWNER:

SHEET NUMBER: SHEET NAME:

DATE: 09.06.2017

FORMAT:

ARCHITECTURE
ACI ARCHITECTURE, INC.
1550 S. Orange Blossom Trail
Suite 500
Winter Park, FL 32789

CIVIL ENGINEER
ATKINS, INC.
5500 Research Boulevard
Suite 200
Orlando, FL 32819

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
LAND DESIGN, INC.
105 S. Orange Blossom Trail
Winter Park, FL 32789

ARCHITECT
ULRICH & ASSOCIATES
105 S. Orange Blossom Trail
Winter Park, FL 32789
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11" x 17" SHEETS ARE HALF SIZE DOCUMENTS
EXTERIOR FINISHES KEY NOTES:

- Roof: Roof Top Finish
- Wall: Wall Finish
- Door: Door Finish
- Window: Window Finish
- Siding: Siding Finish
- Trim: Trim Finish

NOTE: REFER TO SHEET 5.1 FOR TYPICAL FINISH MATERIALS.
CONDEV
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ENLARGED EAST ELEVATION

NOTE: REFER TO SHEET 5.1 FOR TYPICAL FINISH MATERIALS.
CONDEV
650 N. New York Ave., Winter Park, FL.

RENDERING
5.8 RENDERING
SCAle: 1:5

RENDERING VIEW LOOKING SOUTH ALONG WHIPPLE AVE.

CONDEV
650 N. New York Ave., Winter Park, FL

11" x 17" SHEETS ARE HALF SIZE DOCUMENTS
CONDEV
650 N. New York Ave., Winter Park, FL

RENDERING - VIEW LOOKING SOUTH

CONDEV + AC ARCHITECTS

9/4/07
5.9

REVISION: 09.06.2017

CONDE
650 N. New York Ave., Winter Park, FL

OWN
11" x 17" SHEETS ARE HALF SIZE DOCUMENTS
EXISTING TREE TO REMAIN, SEE SHEET 7.4 (TYP. OF 8)
LOW SIGNAGE WALL WITH COLUMNS (TYP. OF 2)
SCREENED TRANSFORMER
ON STREET PARKING (4 SPACES)
COMMUNITY DROP-OFF
EXISTING UTILITY TO REMAIN
PLANTER MIX
WALL FOUNTAIN (TYP. OF 4 HOMES)
PRIVATE COURTYARD (TYP. OF 16 HOMES)
TRANSFORMER SCREEN HEDGE (TYP.,)
BOUGAINVILLEA / ARBOR WALKWAY (TYP.)
PLANTING AREA (TYP.)
PLANTERS AND FURNISHINGS (TYP. ALL COURTYARDS)
STREET TREE (TYP. OF 4)
ACCENT PLANTER (TYP. OF 4)
GROUND COVER TYPE A (TYP.)
GROUND COVER TYPE B (TYP.)
CRAPE MYRTLE (TYP.)
HEDGE PLANTING (TYP.)
TURF PLANTING (TYP.)
SCREENED PRIVATE WASTE COLLECTION (TYP. OF 16 HOMES)
BICYCLE PARKING (4 SPACES)
ACCENT WHITE BIRD OF PARADISE (TYP. OF 4)
JAPANESE BLUEBERRY AT ENTRANCE COURTYARDS (TYP. OF 16)
ACCENT PAVER DECORATIVE UTILITY COVER/DRAIN (TYP.)
SCREENED TRANSFORMER PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION TO ADJACENT PROPERTY
ON STREET PARKING (3 SPACES)
CONCRETE SIDEWALK (TYP.)
COURTYARD BRICK PEDESTRIAN PAVER (TYP.)
COURTYARD FOUNTAIN
COURTYARD PLANTING
COURTYARD SITE WALLS AND ENTRANCE GATES
SITE PAVERS
SITE CHARACTER IMAGES
WATER FEATURE
OWNER:
AVCON, INC.
5555 East Michigan Street, Suite 200
Orlando, Florida 32822
Tel. (407) 599-1122
Auth. No. 5057
ACi ARCHITECTS, Inc.
955 North Pennsylvania Avenue
Winter Park, Florida 32789
Tel. (407) 740-8405
FL AA0002940
LAND DESIGN, INC.
100 S. Orange Avenue
Orlando, FL 32701
(407) 270-7800
CONDEV PROPERTIES
650 N. New York Ave., Winter Park, FL
SURVEYOR
IRELAND & ASSOCIATES SURVEYING, INC.
Lake Mary, Florida 32746
Tel. (407) 678-3366
CONDEV PROPERTIES CORPORATION
1270 North Orange Avenue
Winter Park, Florida 32789
(407) 679-1748
CANOPY TREES
- Quercus imbricata - Live Oak
- Lagerstroemia indica - Tuscania - Tuscania Grape Myrtle
- Elaeagnus sideroxylon - Japanese Blueberry Tree
- Galphimia glauca - Thryallis
- Pteleospermum macropphyllum - Yew Pine
- Viburnum suspensum - Sandbark Viburnum

MEDIUM SHRUBS / GRASSES
- Rose 'Knockout' - Knockout Rose
- Russelia equisetiformis - Red Firecracker Plant
- Zania portulaca - Cordle
- Arachis glabrata - Perennial Peanut
- Dioses vegeta - African Iris
- Sex octorhiza 'Sticks Dwarf' - Dwarf Yaupon Holly

LOW SHRUBS / GROUNDCOVERS
- Liriope muscari Emerald - Emerald Goddess Liriope
- Ophiopagan planiscapus 'Nigrescens' - Mondo Grass
- Sambucus nigra - Black Sandalwood
- Sansevieria trifasciata - Black Coral - Black Coral Snake Plant
- Sansevieria trifasciata 'Laurenzi' - Laurenzi Snake Plant
- Trachelospermum jasminoides 'Confederate' - Confederate Jasmine
- Tulbaghia violacea - Society Garlic

PLANTER MATERIAL
- Agave 'Orange Flame' - Orange Flame Agave
- Agave 'Blue Flame' - Blue Flame Agave
- Agave 'Isthmopolitan' - Thracia Century Plant

CONDEV PROPERTIES
650 N. New York Ave., Winter Park, FL
August 21, 2017

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

As we enter this final phase of approvals for our church property, we thought it might be helpful to share some background on our decision to develop our property.

Over the last several years, our church membership has had many discussions about how to best fulfill our mission and outreach within the community. About two years ago, we agreed that our desire was to consolidate all our church functions into a new state-of-the-art facility.

Working with design professionals, we explored various options including major renovation to our existing buildings, selling the entire property and relocating, and rebuilding on our current site. Our members ultimately chose to remain on our current site, construct a new building, and offer the north portion of the property as a development opportunity within Winter Park’s central business district.

Out of the multiple developers we met with, we chose Condev because of their long history in Winter Park and their ability to share our vision for the property. Over the last six months we have worked side by side with the principals of Condev to design a harmonious site plan that will work for both parties. We support the townhome design, and feel that the development will be a good neighbor to us and an enhancement to the city of Winter Park.

Sincerely,

Steven Wennerstrom
Chairman, Executive Board
subject
Ordinance - Request of the City of Winter Park to amend the "Subdivision Regulations" so as to establish minimum criteria and standards for the subdivision or split of lakefront portions of properties across the street from the principal residence (1)

motion / recommendation
Recommendation to approve the Ordinance to amend the “Subdivision Regulations” in order to provide standards for the split of lake frontages across the street from the main home.

background
The city received a request for subdivision or lot split approval to divide the lakefront portion of 1486 Alabama Drive (across Alabama Drive on Lake Maitland) so the adjacent lot, 1488 Alabama Drive would also have a dock/boathouse and access to the Chain of Lakes.

The Comprehensive Plan and the Subdivision Code do not provide specific guidance regarding criteria for this circumstance. That is why the planning staff has proposed this Ordinance to remedy that situation.

The Objective and Policy from the Comprehensive Plan below clearly state that the intention is to limit development and density on the lakefronts. However, it is not clear whether “density” means houses or boathouses.

OBJECTIVE 1-5.1: MAINTAIN AND PRESERVE THE CHARACTER AND QUALITY OF LAKEFRONT AND OTHER WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE USE OF LAND USE CONTROLS. It is the intent of the City to apply land use controls to maintain and preserve the existing density, character and quality of lakefront land use by prohibiting lot splits and maintaining low densities.

Policy 1-5.1.1: Preserve Lakefront Estates. To maintain the diversity of sizes of lakefront properties and estates and to strongly discourage the subdivision or split of
such properties, the City shall preserve low densities along the City’s lakefront property, including larger lakefront estates in order to perpetuate the unique character of Winter Park that sets it apart from other cities throughout Florida.

In the Subdivision and Zoning Codes there is no specific mention of the minimum size or width requirements for the portion of the property on the lake across the street from the home. Thus, one could make an argument that there are no minimum size requirements for lakefront parcels split by a street from the main building site. However, in that case, homeowners would have the right to divide their lakefronts to any width standard they desired and presumably have the “right” to do so as no variance is necessary. An alternative interpretation is that the same width requirements exist for the lakefront portion of the property, as the principal residence since the dock/boathouse is an accessory use to the principal residence. Since this is not clear in the Subdivision or Zoning Code, the planning staff is proposing this Ordinance to establish standards for requests such as this.

