The work session was called to order by Mayor Kenneth Bradley at 2:06 p.m. in the Commission Chambers, 401 Park Avenue South, Winter Park, Florida.

Members present:  
Mayor Kenneth Bradley  
Commissioner Steven Leary  
Commissioner Sarah Sprinkel  
Commissioner Carolyn Cooper  
Commissioner Tom McMacken

Also present:  
City Manager Randy Knight  
City Clerk Cynthia Bonham  
Deputy City Clerk Michelle Bernstein  
City Attorney Larry Brown  
CRA Manager Dori Stone

Others present:  
Silvia Vargas, Wallace, Roberts & Todd (WRT)

Comprehensive Plan Analysis Discussion

This meeting was a work session with no public input. The purpose of this meeting was for the Commissioners to discuss the final Comprehensive Plan Analysis report titled “Analysis of Potential Policy and Regulatory Impediments to Economic Development” prepared by Wallace, Roberts & Todd (WRT) dated September 2, 2013.

Silvia Vargas with Wallace, Roberts & Todd (WRT) presented the attached Power Point which covered the background/overall process, policy and regulatory documents, identification of key issues/context, identification and analysis of key issues, core issues and problems, specific policy/regulatory issues and next steps.

Following the presentation, Ms. Vargas referenced their final report and offered the following recommendations: clarify the role and purpose of the Comprehensive Plan, address the absence of a shared consensus on community vision, resolve the perceived conflict between growth and preservation, address the lack of clear economic development goals in the Comprehensive Plan, choose between form-based and conventional regulations, streamline/clarify the Land Development Code, maintain/abandon or modify concurrency and to reconcile expectations for West Fairbanks Avenue and other principal arterial corridors.

Ms. Vargas answered questions relative to what the next steps should be and offered the following recommendations as listed in their final report: develop a strategy for the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Economic Development Advisory Board to coordinate and work together on issues related to the impact of specific comprehensive plan policies and land development code regulations on economic development in the City; develop a methodology for conducting a 9-12 month long City-wide visioning process with ample opportunities for meaningful public input including the involvement of all City boards; initiate a detailed review of the Comprehensive Plan against the revised requirements of Chapter 163, F.S.,
to identify all areas of inconsistency and determine the need to update the plan prior to the state’s deadline.

CRA Manager Dori Stone explained that the Economic Development Advisory Board and the Planning & Zoning Advisory Board have expressed the desire to take on WRT’s observations and recommendations. They will then report back to the Commission with their overall recommendations for consideration.

The Commission inquired as to what the cost would be if we were to engage in a 6-12 month community wide visioning process. Ms. Stone responded that she would be happy to put a scope together so they can start pricing it out.

The meeting adjourned at 3:24 p.m.

City Clerk Cynthia S. Bonham
TODAY'S AGENDA
1. Background
2. Process
3. Review of Policy and Regulatory Documents
4. Identification and Analysis of Key Issues
5. Summary of Recommendations
6. Next Steps
7. Discussion

BACKGROUND: WINTER PARK AND THE RECESSION
Winter Park was not immune to the impacts of the Great Recession.
Since 2007, the city has endeavored to reinforce strengths, while reversing economic factors that could undermine the city's competitive position:
- Overall cost of living
- Housing costs
- Jobs
- Real estate and development
BACKGROUND: WRT'S ASSIGNMENT (SCOPE)

- Review the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code to understand the potential effect of current policies and regulations on economic development.
- Recommend adjustments that may be necessary to reinforce and maintain the

BACKGROUND: WHAT THIS IS NOT...

- A complete evaluation and appraisal or an amendment of the comprehensive plan or the LDC
- A market analysis
- An economic development study
- An urban design study

PROCESS

LISTEN

IDENTIFY KEY ISSUES

STRATEGIC FOCUS
POLICY AND REGULATORY DOCUMENTS

City of Winter Park Comprehensive Plan
- Adopted in February 2009 (Ordinance No. 2762-09).
- Found in compliance by former Florida DCA in May of 2009.
- Supersedes comprehensive plan from 1991.
- Follows statutory changes to Chapter 163, Part II, F.S. up to 2007
- Includes all "required" elements, but no optional elements previously authorized in Chapter 163.

City of Winter Park Land Development Code
- Chapter 58 of the Code of Ordinances.
- Amended and updated piecemeal.
- Rezonings are the most routine type of amendment.

City of Winter Economic Development Plan
- Short-term (3-year) economic development plan completed in 2011.
- Ancillary cluster analysis identifies seven business clusters:
  - Education and Knowledge Creation
  - Financial and Professional Services
  - Real Estate and Development
  - Creative Services
  - Arts and Culture
  - Retail & Services
  - Health Care Services

City of Winter Economic Development Plan
- Tax base composition

2010 Taxable Value Allocation by Use Type
- Residential & Commercial
- Industrial

$4,000,000
72%
POLICY AND REGULATORY DOCUMENTS
City of Winter Economic Development Plan

IMPLEMENTATION
To promote a diverse, sustainable, and prosperous economic environment that encompasses all elements of the City's identity, focused on community, culture and commerce.

