

CITY OF WINTER PARK
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE CITY COMMISSION
February 28, 2005

The special meeting of the Winter Park City Commission was called to order by Mayor Kenneth "Kip" Marchman at 2:00 p.m. in the Commission Chambers, 401 Park Avenue South, Winter Park, Florida.

PRESENT: Mayor Kenneth "Kip" Marchman, Commissioners Douglas Storer, John Eckbert (arrived at 2:03 p.m.), Doug Metcalf (arrived at 2:04 p.m.) and Barbara DeVane; City Attorney C. Brent McCaghren; City Manager James Williams; City Clerk Cindy Bonham and Deputy City Clerk Tania Haas.

1. Update on the Orange County School Board actions regarding the former Glenridge Middle School Property.
2. Update from City Attorney on Option Contract timing.
3. Presentation/discussion with Planning staff seeking:
 - a. Authorization to advertise RFQ for developer partner.
 - b. Approval of Selection Committee membership/structure.
 - c. Approval of guiding principles for RFQ.

All items were discussed simultaneously.

City Planner Jeff Briggs said the purpose of the meeting is to discuss the process for the City to purchase and locate a joint developer partner. City Attorney McCaghren reported that the agreement with the School Board provides that at such time the School Board determines to surplus the property, they notify the City in writing, and that the City has 30 days to advise whether or not the City is interested in acquiring the property. He continued that if the City determines that it is not interested, the School Board is free to market the property. He said if the City expresses an interest to acquire the property within the 30 days, the City is to notify the School Board. He continued that once the School Board receives the notification, it will have the property appraised and provide the City a copy of the appraisal. He said the City has 60 days from receipt of the appraisal to notify the School Board of its intent to purchase the property at the appraised price. Mr. McCaghren noted that if the City intends to purchase the property at the appraised price, the City has 90 days to close the transaction.

Mr. McCaghren reported that his office received a letter from the School Board dated February 23, 2005, stating that on February 22, 2005, the School Board voted to commence the process to declare the property no longer needed for educational purposes and to implement the City's agreement. He continued that the letter states that the School Board is providing written notice, along with copies of the two most recent appraisals. He said the letter requests that the City notify the School Board within 30 days of its intent. Mr. McCaghren explained that the letter received by his office did not include copies of the appraisal and suggested waiting until the Mayor received his copies. Mr. McCaghren spoke of the possibility that the 30 day notification period may begin on the date indicated on the School Board letter, and if so, the City should notify the School Board within the 30 days of its intent.

Additionally, he explained that the School Board is combining the two time periods (30 days to respond with interest, 60 days to respond regarding purchasing the property at the appraised price) in one transmittal to the City.

Planner Briggs explained that the City may only have 150 total days to make a decision, close on the property by July, and work through a request for proposal process. He suggested that it may be essential to perform a preliminary development plan approval/preliminary plat through the Planning and Zoning and City Commissions. He elaborated about a reliable preliminary development plan approval/preliminary plat that can be used at closing. Mr. Briggs stated staff is seeking authorization to advertise and field prospective interest from developers. He suggested using a similar format to the one used for the City Hall RFQ/RFP process for the Glenridge property. He spoke about breaking the process into two parts and advertising the request for qualifications which would include a selection committee. Mr. Briggs suggested that the selection committee include the following: (1) City Commissioner, (1) Planning and Zoning Commission member, (1) Parks and Recreation Board member or (1) citizen at large. He said staff recommends Tom Alday as the representative from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Discussion ensued regarding the time frame needed for the Request for Proposal and the Request for Qualification Process, accomplishing what the community prefers with the property and keeping the City out of undue risks.

City Attorney McCaghren was informed that a package was received notwithstanding the letter dated February 23, 2005, with a postmark of February 25, 2005, that included the original notification and the two appraisals. After a brief review of the appraisal summary, Mr. McCaghren said one of the appraisals has a current date of January 31, 2005, and the other February 1, 2005. He said in order to be safe, it should be anticipated that a 60-day window exists in which to inform the School Board of the City's intent to purchase the property.

Planner Briggs said a decision needs to be made whether this should be conducted in two parts; a Request for Qualifications which would then be short listed to a Request for Proposal, or whether both should be advertised simultaneously. He recommended conducting the RFQ and RFP processes separately so that all respondents provide their qualifications and development proposals.