Planning Staff Analysis: The paramount concern for staff is the precedent set with regards to the 84 instances in the City where the lakefront portion of the property is separated by the intervening street. Those situations exist, on Alabama Drive on Lake Maitland, for a section of Osceola Avenue on Lake Mizell; for a section of Lakeview Drive on Lake Virginia and for a portion of Fawsett Road on Lake Sue.

There are significant economic incentives for these 84 lakefront owners to consider the sale of a portion of their lakefront and a corresponding positive economic incentive for non-lakefront owners who live close to the lake to gain lakefront access. The Zoning Code has a stated goal of keeping the lakefronts “as natural as reasonably possible” and the negative effect for the City would be exactly the opposite if multiple additional boathouses could be built along the lakeshores.

Subdivision Code Ordinance: To help remedy this precedent concern and provide criteria for the future the applicants and staff, the staff is proposing a companion ordinance to amend the Subdivision Regulations to establish criteria. Once the City specifically adopts criteria then variances to those standards can be denied by the City Commission. The three criteria that the proposed ordinance establishes are:

1. That the same lot width standards apply to the lakefront portion of the property as they do to the principal residence, thus a variance is required;
2. That the split may be approved only when the benefiting lot is directly across the street from the parcel (which is defined as within 70 feet). In this way homes down the street or around the corner cannot benefit, and
3. That the end result is a consolidated property with both the lakefront and main residence property included in the deed and Property appraiser description, so that it cannot be sold off later to another third party.

In summary, the ordinance criteria clarifies that any split is a variance, (so the City can deny); you must be directly across the street from the parcel (within 70 feet) and that you can’t later decide to sell it off to a third party. From the analysis presented by the applicant and the staff’s review there are only three other properties that could qualify to meet these criteria.

Planning and Zoning Board Minutes – October 3, 2017:
REQUEST OF DEBORAH CROWN AND BRANDON & JENNIFER LENOX
FOR: SUBDIVISION OR LOT SPLIT APPROVAL TO DIVIDE THE LAKEFRONT
PORTION OF THE PROPERTY AT 1486 ALABAMA DRIVE SUCH THAT THE
ADJACENT HOME AT 1488 ALABAMA DRIVE WILL ACQUIRE THAT SPLIT
PORTION OF THE LAKEFRONT ACROSS THE STREET FROM THESE TWO HOMES.
REQUEST OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK TO: AMEND THE “SUBDIVISION
REGULATIONS” SO AS TO ESTABLISH MINIMUM CRITERIA AND STANDARDS
FOR THE SUBDIVISION OR SPLIT OF THE LAKEFRONT PORTIONS OF
PROPERTIES LOCATED ACROSS THE STREET FROM THE PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.

Planning Manager, Jeff Briggs, presented the Staff Report. He explained that Deborah
Crown (owner of 1488 Alabama Drive) and Brandon & Jennifer Lenox (owners of
1486 Alabama Drive) are requesting subdivision or lot split approval to divide the
lakefront portion of the Lenox property (across Alabama Drive on Lake Maitland) so
that both properties may have a dock/boathouse and access to the Chain of Lakes.

Mr. Briggs explained that both parties desire to split off the western portion of the
lakefront so that the Crown property at 1488 Alabama Drive can purchase and own a
portion of the lakefront that is 20 feet wide at the street and 50 feet wide on Lake
Maitland. He stated that the property is zoned (R-1AA) and total property is 125 feet
across the lake, it is 105 feet across the street. Along with the purchase comes the
existing boathouse owned by the Lenox. The split would leave the Lenox property at
1486 Alabama drive with a lakefront parcel that has 85 feet on the street and 75 feet
on Lake Maitland. The Lenox would then build a new boathouse on their property,
subject to approval from the Lakes & Waterways Board.

Mr. Briggs stated that the paramount concern for staff related to this request is the
precedent set with regards to the other 84 instances in the City where the lakefront
portion of the property is separated by the intervening street. Those situations exist,
such as in this case on Alabama Drive on Lake Maitland, for a section of Osceola
Avenue on Lake Mizell; for a section of Lakeview Drive on Lake Virginia and for a
portion of Fawsett Road on Lake Sue. He noted that there are significant economic
incentives for these 84 lakefront owners to consider the sale of a portion of their
lakefront and a corresponding positive economic incentive for non-lakefront owners
who live close to the lake to gain lakefront access. The Zoning Code has a stated
goal of keeping the lakefronts “as natural as reasonably possible” and the negative
effect for the City would be exactly the opposite if multiple additional boathouses
could be built along the lakeshores.

Mr. Briggs went on to explain that in order to remedy this precedent concern and
provide criteria for the future, the applicants and the staff are proposing a companion
ordinance to amend the Subdivision Regulations to establish criteria for the future.
Once the City specifically adopts criteria then variances to those standards can be
denied by the City Commission. The three criteria that the proposed ordinance
establishes are:

1. That the same lot width standards apply to the lakefront portion of the property
   as they do to the principal residence, thus a variance is required;
2. That the split may be approved only when the benefiting lot is directly across
the street from the parcel (which is defined as within 70 feet). In this way homes down the street or around the corner cannot benefit, and

3. That the end result is a consolidated property with both the lakefront and main residence property included in the deed and Property appraiser description, so that it cannot be sold off later to another third party.

Mr. Briggs summarized by stating that the ordinance criteria clarifies that any split is a variance, (so the City can deny); you must be directly across the street from the parcel (within 70 feet) and that you can’t later decide to sell it off to a third party. From the analysis presented by the applicant and the staff’s review there are only three other properties that could qualify to meet these criteria. Thus, the staff’s concerns about the precedent setting nature of this approval are mitigated by the companion ordinance.

Staff recommendation is for approval of both the subdivision/lot split as well as the Companion Ordinance. Mr. Briggs answered questions from the Board.

Attorney, Stuart Buchan of Swann Hadley Stump Dietrich & Spears, 200 E New England Avenue, Winter Park, FL, represented the applicants. He reiterated Mr. Briggs’ review of the Comprehensive Plan where it states that Winter Park puts a high value on its lakefront homes because it is a characteristic that makes the City unique and in order to protect that, the City does not want more density on the lake. Mr. Buchanan stated that he feels this project accomplishes both goals of the City in that it creates, what is almost a lakefront estate, into a true lakefront estate as the property will have a boat dock, at the same time, because it is a unique circumstance, does not create more density since the crown house is already exists. Lastly, Mr. Buchanan stated that applicants agreed to and are in support of the text and language amendments to the code.

Applicant, Deborah Crown, 1466 Alabama Drive addressed the Board. She explained that at the suggestion of Staff, one of the first things she did was speak to the neighbors to explain the lakefront lot split request and make sure that they would be comfortable with the project. She presented a signed petition from the neighbors in support of the lakefront split.

Applicant, Brandon Lenox, 1486 Alabama Drive addressed the Board. He explained in preparing for this request he spent a considerable amount of time doing research on lakefront properties in the City of Winter Park. He presented information to the Board showing that this request is an isolated event and why it would benefit the City as well as the applicants. He answered questions from the Board related the shape of the portion of the lot being sold in this request and the location of the dock.

No one else wished to speak. Public hearing closed.

The Planning Board members discussed the combined requests and agreed that the Subdivision Code amendment was necessary to establish rules for these circumstances and to avoid a precedent for other such circumstances. The Board members agreed that since the Crown property was directly across the street and the immediate neighbors were in support that the split was acceptable in this circumstance.
Motion made by Ray Waugh, seconded by Laura Turner for subdivision or lot split approval to divide the lake front portion of the property at 1486 Alabama Drive such that the adjacent home at 1488 Alabama Drive will acquire that split portion of the lakefront across the street from these two homes.

Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.

Motion made by Ray Waugh, seconded by Laura Turner to amend the “Subdivision Regulations” so as to establish minimum criteria and standards for the subdivision or split of the lakefront portions of properties located across the street from the principal residence.

Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote

alternatives / other considerations
N/A

fiscal impact
N/A
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ORDINANCE NO. __________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 58 “LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE” ARTICLE VI, “SUBDIVISION AND LOT CONSOLIDATION REGULATIONS” SO AS TO ESTABLISH MINIMUM CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR THE SUBDIVISION OR SPLIT OF THE LAKEFRONT PORTIONS OF PROPERTIES LOCATED ACROSS THE STREET FROM THE PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE, PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION, CONFLICTS, SEVERABILITY AND EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City desires to establish standards and criteria to apply to any future request to subdivide the lakefront portion of properties located across the street from the principal residence, and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Winter Park has recommended approval of this Ordinance at its October 3, 2017 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission of the City of Winter Park held duly noticed public hearings on the proposed zoning change set forth hereunder and considered advice of staff, citizens, and all interested parties submitting written and oral comments and supporting data and analysis, and after complete deliberation, hereby finds the requested change consistent with the City of Winter Park’s Comprehensive Plan; and

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

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

SECTION 1. That Chapter 58 “Land Development Code”, Article VI "Subdivision and Lot Consolidation Regulations" of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended and modified by adding a new Section 58-393 “Accessory Lakefront Lot Standards” to read as follows:

Sec. 58-393. Accessory Lakefront Lot Standards.