YEAR 1 ACCOMPLISHMENTS
- Funding: $286,600
- Action Plan
- Tracking, monitoring and reporting
- Year 1 Accomplishments

CONTEXT
A growing, changing community with a long history of planning...

"Excited about his vision of a community, Chase contacted boyhood friend Oliver Chapman and the two men purchased 600 acres of land around the shores of several lakes for $13,000. They hired surveyor Samuel A. Robinson of Orlando to lay out a tidy grid of residential streets with curves encircling areas designated for hotels, schools, churches, and a large central park in the downtown district."

Winter Park Historical Association
IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF KEY ISSUES

- Core (Overarching) Issues and Problems
- Specific Policy and Regulatory Issues
- Other Issues

CORE ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

Disagreement in Understanding of the Role and Purpose of the Comprehensive Plan

- Conflicting perspectives on what a comprehensive plan should be: high-level policy guide versus a focus for detailed rules and directives to give LDC “more teeth.”

- Language in various policies and strategies appears to have been directly appropriated from development codes.

- If the regulations are well composed, then there should be no need to duplicate them in the comprehensive plan.

"We need a plan that calls us to greatness. Instead this plan is packed full of minutiae; things that most other cities don’t have. It needs to be a living, breathing document and instead it wants to be static."
CORE ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

Absence of a Shared Consensus on Community Vision

- The 2009 Comprehensive Plan does not include a "community vision."
- Today, vision-like language in the plan revolves around a "village" image of Winter Park and does not acknowledge other, newer sectors of the city.
- Some in the community doubt that a consensus vision can be arrived at, due to perceptions that differences of opinion in the community run too deep.

There is no true vision in the city except for Park Avenue, which is "don't do anything" there.

CORE ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

"One-Size Fits All" Approach

- The City of Winter Park is comprised of a variety of distinct "districts", each with its own unique character and needs.
- The plan should reflect and celebrate the differences between these areas. Some existing policies seem to negate existing character definitions.
- Various existing and proposed studies, plans and guidelines for specific areas and corridors such as Fairbanks Avenue, Lee, Denning and Aloma are not referenced in the plan.

Everything in this city lives and breathes around Park Avenue, but you have at least two Winter Parks - a core which embodies... how people see or want to see Winter Park, and "the rest" is another area many want to ignore.

CORE ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

Perceived Conflict between the Notions of Growth and Preservation

- There is agreement that the city's history and design character are crucial to its sustained economic development and celebrated quality of life.
- Some perceive growth and preservation as inconsistent, because growth is equated with change (negative).
- Many residents identify Winter Park with the city's historic downtown which both epitomizes the city. However, Winter Park is not monolithic and the historic downtown and neighborhoods are not the sole identity of Winter Park.

"...we must find a balance between a reasonable amount of economic development and opportunity, and retaining the good things that have made Winter Park special."

CORE ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

Traditional versus Form-Based Zoning

- Preferences vary between a land use control, development performance, or building form regulatory focus – in all three.
- The comprehensive plan and the LDC mostly embrace an Euclidian approach (emphasizing separation of land uses, and regulation of density and intensity) but also attempt to regulate form and scale to prevent "character" incompatibilities.
- The greatest concerns revolve around bulding form (particularly in the CSD) How does a building appear from the street? How does it interface with the public realm and its surroundings?

Policy 1.3.2.6 requires the city to "investigate the application of a form-based code to more effectively promote the review of development in accordance with the policies of this Comprehensive Plan."
CORE ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

Lack of Integration between the City's Economic Development Goals and the Comprehensive Plan

- The current plan does not include economic development elements.
- The city completed a strategic 5-year Economic Development Plan in 2011.
- The Economic Development Plan goals and objectives have not been integrated into the comprehensive plan.

Clarifying the Purpose of the Land Development Code

- The purpose of some regulations included in the LDC is unclear: "Why is this here? What is it supposed to accomplish?"
- The purpose of the LDC should be to carry out the city's comprehensive plan by regulating specific and activities.
- If the comprehensive plan is the "what we want to do," the LDC is the "how we are going to do it."

SPECIFIC POLICY AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Discouraging the Proliferation of Sprawl

- Winter Park meets the 2008 statutory requirements of Chapter 163, P. S. to discourage the proliferation of sprawl (Objective 1-3.16).
- In 2011, a new definition of "urban sprawl" is introduced into Chapter. One of the indicators that must be met now is to not "discourage or inhibit any development or the redevelopment of existing neighborhoods and communities." (§163.3177(6)(a).