Subdivision/lot splits of lakefront property located across a street from the principal lot with the main residence shall maintain the same lot width on the lake as is required for main residence. Subdivision/lot splits of lakefront property located across a street from the principal lot with the main residence may be allowed by the City Commission, as a variance if: (i) the property which is to benefit and own and use the land for access to the lake and/or for use by an accessory structure such as a dock or boathouse is located within seventy (70) feet of the lakefront property, and (ii) that portion of the lakefront property which is to be split off must be consolidated into the deed and Orange County Property Appraiser as a unified parcel.
SECTION 2. SEVERABILITY. If any Section or portion of a Section of this Ordinance proves to be invalid, unlawful, or unconstitutional, it shall not be held to invalidate or impair the validity, force, or effect of any other Section or part of this Ordinance.

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

SECTION 4. CODIFICATION. It is the intention of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida, and it is hereby ordained that the provisions of this Ordinance shall become and be made a part of the Code of Ordinance of the City of Winter Park, Florida; that the Sections of this Ordinance may be renumbered or re-lettered to accomplish such intention; that the word, “Ordinance” may be changed to “Section,” “Article,” or other appropriate word.

SECTION 5. EFFECTIVE DATE. This ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its final passage and adoption.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida, held in City Hall, Winter Park, on this ______ day of ________________, 2017.

______________________________________________
Mayor Steve Leary

Attest:

______________________________________________
City Clerk
Policy 1-4.4.9: Proposed Annexation Areas. The City has and shall continue to achieve the coordination with Orange County prior to annexing the four unincorporated Annexation Reserve Areas (ARAs) identified below:

1. Annexation Reserve Area #1: Lake Killarney. ARA #1 is a growth annexation area comprised of 198 acres, is located north of Fairbanks Avenue and is bounded by Lake Killarney on the north. The area contains approximately 1,300 residents and is primarily designated Low-Density Residential to the south side of the Lake, Office to the west along Wymore, and the Killarney Elementary School, located to the southwest near I-4, is designated Institutional. Annexation of this area would extend the City limits of Winter Park to I-4, the major barrier west of the City limits.

2. Annexation Reserve Area #2: Kentucky/Oglesby. ARA #2 is a growth annexation area comprised of 13± acres and accommodating approximately 40 residents, is located south of Fairbanks Avenue, north of Oglesby Avenue, east of I-4 and east and west of Clay Street. Annexation of this area would fill in the gap between the existing City limits and the City limits of Orlando to the south.

3. Annexation Reserve Area #3: Lawndale. ARA #3 is a growth annexation area containing 50± acres and approximately 300 residents, is located south of Minnesota Avenue, north of Harmon Avenue, west of Clay Street, and east of Wisconsin Avenue with a section extending north of Minnesota following Jackson Avenue west of Nicolet Avenue and east of Harold Avenue. Annexation of this area would fill in the gap between the existing City limits and the City limits of Orlando to the south.

4. Annexation Reserve Area #4: Stonehurst. ARA #4 is an enclave comprised of 5.6 acres and containing approximately 30 persons located in 13 single-family dwellings, is located in the south section of the City, south of Lake Virginia, north of Glenridge Way, between Lauren Road and Winchester Drive. This area is an unincorporated Orange County enclave, completely surrounded by the City limits of Winter Park.

GOAL 1-5: QUALITY AND CHARACTER. The City recognizes the many unique areas of the City and provides planning processes and regulations that ensures quality development while reflecting the context and heritage of the many facets of Winter Park.

OBJECTIVE 1-5.1: MAINTAIN AND PRESERVE THE CHARACTER AND QUALITY OF LAKEFRONT AND OTHER WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE USE OF LAND USE CONTROLS. It is the intent of the City to apply land use controls to maintain and preserve the existing density, character and quality of lakefront land use by prohibiting lot splits and maintaining low densities.

Policy 1-5.1.1: Preserve Lakefront Estates. To maintain the diversity of sizes of lakefront properties and estates and to strongly discourage the subdivision or split of such properties, the City shall preserve low densities along the City’s lakefront property,
including larger lakefront estates in order to perpetuate the unique character of Winter Park that sets it apart from other cities throughout Florida.

Policy 1-5.1.2: Limitations of Development of Waterfront Lots. The City shall require that the Planning and Zoning Board review and approve plans for construction on all waterfront properties.

Policy 1-5.1.3: Restrictions on Lake or Canal Lot Development. The Planning and Zoning Board Commission shall have the discretion to place conditions on any lake or canal lot construction plan approval and to impose more stringent and restrictive requirements and development standards due to the environmental sensitivity of these properties.

Policy 1-5.1.4: Management of Lakefront Development. The City shall restrict lakefront development outside of the floodplain and lake setback areas around the lakes to the lowest density residential land uses with the corresponding lot coverage and impervious coverage.

Policy 1-5.1.5: Management of Undeveloped Lakefront Lots. Lakefront areas that are undeveloped but previously platted and in common ownership may combine lots so as to conform to the minimum lot sizes and frontages required or the average lot sizes and frontages of existing lots within a 500 ft. radius whichever is greater.

Policy 1-5.1.6: Development of Large Lakefront Tracts to Provide Adequate Public Access for Public Purposes. The development of large unplatted lakefront tracts shall include provisions for public access of a passive nature and public visual access along with agreements for the proper maintenance of these areas.

Policy 1-5.1.7: Lakefront Setbacks. The City shall enforce a minimum fifty (50) foot lakefront setback and require site plan review for all lakefront and canal front construction. The City shall prohibit filling in lakefront and stream front wetlands and shall require a conditional use approval for any type of allowable construction in such areas. In addition, no encroachment, fill, or other new development shall be permitted in a floodway. Development of flood prone areas shall be addressed on a site by site basis as part of the site plan review or conditional use process. The City shall coordinate with the State, the St. Johns River Water Management District, the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council, Orange County, state agencies, and other agencies concerned with managing natural resources. Such intergovernmental coordinating activities shall be directed toward protecting the values and functions of respective natural systems.

OBJECTIVE 1-5.2: PRESERVE THE QUALITY AND CHARACTER OF WINTER PARK'S RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS. By recognizing and maintaining the variety of neighborhoods and housing types available throughout the City, the City will protect and conserve the diverse range of residential opportunities.
September 6, 2017

Dear Mr. Briggs:

Thank you for taking the time to meet with Jennifer & Brandon Lenox (the “Owners”), Deborah Crown (the “Applicant”) and myself. The Owners live at 1486 Alabama Drive and the Applicant has purchased the home at 1466 Alabama Drive. The Owners’ home and the Applicant’s home are adjacent to each other and both are across the street from Lake Maitland. All of the property in front of the two homes that is between Alabama Drive and Lake Maitland belongs to the Owner.

The attached Application for Subdivision requests that a portion of the land between Alabama Drive and Lake Maitland be subdivided (i.e. split) from the Owner’s property and consolidated with the Applicant’s property. We expect that the consolidation will be a condition of approval for the subdivision. The City’s Comprehensive Plan and Code discourage subdivision of lake front properties so that there is not an increase in density in order to encourage lakefront estates. We believe the Application meets both of these goals in that it does not increase density by creating a new dwelling unit while at the same time creating a lakefront estate which is consistent with the characteristics of the neighborhood.

Based on research done by the Owners, we believe there are no other properties in Winter Park, other than a few owned by the City or Rollins College, which share the characteristics of the Applicant’s property of being across the street from a lake and separated from the lake by a road where the land between the road and lake are owned by a private person/entity. Therefore, the action requested by the Applicant will not set precedent as the characteristics of these properties are unique. However, in order to confirm exactly what circumstances may allow for subdivision of lakefront property, the Applicant also requests the following text amendment to the City Code:

“Subdivision/lot splits of lakefront property may be allowed as a variance if: (i) the property from which the land is to be split shall be on a lake and divided by a public right of way, (ii) the property which the land will be consolidated with shall be across a public right of
way from a lake, (iii) both the property from which the land will be split and the property with which the land will be consolidated must be adjacent to each other along their side yard boundaries, (iv) that portion of the lakefront property which is to be split off cannot be between the property from which it is to be split and the lake, (v) that portion of the lakefront property which is to be split off must be between the property with which it will be consolidated and the lake. For purposes of determining the location of the property to be split off in relation to the lake, a line shall be drawn from the middle of road frontage of the lot from which it will be split (or the middle of the road frontage of lot with which it will be consolidated) to the middle of the split off lot, and whether a straight line between those two points extend into the contiguous lake.”

Thank you for working with us on this Application.

Sincerely,

Stuart Buchanan
September 5, 2017

Brandon and Jennifer Lenox
1486 Alabama Dr
Winter Park, FL #2789

Brandon and Jennifer Lenox hereby authorize the applicant, Deborah Crown, to act as the agent for the owners, Brandon and Jennifer Lenox, for the lot split of 1486 Alabama Dr, Winter Park Florida 32789.

Kind Regards,

Brandon Lenox

Jennifer Lenox
Lenox/Crown Property Report

All data was obtained through the Orange County Property Appraiser’s Office, Orange County Tax Collector’s Office and The City of Winter Park.

Part 1.

There are 84 homes in the City of Winter Park where a street divides the property with a home on it from lakefront property across the street. Of the 84 homes, 78 have deeded lakefront land across the street. Among the 6 homes that do not have a deeded piece of property across the street, 5 of the properties across the street are owned by either the City of Winter Park (4), or Rollins College (1). The single remaining property is 1466 Alabama Dr (Crown Residence). Land directly across the street is owned by the Lenox Residence (1486 Alabama Dr).

6 Properties that do not have deeded land on the lake with direct lake views:
1. 165 W. Fawsett Rd. - Direct view of Lake Sue across the street. Land across the street is owned by the city of Winter Park. Parcel ID 18-22-30-2844-00-005
2. 937 Lakeview Dr. - Direct view of Lake Virginia across the street. Land across the street is owned by Rollins College. Parcel ID 05-22-30-9400-63-010
3. 905 Lakeview Dr. - Direct view of Lake Virginia across the street. Land across the street is owned by the City of Winter Park. Parcel ID 07-22-30-1490-00-001
4. 1110 Alabama Drive - Direct view of Canal across the street. Canal Land deeded to the City of Winter Park Parcel ID 31-21-30-4220-04-160
5. 1450 Alabama Drive – No deeded land. Partial view of Lake Maitland. Land across the street is deeded to the City of Winter Park. Parcel ID 31-21-30-4220-00-000
6. 1466 Alabama Drive – Direct View of Lake Maitland No Deeded Land (Crown residence). Land across the street is owned by 1486 Alabama Dr (Lenox Residence)

Below is a list of the 79 properties that have deeded lakefront land across the street from the home.

Lake Sue
185 W. Fawsett Rd
201 W. Fawsett Rd
235 W. Fawsett Rd
251 W. Fawsett Rd
2290 W. Fawsett Rd
2200 W. Fawsett Rd
2170 W. Fawsett Rd
2150 W. Fawsett Rd
2130 W. Fawsett Rd
2110 W. Fawsett Rd
2010 W. Fawsett Rd
2020 W. Fawsett Rd
2050 W. Fawsett Rd
2060 W. Fawsett Rd
2080 W. Fawsett Rd
1936 W. Fawsett Rd
1900 W. Fawsett Rd
1860 W. Fawsett Rd

**Lake Virginia**
1169 Lakeview Dr
1167 Lakeview Dr
1135 Lakeview Dr
1111 Lakeview Dr
1071 Lakeview Dr
1055 Lakeview Dr
1035 Lakeview Dr
1023 Lakeview Dr
1005 Lakeview Dr
965 Lakeview Dr
945 Lakeview Dr

**Lake Mizell**
1000 Genius Dr
1008 Genius Dr
1016 Genius Dr
1024 Genius Dr
913 Osceola Ave - No Direct View of the Lake
919 Osceola Ave
921 Osceola Ave
1001 Osceola Ave
1031 Osceola Ave
1041 Osceola Ave
1101 Osceola Ave
1141 Osceola Ave
1200 Osceola Ave
1220 Osceola Ave

**Lake Maitland**
1218 Alabama Drive
1230 Alabama Drive
1246 Alabama Drive
1260 Alabama Drive
1288 Alabama Drive  
1292 Alabama Drive  
1360 Alabama Drive  
1400 Alabama Drive  
1486 Alabama Drive – Lenox Residence  
1500 Alabama Drive  
1510 Alabama Drive  
1520 Alabama Drive  
1530 Alabama Drive  

**Lake Killarney**  
230 Killarney Dr  
240 Killarney Dr  
250 Killarney Dr  
300 Killarney Dr  
320 Killarney Dr  
350 Killarney Dr  
400 Killarney Dr  
430 Killarney Dr  
1838 Killarney Dr  
1840 Killarney Dr  
1894 Killarney Dr  
1898 Killarney Dr  
1891 Killarney Dr  
115 Killarney Dr  
131 Killarney Dr  
139 Killarney Dr  
143 Killarney Dr  
145 Killarney Dr  
1321 Fairview Ave  
1300 Fairview Ave  
120 Broadview  

**Part 2.**  

Below is a summary of every Winter Park street that has a lakefront home on it. Noted are any properties that have some variance related to lakefront access.  

**Lake Maitland**  
Gipson Green Lane – None  
Bett Mar Lane – None  
Columbia Ln – None  
Legion Dr – None  
Summerland Ave – None
Gaines Way – None
Summer Way
1. 1662 Summer Way – narrow strip of land for lake access. No direct view of Lake Maitland

Green Cove Rd – None
New York Ave – None
North Park Ave – None
Old England Ave – None
Anchorage Ct – None
McKean Cir – None

Palmer Ave
1. 721 Palmer Ave – Narrow strip of land behind 751 Palmer Ave, for Canal/Lake Access. 721 Palmer and 751 Palmer share a single boathouse on the canal.
2. 1031 Palmer Ave owns land on the canal with a boathouse and lake access. 1031 Palmer does not sit on the canal, across the street from the canal, or adjacent to the water/canal. 1031 Palmer is located on the corner of Palmer Ave and Alabama Dr (closer to Temple) and is 0.4 miles from the canal property.

Mayfield Ave
1. 820 Mayfield Ave - owns land on the canal with a boathouse and lake access. 820 Mayfield does not sit on the canal, across the street from the canal, or adjacent to the water/canal.
2. 920 Mayfield Dr - owns land on the canal with a boathouse and lake access. 920 Mayfield does not sit on the canal, across the street from the canal, or adjacent to the water/canal. *** Deed for land was transferred from 841 Mayfield Ave to 920 Mayfield Ave in 2016. 920 Mayfield Ave is located .35 miles from the owned boathouse.

Alabama Dr
1. 1737 Alabama Drive owns land on the canal with a boathouse and lake access. 1737 Alabama Drive does not sit on the canal or adjacent to the water/canal. **Deed to canal property for 1737 Alabama Drive was transferred from 1760 Alabama Dr in 2015. 1737 is located on the corner of Alabama Drive and Via Tuscany and 1737 Alabama is located 0.4 Miles from the canal property.
2. 1764 Alabama Drive - owns land on the canal with a boathouse and lake access. 1764 Alabama Drive does not sit on the canal, across the street from the canal, or adjacent to the water/canal. 1764 Alabama is located 0.45 Miles from the canal land.
3. 1710 Alabama Drive owns land on the canal with a boathouse and lake access. 1710 Alabama Drive does not sit on the canal, across the street from the canal, or adjacent to the water/canal. 1710 Alabama Drive is located on
the intersection of Alabama Drive and Via Tuscany 0.5 miles from the canal property.
4. 1287 Alabama Drive (canal property) is owned by the owners of 870 Mayfield Ave. 870 Mayfield Ave does not sit on the canal, across the street from the canal, or adjacent to the water/canal. 870 Mayfield is located in between the intersections of Mayfield Ave and Harding Ave and Mayfield Ave and Alabama way. 870 Mayfield Ave is located 0.3 miles form the property on the canal (1287 Alabama Dr).
5. ***1529 Alabama Dr*** – 1529 Alabama Dr is lakefront property only. There is no house across the street. Property mailing address is a PO Box and deeded to a Trust.

Interlachen Ave
1. 300 South Interlachen Ave Unit 303 – Owns a boathouse located at 1291 Alabama Drive. 300 South Interlachen Ave Unit 303 does not sit on the canal, across the street from the canal, or adjacent to the water/canal. 300 South Interlachen Ave Unit 303 is 1.5 miles form the owned property on the canal (1291 Alabama Drive)

1011 Ayrshire St, Orlando, FL 32803
1. 1011 Ayrshire St, Orlando, FL 32803 owns the canal lot and boathouse located at 1293 Alabama Drive. 1011 Ayrshire St, Orlando, FL 32803 does not sit on the canal, across the street from the canal, or adjacent to the water/canal. 1011 Ayrshire St, Orlando, FL 32803 is located in the city of Orlando and is 3.5 miles from the canal property on 1293 Alabama Drive.

Via Tuscany – None

Isle of Sicily – All properties have lake access in back yard and across the street. There are no properties on the street that lack accesses therefore there are no adjacent properties that could request lakefront property via a purchase or variance.

Pinetree Rd – None

Venetian Way –
1. 2105 Venetian Way – narrow strip of lake access

Azalea Place
1. 2211 Azalea Place – narrow strip of lake access. All adjacent properties have lake access.

Poinciana Ln – None
Lake Osceola
Georgia Ave – None
Seminole Drive – None
Palmer Ave – None
Via Bella – None
Greentree Drive – None
Temple Grove – None
Bonita Dr – None

***Alberta Drive
1. 1210 Alberta Drive granted land across the street from Lake Osceola. Land is a narrow walkway solely for the purpose of access to Lake Osceola. Strip is 10 ft. in width with a dock at the end of the access on Lake Osceola. From 1210 Alberta Drive there is no direct view to the lake.