Concurrence

- The comprehensive plan follows the 2008 concurrence requirements of Chapter 163.
- The Land Development Code (Chapter 58) incorporates concurrence management regulations (Article II).
- In 2012, the legislature deleted transportation, parks and recreation, and schools from the list of facilities and services subject to the concurrence (§163.3165(1)).
- The number of communities opting out of one or more of these requirements has been rising since 2012.
SPECIFIC POLICY AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Concurrency

- Transportation: Burden on staff and developers, lack of staff resources, effectiveness (major corridors are FDOT-owned/maintained).
- Parks and Recreation: Reasonableness of current LOS (10 acres/1000 persons — one of the highest in the state). Winter Park as a mature, landlocked community, expecting additional growth, will require more park land than it can provide under its current LOS.
- The city is projected to grow by about 5,500 people by 2026, requiring 345 acres of park land to meet the adopted standard. Therefore by 2028 the city could experience a deficit of nearly 49 acres. At current land prices, acquiring additional park land could cost the city $36,750,000 plus operation and maintenance costs.

SPECIFIC POLICY AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Concurrency: Park and Recreation Options

- Adjust the adopted LOS from 10 acres/1,000 persons to 8 acres/1,000 persons to continue to meet long-term parks and recreation needs with the current park land inventory.
- Review the city's long-term annexation strategy as means to slow population growth.
- Develop a non-residential system development charge (SDC) allowing the city to require non-residential development to pay a fee in dedicated park land as a condition of building permit approval.

SPECIFIC POLICY AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Concurrency: Transportation Options

- Opt out of concurrency entirely, maintaining only the Proportionate Fair Share assessment (Policy 2-4.5), or adopt supplemental or replacement tools such as developer agreement, impact fees, or mobility fees.
- Rescind concurrency surgically, e.g., exempt major corridors that are in need of redevelopment, but continue to require compliance from projects on collector roads and special districts.
- “Tweaks” the current system, taking advantage of the new local flexibility and authority to achieve a transportation system more tailored to the city's goals and vision.

SPECIFIC POLICY AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Definition of Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

- FAR definition (Policy 1-2.1.4) is very specific and narrow, going to the extreme of including methods for calculation in the policy.
- If the concern is with the appearance of bulk or structured parking facilities, such concerns can be resolved through Form and appearance standards.
SPECIFIC POLICY AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Definition of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Options

- Remove detail that is contained in the comprehensive plan policy (maintain in LDC).
- Eliminate private parking garages from the calculation of floor area ratio in Policy 1-2.1 across the board, or maintain private garages in the calculation of FAR in key corridors of the CBD, such as the Park Avenue area, Mont Avenue, Hamblin Square, etc. but exempt them in other parts of the city.
- Keep private garages in the calculation of FAR, but increase the allowance from 200% to 300%.
- Consider reducing commercial parking requirements in the city's core districts (CBD) to even more urban standards.

SPECIFIC POLICY AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Building Heights

- The comprehensive plan defines building height in terms of number of stories, whereas the LDC defines height in terms of number of linear feet per floor.
- If the main concern is the building height, volume, scale and outer appearance, using height in total feet combined with standards or guidelines for articulating the building façade (floor lines) should be sufficiently effective.

SPECIFIC POLICY AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Density and Floor Area Ratio

- To encourage mixed use development in both infill and redevelopment sites, offer a combination of density and floor area provision, rather than one or the other.
- Provide clear metrics for calculating the combination of density and floor area in mixed land uses on a single site or building.
- To discourage "Mansions" and excessively large building volumes, use a combination of building height, setbacks, stepbacks (where appropriate), building coverage and guidelines for breaking up the mass of a structure.

SPECIFIC POLICY AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Planned Unit Residential Development Inconsistencies

- PURD is only mentioned in text description of the single family residential designation, but not on the low density residential designation.
- The LDC regulations relative to PURD include provisions for multi-family dwellings, but the comprehensive plan limits the housing types to single-family, zero lot line or townhouse development under single family residential.
- Maximum building heights for multi-family dwellings may be unachievable when combined with the prescribed floor area ratio.
SPECIFIC POLICY AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Planned Development Districts
- PD is a tool intended to provide flexibility and promote development or redevelopment of larger scale projects that help the community achieve specific goals.
- This land use designation and zoning category is the only and closest thing Winter Park has to a real mixed use district. However, a single district providing a range of allowable densities and intensities might have sufficed.
- The city adopted these districts relatively recently and has not had an opportunity to test them.
- The maximum size thresholds may be too low and the requirement to subject properties larger than the maximum to two different processes make the application of this zoning tool too onerous and unattractive to developers.

NEXT STEPS
1. Feedback from boards
2. Document revision – summary of recommendations
3. Public presentation/input solicitation
4. Final recommendations/final report

SPECIFIC POLICY AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Parking Lot (PL) Future Land Use
- Parking lots are not typically considered as a principal use in a citywide comprehensive plan. Much less designated as a distinct future land use or zoning district.
- Surface parking lots that are ancillary uses to a principal use should not be treated separately from their principal use.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

COMMENTS