Lakewood Drive
1. 495 Lakewood Drive – Narrow strip of land for lake access adjacent to Winter Park Owned Park

Trismen Terrace – None
Osceola Ct – None
Chase Ave – None
Interlachen Ave – None
Webster Ave – None
Kiwi Circle – None

Lake Virginia
520 East Lake Sue Ave
1. 520 East Lake Sue Ave owns a narrow strip of land across Virginia Dr. Home does not have a direct line of sight to lake Virginia.

Lake Virginia Drive
1. Access granted to 520 East Lake Sue Ave property. See above.

Preserve Point Dr – None
Genius Drive – None
Osceola – None
Lakeview Drive – None
Stirling Ave – None
College Pt. – None
Highland Rd – None
Henkel Cir – None

Lake Mizell
Audubon Lane – None
Henkel Cir – None
Osceola Ave
1. 892 Osceola Ave – Land has been divided to allow for owners across Osceola Ave to have Access to Lake Mizell.
2. 913 Osceola Ave – Deeded land across the street to Lake Mizell. Land is surrounded on both sides by 829 Osceola Ave (above)
3. 919 Osceola Ave – Deeded land across Osceola Ave. (As above)
4. 9210 Osceola Ave – 859 Square foot piece of land on Lake Mizell that is owned by 138 Detmar Rd. Detmar road is not on or adjacent to Lake Mizell.

Genius Dr – None

Lake Berry
Genius Dr – None
Balmoral Rd – None
Lake Berry Dr – None
Chase Landing Way – None
Preserve Point Dr – None

Lake Killarney

Killarney Drive
1. Parcel ID # 12-22-29-4172-07-001 (Deeded Address) – 0.03 acre piece of land on Lake Killarney. Land is not owned by adjacent properties on Lake Killarney. Deeded to owners with a mailing address of 325 S, Orlando Ave. 325 S. Orlando Ave is a commercial building. Owner’s homesteaded property is located in Apopka.
2. 1801 Killarney Drive - 0.1 vacant lakefront property with no lot/home adjacent to it. Deeded address is 355 Starling Rd, Winter Park, FL 32789 (0.2 miles from 1801 Killarney Dr)

Lakeview Ave
1. 438 Lakeview Ave – Parcel Number 12-22-29-4172-01-102. 0.07-acre lakefront lot on Lake Killarney with no deeded land or home adjacent or across the street. Deeded Owners are located at 825 Dixie Pkwy, Winter Park, FL 32789 (1.9 miles from lakefront land).

Kilshore Lane – None
Blue Heron Dr – None
Killarney Dr – None
Euston Rd. – None
Lotafun Ave – None
Ololu Dr- None

Rippling Ln
1. Parcel ID 02-22-29-0000-00-085 – Property is a 10ft wide strip of land on Lake Killarney deeded to property at 212 Rippling Lane, which is across the street from the lakefront properties. 10ft strip is between two lakefront properties. No other property that is across the street from Lake Killarney
on Rippling Ln has land access to Lake Killarney.

Lake Dr
1. 2120 Lake Drive – Property is a 10ft wide strip of land for lake access deeded to an LLC registered at 505 Lakefront Blvd, Winter Park Florida. 505 Lakefront Blvd is located 1.1 miles from 2120 Lake Drive. The lot is non buildable (0.07 acres) and for the sole purpose of lake access.

Boitnott Ln – None
Country Club Drive – None

Lake Bell
Kindel Ave – None
Turner Rd – None
Lake Bell Dr – None
Early Ave – None

Lake Wilderness
Early Ave – None
Albert Lee Parkway – None

Lake Spider
Barker Dr – None
Lake Spider Dr – None
St George St – None

Lake Sue
1. 1941 Englewood Rd is deeded a narrow strip of land for access to Lake Sue on Fawsett Rd. 1941 Englewood is a block from Lake Sue behind the lakefront homes and does not have a direct view of the lake.
subject
Request of Deborah Crown and Brandon & Jennifer Lenox for subdivision or lot split approval to divide the lakefront portion of the property at 1486 Alabama Drive

motion / recommendation
Recommendation to approve the lot split request to divide the lakefront portion of the property at 1486 Alabama Drive such that the adjacent home at 1488 Alabama Drive will acquire that split portion of the lakefront across the street from these two homes.

background
Deborah Crown (owner of 1488 Alabama Drive) and Brandon & Jennifer Lenox (owners of 1486 Alabama Drive) are requesting subdivision or lot split approval to divide the lakefront portion of the Lenox property (across Alabama Drive on Lake Maitland) so that both properties may have a dock/boathouse and access to the Chain of Lakes.

Property Characteristics and Lot Split Request: The Lenox property at 1486 Alabama Drive, (like their three neighbors to the east), have their home on one side of Alabama Drive and their lakefront across Alabama Drive from their home. The property is zoned R-1AA and their lakefront portion is zoned R-1AAA and has approximately 105 feet of frontage on the street and 125 feet of frontage on Lake Maitland.

The two parties desire to split off the western portion of the lakefront so that the Crown property at 1488 Alabama Drive can purchase and own a portion of the lakefront that is 20 feet wide at the street and 50 feet wide on Lake Maitland. Along with the purchase comes the existing boathouse owned by the Lenox. The split would leave the Lenox property at 1486 Alabama Drive with a lakefront parcel that has 85 feet on the street and 75 feet on Lake Maitland. The Lenox would then build a new boathouse on their property, subject to approval from the Lakes & Waterways Board.
Based on the criteria for subdivision or lot splits for accessory lakefront lots, this request requires a variance since the divided lakefront properties will not maintain the same lot width on the lake as required for the main residence. The accessory lakefront lot widths at the lake would be 50 feet and 75 feet in lieu of the required 150 feet. However, it does meet the criteria for a variance since the property will benefit a property within 70 feet of the lakefront property, and the Crown property at 1488 Alabama Drive will consolidate this lakefront portion into their deed and Orange County Property Appraiser as a unified parcel.

Planning and Zoning Board Minutes – October 3, 2017:

REQUEST OF DEBORAH CROWN AND BRANDON & JENNIFER LENOX
FOR: SUBDIVISION OR LOT SPLIT APPROVAL TO DIVIDE THE LAKEFRONT PORTION OF THE PROPERTY AT 1486 ALABAMA DRIVE SUCH THAT THE ADJACENT HOME AT 1488 ALABAMA DRIVE WILL ACQUIRE THAT SPLIT PORTION OF THE LAKEFRONT ACROSS THE STREET FROM THESE TWO HOMES.
REQUEST OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK TO: AMEND THE “SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS” SO AS TO ESTABLISH MINIMUM CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR THE SUBDIVISION OR SPLIT OF THE LAKEFRONT PORTIONS OF PROPERTIES LOCATED ACROSS THE STREET FROM THE PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.

Planning Manager, Jeff Briggs, presented the Staff Report. He explained that Deborah Crown (owner of 1488 Alabama Drive) and Brandon & Jennifer Lenox (owners of 1486 Alabama Drive) are requesting subdivision or lot split approval to divide the lakefront portion of the Lenox property (across Alabama Drive on Lake Maitland) so that both properties may have a dock/boathouse and access to the Chain of Lakes.

Mr. Briggs explained that both parties desire to split off the western portion of the lakefront so that the Crown property at 1488 Alabama Drive can purchase and own a portion of the lakefront that is 20 feet wide at the street and 50 feet wide on Lake Maitland. He stated that the property is zoned (R-1AA) and total property is 125 feet across the lake, it is 105 feet across the street. Along with the purchase comes the existing boathouse owned by the Lenox. The split would leave the Lenox property at 1486 Alabama drive with a lakefront parcel that has 85 feet on the street and 75 feet on Lake Maitland. The Lenox would then build a new boathouse on their property, subject to approval from the Lakes & Waterways Board.

Mr. Briggs stated that the paramount concern for staff related to this request is the precedent set with regards to the other 84 instances in the City where the lakefront portion of the property is separated by the intervening street. Those situations exist, such as in this case on Alabama Drive on Lake Maitland, for a section of Osceola Avenue on Lake Mizell; for a section of Lakeview Drive on Lake Virginia and for a portion of Fawsett Road on Lake Sue. He noted that there are significant economic incentives for these 84 lakefront owners to consider the sale of a portion of their lakefront and a corresponding positive economic incentive for non-lakefront owners who live close to the lake to gain lakefront access. The Zoning Code has a stated goal of keeping the lakefronts “as natural as reasonably possible” and the negative effect for the City would be exactly the opposite if multiple additional boathouses could be built along the lakeshores.
Mr. Briggs went on to explain that in order to remedy this precedent concern and provide criteria for the future, the applicants and the staff are proposing a companion ordinance to amend the Subdivision Regulations to establish criteria for the future. Once the City specifically adopts criteria then variances to those standards can be denied by the City Commission. The three criteria that the proposed ordinance establishes are:

1. That the same lot width standards apply to the lakefront portion of the property as they do to the principal residence, thus a variance is required;
2. That the split may be approved only when the benefiting lot is directly across the street from the parcel (which is defined as within 70 feet). In this way homes down the street or around the corner cannot benefit, and
3. That the end result is a consolidated property with both the lakefront and main residence property included in the deed and Property appraiser description, so that it cannot be sold off later to another third party.

Mr. Briggs summarized by stating that the ordinance criteria clarifies that any split is a variance, (so the City can deny); you must be directly across the street from the parcel (within 70 feet) and that you can’t later decide to sell it off to a third party. From the analysis presented by the applicant and the staff’s review there are only three other properties that could qualify to meet these criteria. Thus, the staff’s concerns about the precedent setting nature of this approval are mitigated by the companion ordinance.

Staff recommendation is for approval of both the subdivision/lot split as well as the Companion Ordinance. Mr. Briggs answered questions from the Board.

Attorney, Stuart Buchan of Swann Hadley Stump Dietrich & Spears, 200 E New England Avenue, Winter Park, FL, represented the applicants. He reiterated Mr. Briggs’ review of the Comprehensive Plan where it states that Winter Park puts a high value on its lakefront homes because it is a characteristic that makes the City unique and in order to protect that, the City does not want more density on the lake. Mr. Buchanan stated that he feels this project accomplishes both goals of the City in that it creates, what is almost a lakefront estate, into a true lakefront estate as the property will have a boat dock, at the same time, because it is a unique circumstance, does not create more density since the crown house is already exists. Lastly, Mr. Buchanan stated that applicants agreed to and are in support of the text and language amendments to the code.

Applicant, Deborah Crown, 1466 Alabama Drive addressed the Board. She explained that at the suggestion of Staff, one of the first things she did was speak to the neighbors to explain the lakefront lot split request and make sure that they would be comfortable with the project. She presented a signed petition from the neighbors in support of the lakefront split.

Applicant, Brandon Lenox, 1486 Alabama Drive addressed the Board. He explained in preparing for this request he spent a considerable amount of time doing research on lakefront properties in the City of Winter Park. He presented information to the Board showing that this request is an isolated event and why it would benefit the City as well as the applicants. He answered questions from the Board related the
shape of the portion of the lot being sold in this request and the location of the dock.

No one else wished to speak. Public hearing closed.

The Planning Board members discussed the combined requests and agreed that the Subdivision Code amendment was necessary to establish rules for these circumstances and to avoid a precedent for other such circumstances. The Board members agreed that since the Crown property was directly across the street and the immediate neighbors were in support that the split was acceptable in this circumstance.

Motion made by Ray Waugh, seconded by Laura Turner for subdivision or lot split approval to divide the lake front portion of the property at 1486 Alabama Drive such that the adjacent home at 1488 Alabama Drive will acquire that split portion of the lakefront across the street from these two homes.

Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote.

Motion made by Ray Waugh, seconded by Laura Turner to amend the “Subdivision Regulations” so as to establish minimum criteria and standards for the subdivision or split of the lakefront portions of properties located across the street from the principal residence.

Motion carried unanimously with a 7-0 vote

alternatives / other considerations
N/A

fiscal impact
N/A
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<tr>
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<th>Upload Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backup Materials</td>
<td>10/11/2017</td>
<td>Backup Material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**subject**

Ordinance - W. Canton Avenue Easement Vacate

**motion / recommendation**

Approve motion to vacate easement. There are no known utilities within this easement and letters of “no objection” are attached from each potential utility.

**background**

The City of Winter Park received a request from Lowndes, Drosdick, Doster, Kantor and Reed, PA, to vacate the easement located at 841 W. Canton Avenue.

**alternatives / other considerations**

Not approve easement vacate.

**fiscal impact**

No direct financial impact as a part of this action

**ATTACHMENTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Upload Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canton Ave Easement Vacate title sheet</td>
<td>9/19/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton Ave Easement Vacate Ordinance</td>
<td>9/19/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton Ave Easement Vacate Exhibit A</td>
<td>9/19/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton Ave Easement Vacate Back up</td>
<td>9/19/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
subject
Request to abandon an easement at 841 W. Canton Avenue, Winter Park, Florida.

motion | recommendation
Approve motion to vacate easement. There are no known utilities within this easement and letters of “no objection” are attached from each potential utility.

background
The City of Winter Park received a request from Lowndes, Drosdick, Doster, Kantor and Reed, PA, to vacate the easement located at 841 W. Canton Avenue.

alternatives | other considerations
Not approve easement vacate.

fiscal impact
No direct financial impact as a part of this action
ORDINANCE NO. _____-17

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA VACATING AN EASEMENT LOCATED AT 841 W. CANTON AVENUES, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN OFFICIAL RECORDS BOOK 1859, PAGE 55, OFFICIAL RECORDS BOOK 1859, PAGE 90 AND OFFICIAL RECORDS BOOK 1859, PAGE 579, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF ORANGE COUNTY, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN PLAT BOOK O, PAGE 140; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS, RECORDING AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City of Winter Park has authority to adopt this Ordinance by virtue of its home rule powers and Charter with respect to abandoning and vacating rights of way no longer needed for public purposes, and the City Commission has made such a determination.

BE IT ENACTED by the People of the City of Winter Park, Florida as follows:

Section 1. The City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida hereby vacates and abandons the easement legally described in that certain legal description and sketch of description attached hereto as Exhibit “A”.

Section 2. In the event of any conflict between this Ordinance and any other ordinance or portions of ordinances, this Ordinance controls

Section 3. After adoption, this Ordinance shall be recorded in the public records of Orange County, Florida.

Section 4. This ordinance shall take effect immediately upon its passage and adoption.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, Florida, held at City Hall, Winter Park, Florida, on the _______ day of ___________, 2017.

Mayor Steven Leary

ATTEST:

City Clerk Cynthia S. Bonham
VIA EMAIL AND HAND DELIVERY

City of Winter Park
500 N. Virginia Ave,
Winter Park, FL 32789
Attn: Donald J. Marcotte
Email: dmarcotte@cityofwinterpark.org

Re: Vacation of Easements Recorded in Official Records Book 1859, Page 55; Official Records Book 1859, Page 90 and Official Records Book 1859, Page 579, all of the Public Records of Orange County, Florida (collectively, the “Easement”) for the property located at 841 W. Canton Avenue (the “Property”)

Dear Don:

With regards to the above-referenced matter, enclosed please copies of the following documents and required approvals to vacate the Easement:

1. A copy of the City of Winter Park Easement Vacation Instructions;
2. A copy of the recorded Easement;
3. A survey of the Property showing the location of the Easement;
4. A signed letter approving the vacation from Nick Brana, on behalf of Duke Energy (dated 9/1/17);
5. A signed letter approving the vacation from Christian Read, on behalf of Century Link (dated 7/25/17);
6. A signed letter approving the vacation from Crystal L. Corbitt, on behalf of Teco (dated 8/2/17);
7. A signed letter approving the vacation from Jason Riegler, on behalf of the City of Winter Park’s Wastewater Utility Department (dated 8/2/17);
8. Michael Passarella, on behalf of the City of Winter Park’s Engineering Department (dated 8/3/17);

9. A signed letter approving the vacation from Marvin L. Usry, Jr., on behalf of Bright House Networks, Inc. (dated 8/29/17); and

10. A signed letter approving the vacation from Michel L. Champagne, on behalf of Charter Communications, Inc. (dated 8/30/17).

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions concerning any of the documents enclosed herein. Since we cannot record our plat for the Property until this easement has been vacated of record, please confirm if there is anything else needed as we will be happy to provide. Thank you for your assistance!

Regards,

Tara L. Tedrow

TLT/TLT

Encl.

Cc:
Anil Deshpande (via email)
Steve O’Dowd (via email)
Dave Schmitt (via email)
Patrick Finnerty (via email)
#1: A copy of the City of Winter Park Easement Vacation Instructions

[See Attached]
1) Submit letter of request, including reasons for requesting the Easement Release.

2) Submit a copy of a Survey Plat showing the proposed area to be released.

3) Submit copies of letters from all utility companies stating their position on the proposed release. (List at bottom of page).

The request can be submitted by mail to Don Marcotte, City Engineer, 401 Park Avenue South, Winter Park, Florida 32789 or hand delivered to 500 N. Virginia Ave, Winter Park, FL 32789. Contact Donald J. Marcotte, P.E., City Engineer (407) 599-3424 or E-mail: dmarcotte@cityofwinterpark.org if you have any questions regarding Release of Easements.

**UTILITY CONTACT LIST**

TECO/Peoples Gas
600 West Robinson
P.O. Box 2433
Orlando, FL 32802-2433
Attn: Bruce A. Stout, Sr. Engineer Tech
407-420-2678
407-843-6174 FAX

Bright House Networks Inc
Marvin Usry
407-532-8509
P J King, Construction Supervisor
407-532-8508
3767 All American Blvd.
Orlando, FL 32810
407-532-8544 FAX

City of Winter Park
Phil Daniels
Water/Wastewater Asst. Utility Director
401 Park Avenue South
Winter Park, FL 32789-4386
407-599-3355
407-643-1680 FAX

City of Winter Park
Terry Hotard
Electric Asst. Director
401 Park Avenue South
Winter Park, FL 32789-4386
407-599-3400
407-599-3417 FAX

Duke Energy, Inc.
3300 Exchange Place
Lake Mary, FL 32746
Lori L. Herring
Easement Specialist
407-942-9463
407-942-9417 FAX

Century Link
Steve O’Brien
407-830-3650
Candy Crim
407-830-3421
952 First St.
Altamonte Springs, FL 32701
407-260-2683 FAX
Date: ____________________

____________________

Dear ____________________:

I am in the process of requesting the City of Winter Park vacate an (easement/right of way) as shown on the copy of the enclosed tax map. The site is located at (address) ___________________________ in Winter Park. In order to have this action heard, I must provide letters of no objection from utility companies serving the neighborhood.

Please review your records, complete the form, below, and return this letter to me at ___________________________. If you have any questions, please contact ___________________________.

Sincerely

Name: ______________________________________________________
Address: ____________________________________________________
City, State, Zip Code: _________________________________________

The subject parcel is not within our service area.

The subject parcel is within our service area. We do not have any facilities within the easement/right of way. We have no objection to the vacation.

The subject parcel is within our service area. We object to the vacation.

Additional comments: _________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

Signature: _________________________________________________

Print Name: ______________________________________________

Title: ______________________________________________________

Date: ______________________________________________________
#2: A copy of the recorded Easement

[See Attached]
#3: A survey of the Property showing the location of the Easement

[See Attached]
#4: A signed letter approving the vacation from Nick Brana, on behalf of Duke Energy (dated 9/1/17)

[See Attached]
July 20, 2017

VIA FACSIMILE

Duke Energy, Inc.
3300 Exchange Place
Lake Mary, Florida 32746
Attn: Lori L. Herring, Easement Specialist
Fax: 407-942-9463

Re: Request to Vacate Unused Utility Easement at 841 W. Canton Ave, Orlando, Florida

Dear Ms. Herring:

I am in the process of requesting the City of Winter Park vacate an unused utility Easement Area (with such Easement Area and the respective rights thereto established pursuant to those certain instruments recorded in the Public Records of Orange County, Florida and enclosed herein for your review and reference). The Easement Area, as shown on the copy of the enclosed Boundary Survey, is located at 841 W. Canton Ave in Winter Park (with such parcel being more particularly depicted as Lot 2 on the enclosed Boundary Survey). In order to have this action heard, I must provide letters of no objection from utility companies serving the neighborhood.

Accordingly, after you have had an opportunity to review the enclosed documents and your records, please complete the form included below at your earliest convenience.

The subject parcel is not within our service area.

The subject parcel is within our service area. We do not have any facilities within the easement/right of way. We have no objection to the vacation.

The subject parcel is within our service area. We object to the vacation.

Additional comments: Area has been transferred to City of Winter Park.

Signature: Nick Paine
Print Name: Nick Paine
Title: Land Rep. - Florida Region
Date: 9/1/17
Please promptly return this letter (with the form above completed and signed by you on behalf of the above-named utility company) to me via email at peter.simmons@lowndes-law.com. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Peter H. Simmons

Enclosures
#5: A signed letter approving the vacation from Christian Read, on behalf of Century Link (dated 7/25/17)

[See Attached]
July 20, 2017

Re: Request to Vacate Unused Utility Easement at 841 W. Canton Ave, Orlando, Florida

Dear Mr. O'Brien and Ms. Crim:

I am in the process of requesting the City of Winter Park vacate an unused utility Easement Area (with such Easement Area and the respective rights thereto established pursuant to those certain instruments recorded in the Public Records of Orange County, Florida and enclosed herein for your review and reference). The Easement Area, as shown on the copy of the enclosed Boundary Survey, is located at 841 W. Canton Ave in Winter Park (with such parcel being more particularly depicted as Lot 2 on the enclosed Boundary Survey). In order to have this action heard, I must provide letters of no objection from utility companies serving the neighborhood.

Accordingly, after you have had an opportunity to review the enclosed documents and your records, please complete the form included below at your earliest convenience.

The subject parcel is not within our service area.

X The subject parcel is within our service area. We do not have any facilities within the easement/right of way. We have no objection to the vacation.

The subject parcel is within our service area. We object to the vacation.

Additional comments:

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name: [Print Name]
Title: [Title]
Date: [Date]

www.lowndes-law.com
July 20, 2017

Please promptly return this letter (with the form above completed and signed by you or behalf of the above-named utility company) to me via email at peter.simmons@lowndes-law.com. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Peter H. Simmons

Enclosures
#6: A signed letter approving the vacation from Crystal L. Corbitt, on behalf of Teco (dated 8/2/17)

[See Attached]
August 2, 2017

Peter Simmons
Peter.simmons@lowndes-law.com

RE: Request to Vacate Unused Utility Easement at 841 W. Canton Ave., Orlando, Florida

Peter Simmons:

Please be advised that Peoples Gas System, a division of Tampa Electric Company has no interest in any easements that may or may not be a matter of public record. We have no objection to such easements being released.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,

Crystal L. Corbitt
Distribution Easement Coordinator
Real Estate Services
#7: A signed letter approving the vacation from Jason Riegler, on behalf of the City of Winter Park's Wastewater Utility Department (dated 8/2/17)

[See Attached]
July 20, 2017

VIA FACSIMILE

City of Winter Park
401 Park Avenue South
Winter Park, Florida 32789
Attn: Phil Daniels, Water/Wastewater Asst. Utility Director
Fax: 407-643-1680

Re: Request to Vacate Unused Utility Easement at 841 W. Canton Ave, Orlando, Florida

Dear Mr. Daniels:

I am in the process of requesting the City of Winter Park vacate an unused utility Easement Area (with such Easement Area and the respective rights thereto established pursuant to those certain instruments recorded in the Public Records of Orange County, Florida and enclosed herein for your review and reference). The Easement Area, as shown on the copy of the enclosed Boundary Survey, is located at 841 W. Canton Ave in Winter Park (with such parcel being more particularly depicted as Lot 2 on the enclosed Boundary Survey). In order to have this action heard, I must provide letters of no objection from utility companies serving the neighborhood.

Accordingly, after you have had an opportunity to review the enclosed documents and your records, please complete the form included below at your earliest convenience.

The subject parcel is not within our service area.

The subject parcel is within our service area. We do not have any facilities within the easement/right of way. We have no objection to the vacation.

The subject parcel is within our service area. We object to the vacation.

Additional comments: Only applicable to potable water and sanitary sewer.

Digitally signed by Jason Riegler, P.E.
DN: CN=US_Enviroplan@cityofwinterpark.org,
O=City of Winter Park, OU=Water and Wastewater Utility Department, CN=Jason Riegler, P.E.
Date: 2017.08.02 14:09:10-04'00'
July 20, 2017
Page 2

Please promptly return this letter (with the form above completed and signed by you on behalf of the above-named utility company) to me via email at peter.simmons@lowndes-law.com. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Enclosures

Peter H. Simmons
#8: Michael Passarella, on behalf of the City of Winter Park's Engineering Department (dated 8/3/17)

[See Attached]
July 20, 2017

 VIA FACSIMILE

City of Winter Park
401 Park Avenue South
Winter Park, Florida 32789
Attn: Terry Hotard, Electric Asst. Director
Fax: 407-599-3417

Re: Request to Vacate Unused Utility Easement at 841 W. Canton Ave, Orlando, Florida

Dear Mr. Hotard:

I am in the process of requesting the City of Winter Park vacate an unused utility Easement Area (with such Easement Area and the respective rights thereto established pursuant to those certain instruments recorded in the Public Records of Orange County, Florida and enclosed herein for your review and reference). The Easement Area, as shown on the copy of the enclosed Boundary Survey, is located at 841 W. Canton Ave in Winter Park (with such parcel being more particularly depicted as Lot 2 on the enclosed Boundary Survey). In order to have this action heard, I must provide letters of no objection from utility companies serving the neighborhood.

Accordingly, after you have had an opportunity to review the enclosed documents and your records, please complete the form included below at your earliest convenience.

---

X The subject parcel is within our service area. We do not have any facilities within the easement/right of way. We have no objection to the vacation.

The subject parcel is not within our service area.

The subject parcel is within our service area. We object to the vacation.

---

Additional comments:

---

Signature: Michael A. Passarella
Print Name: Michael Passarella
Title: Sr. Electrical Engineer
Date: Aug. 3, 2017
Please **promptly return this letter** (with the form above completed and signed by you on behalf of the above-named utility company) **to me via email** at peter.simmons@lowndes-law.com. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Peter H. Simmons

Enclosures
#9: A signed letter approving the vacation from Marvin L. Usry, Jr., on behalf of Bright House Networks, Inc. (dated 8/29/17)

[See Attached]
July 20, 2017

VIA FACSIMILE

Bright House Networks Inc.
3767 All American Blvd.
Orlando, Florida 32810
Attn: Marvin Usry;
   PJ King, Construction Supervisor
Fax: 407-532-8544

Re: Request to Vacate Unused Utility Easement at 841 W. Canton Ave, Orlando, Florida

Dear Mr. Usry and Mr. King:

I am in the process of requesting the City of Winter Park vacate an unused utility Easement Area (with such Easement Area and the respective rights thereto established pursuant to those certain instruments recorded in the Public Records of Orange County, Florida and enclosed herein for your review and reference). The Easement Area, as shown on the copy of the enclosed Boundary Survey, is located at 841 W. Canton Ave in Winter Park (with such parcel being more particularly depicted as Lot 2 on the enclosed Boundary Survey). In order to have this action heard, I must provide letters of no objection from utility companies serving the neighborhood.

Accordingly, after you have had an opportunity to review the enclosed documents and your records, please complete the form included below at your earliest convenience.

________________________________________________________
The subject parcel is not within our service area.

☑ The subject parcel is within our service area. We do not have any facilities within the easement/right of way. We have no objection to the vacation.

☐ The subject parcel is within our service area. We object to the vacation.

Additional comments: ____________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
Signature:  
Print Name:  MARVIN L. USRY, JR
Title:  CONSTRUCTION SUPERVISOR
Date:  8/29/2017
Please **promptly return this letter** (with the form above completed and signed by you on behalf of the above-named utility company) **to me via email** at peter.simmons@lowndes-law.com. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Peter H. Simmons

Enclosures
#10: A signed letter approving the vacation from Michel L. Champagne, on behalf of Charter Communications, Inc. (dated 8/30/17)

[See Attached]
VIA FACSIMILE

Bright House Networks Inc.
3767 All American Blvd.
Orlando, Florida 32810
Attn: Marvin Usry;
PJ King, Construction Supervisor
Fax: 407-532-8544

Re: Request to Vacate Unused Utility Easement at 841 W. Canton Ave, Orlando, Florida

July 20, 2017

Dear Mr. Usry and Mr. King:

I am in the process of requesting the City of Winter Park vacate an unused utility Easement Area (with such Easement Area and the respective rights thereto established pursuant to those certain instruments recorded in the Public Records of Orange County, Florida and enclosed herein for your review and reference). The Easement Area, as shown on the copy of the enclosed Boundary Survey, is located at 841 W. Canton Ave in Winter Park (with such parcel being more particularly depicted as Lot 2 on the enclosed Boundary Survey). In order to have this action heard, I must provide letters of no objection from utility companies serving the neighborhood.

Accordingly, after you have had an opportunity to review the enclosed documents and your records, please complete the form included below at your earliest convenience.

The subject parcel is not within our service area.

X The subject parcel is within our service area. We do not have any facilities within the easement/right of way. We have no objection to the vacation.

The subject parcel is within our service area. We object to the vacation.

Additional comments:

BRIGHT HOUSE NETWORKS, LLC

By: Charter Communications, Inc., Its Manager

Signature: [Signature]
Print Name: Michel L. Champagne
Title: Area Vice President, Field Operations
Date: 8/20/17
subject
Ordinance - FY 2017 Budget Amendments

motion / recommendation
Approve the ordinance adopting amendments made to the FY17 budget over the course of last fiscal year (2016-2017).

background
The City Commission is required by Statute to approve any budget adjustments that alter the total amount budgeted in any fund or when funds are transferred between different fund types. The City has adopted the practice of bringing budget amendments to the City Commission as they arise and then bringing a year-end ordinance adopting all the amendments formally to comply with Statute.

Through the receipt of grants, Commission direction, or due to a need to revise original revenue estimates the city periodically needs to make changes to stated account revenues and expenditures. This is primarily a housekeeping process and it properly provides departments and divisions with an accurate picture of the funds available to undertake programs and projects. The following attachment highlights the budget amendments (Exhibit A of the Ordinance) that have already been approved by the Commission at prior meetings and now need to be formally adopted through public hearing.

The following additional items will be reflected in the budget as part of the approval of this ordinance:

Showalter Field Funding: The funding plan for the Showalter Field project involved numerous funding sources including city, community partners, school board, and fundraising. Some of these funding sources were never formally added to the project budget and this adjustment will account for the $99k received from the WP High School Foundation, the $70k from Pop Warner, and the $173,206 in first two year rental fees already collected that will contribute toward the project.
alternatives / other considerations
Not approving the ordinance would require staff to remove the amendments from the accounting system.

fiscal impact
The fiscal impact is neutral as revenues have been received for all capital expenditures collected.

ATTACHMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Upload Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance - FY17 Budget Amendments</td>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance-Exhibit A</td>
<td>10/13/2017</td>
<td>Cover Memo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORDINANCE NO. ________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF WINTER PARK, FLORIDA, AMENDING THE ADOPTED BUDGET AND ACCOMPANYING FIVE YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 – 2017 BY PROVIDING FOR CHANGES IDENTIFIED IN EXHIBIT A; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICTS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Ordinance No. 3012-15, the City of Winter Park, Florida has adopted the Budget and Capital Improvement Program for the fiscal year 2016 – 2017; and

WHEREAS, the City of Winter Park, Florida desires to amend the Budget and Capital Improvement Program for supplemental appropriations in the amounts identified in Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, Section 166.241(4)(c) Florida Statutes require such a budget amendment be adopted in the same manner as the original budget.

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

SECTION 1. The Budget and Capital Improvement Program for fiscal year 2016 – 2017 is hereby amended by providing for changes identified in Exhibit A.

SECTION 2. If any section, subsection, phrase or portion of this Ordinance is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct and independent provision and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions thereof.

SECTION 3. In the event of any conflict between the provisions of this Ordinance and any other ordinance, resolution, or portions thereof, the provisions of this Ordinance shall prevail to the extent of such conflict.

SECTION 4. The provisions of this Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon passage.

ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Commission of the City of Winter Park, held in City Hall, Winter Park, Florida this 13th day of November, 2017.

__________________________
Steve Leary, Mayor

Attest:

_______________________________
Cynthia S. Bonham, City Clerk
### Exhibit A

**Budget Amendments Requiring Commission Approval**

**Fiscal Year 2016 - 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Source Account</th>
<th>Source Acct. Name</th>
<th>Exp. Account</th>
<th>Exp. Acct. Name</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Waste Surcharges (Effluent Testing)</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>403-0000-343.50-11</td>
<td>Industrial Testing - Inside City Limits</td>
<td>403-2843-536.34-40</td>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>City is experiencing a significant increase in wastewater testing for restaurant grease traps. Revenues from surcharges will offset expenses in laboratory testing.</td>
<td>4/24/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Crossings Developer Contribution to Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$89,500</td>
<td>104-0000-369.90-10</td>
<td>CRA Misc. Revenue</td>
<td>104-2308-515.01-62</td>
<td>W. Morse Blvd Streetscape</td>
<td>Reflects developer contribution from Lakeside Crossing to intersection improvements at Morse and 17/92. Improvements included left turn phasing, construction reimbursement, crosswalks, and traffic signal mast arms.</td>
<td>4/24/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>301-0000-369.90-10</td>
<td>Capital Project Fund Misc. Revenue</td>
<td>301-0000-539.10-60</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Traffic Signal Upgrades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Vehicles for Building Inspection</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>001-0000-382.42-11</td>
<td>Building Code Enforcement Restricted Funds</td>
<td>001-2303-524.44-60</td>
<td>Equipment Replacement</td>
<td>Purchases two electric vehicles for building inspection services needs. Permitting is at an all time high and restricted building funds will be used for the acquisition.</td>
<td>4/24/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>502-0000-391.10-10</td>
<td>Equipment fund contributions from General Gov't</td>
<td>502-3210-593.64-20</td>
<td>Equipment Purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Addressing</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>001-0000-382.42-11</td>
<td>Building Code Enforcement Restricted Funds</td>
<td>001-5107-522.13-10</td>
<td>Code Enforcement Part Time Wages</td>
<td>Funding to bring addressing database up-to-date prior to conversion to operating system.</td>
<td>4/24/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Paramedicine Program</td>
<td>$52,845</td>
<td>001-0000-342.60-10</td>
<td>EMS Transport Revenue</td>
<td>5103 Personnel Lines</td>
<td>Fire Rescue Division Personnel lines</td>
<td>Anticipated additional reimbursement from Medicare for ambulance transport fees cover the remainder current year cost of starting the paramedicine program by adding a full time employee.</td>
<td>4/24/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunrail Safety Mitigation Grant</td>
<td>$614,968</td>
<td>301-0000-331.49-10</td>
<td>FDOT Pass Through Projects</td>
<td>301-0000-539.10-77</td>
<td>Sunrail Safety Mitigation</td>
<td>Pass-through grant from FDOT to fund safety improvements to the Sunrail corridor.</td>
<td>3/27/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Bond</td>
<td>$27,430,996</td>
<td>301-0000-382.10-40</td>
<td>Capital Project Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>301-0000-539.10-74</td>
<td>Winter Park Public Library</td>
<td>Reflects bond proceeds to fund construction of Library and Events center project.</td>
<td>5/8/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Transfer from Water to Electric</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>403-0000-382.10-00</td>
<td>Water Fund Balance Carry Forward</td>
<td>406-9200-585.04-10</td>
<td>Electric Contingency</td>
<td>Transfer of $1 million from Water Utility to Electric Utility to support cash position.</td>
<td>9/25/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showalter Funding</td>
<td>$169,100</td>
<td>301-0000-369.90-10</td>
<td>Capital Projects Misc Revenue</td>
<td>301-0000-572.10-56</td>
<td>Showalter Field Improvements</td>
<td>Reflects funds received from WP High School Foundation and Pop Warner.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$173,206</td>
<td>001-0000-382.10-00</td>
<td>Fund Balance Carry Forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflects rental revenue to be contributed toward project construction.</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>