After each Commissioner disclosed they had participated in discussions with the developer, each shared their preferences of what should be planned for the property. Commissioner Storer commented on providing homes and park space on the property. Commissioner Eckbert spoke about creating a residential/park mix. Commissioner Metcalf agreed with the comments expressed and spoke about a townhouse complex for the property. Commissioner DeVane spoke about moving forward with the acquisition of the property and the opportunity to provide a passive park space and residential area.

Planner Briggs provided an illustration that identified the needed infrastructure. He elaborated on the property's ingress and egress points, marketing of the lots, and the agreement with Windsong.

Nancy Shutts, 2010 Brandywine Drive, spoke of the traffic impact to the surrounding residents and the financial ramifications of a proposed residential/park space mix to the City's tax base.

City Attorney McCaghren disclosed the appraisal amounts.

Discussion ensued regarding the partner terminology associated with the development process.

Nancy Renfro, 665 Randy Lane, as a resident of Timberlane Shores, spoke about preserving the gymnasium and the recreation hall located on the site.

Julian Renfro, 665 Randy Lane, spoke about the ingress and egress points of the property, preserving the use of Glenridge Way and whether the City will maintain proper constraints on the developer.

YMCA Director Richard Toll, spoke of the shortage of gyms in the community and the need to preserve the gymnasium on the Glenridge site.

Susan Gable, 1539 Gulfside Drive, elaborated on the importance of maintaining a park space in the development process.

An unidentified speaker expressed her preference of adding another school on Glenridge Way.

Mayor Marchman expressed his support of the guiding principles and the recommendations from staff. City Attorney McCaghren said staff prepared the guiding principles and recommendations prior to having received the communication from the School Board. He cautioned the Commission that due to the more compressed time frame, the deadlines included in the guiding principles may not be appropriate. He recommended shortening the deadline for qualifications to provide additional time to review the proposals. Discussion ensued regarding the status of the structures that the state did not allow the School Board to surplus. Commissioner Metcalf and City Attorney McCaghren confirmed that the School Board is not permitted to surplus properties that are less than 20 years old. Mayor Marchman wanted this matter looked into further.

Commissioner DeVane suggested whether developers should provide recommendations regarding the Blue Ridge Road intersection and traffic flow. Commissioner Storer suggested addressing the traffic and pedestrian access at General Rees and Glenridge in the guiding principles and by developers.

In regards to the Guiding Principles the following comments were provided: Whether Principle #1 should include consideration of one or two story townhouses, and address traffic generation.

Guiding Principle #2: Exterior road access shall be confined to either or both of the adjacent traffic signalized intersections to include Blue Ridge Road without any new road access directly onto Glenridge Way.

Commissioner Storer asked to add a bullet point related to traffic and pedestrian improvement to both accesses.

Guiding Principle #3: The project must contain one or more public park area(s) which is/are suggested to be on the western portion of the site. Infrastructure improvements for the development should contemplate the improvement and development of this public park area as part of the development costs, in accordance with plans prepared by the city.

Discussion ensued on whether this principle should include: The project must contain generous use of green space and whether the park would be owned and maintained by the City. Commissioner Storer suggested the principle to read as follows: The project must contain one or more passive public park area(s) which is/are suggested to be on the western portion of the site.

In regards to Guiding Principle #3, consensus was to read as follows:

Guiding Principle #3: The project must contain one or more passive public park area(s) which is/are suggested to be on the western portion of the site. Infrastructure improvements for the development should contemplate the improvement and development of this public park area as part of the development costs, in accordance with plans prepared by the city.

Consensus decisions:

The following sections to read as noted.

IV. GLENRIDGE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT

The Glenridge Middle School Redevelopment Project is an important and vital component of the evolution of the City of Winter Park. As such, respondents to this RFQ and RFP will need to address adherence to "Guiding Principles" for this project. The following "Guiding Principles" have been adopted for the Glenridge Property Redevelopment:

1. The proposed development shall be primarily single family residential in character with lot sizes and density comparable to the surrounding neighborhoods that permit construction within the applicable zoning regulations including setbacks and floor area ratio. A summary of those regulations are attached.
2. Exterior road access shall be confined to both of the adjacent traffic signalized intersections without any new road access directly onto Glenridge Way. The Developer shall examine the traffic/pedestrian conditions at the Glenridge/Blue Ridge/Timberlane and suggest appropriate modifications.
3. The project must contain one or more passive public park area(s) which is/are suggested to be on the western portion of the site. Infrastructure improvements for the development should contemplate the improvement and development of this public park area as part of the development costs, in accordance with plans prepared by the city.
4. Storm water retention must be accommodated in surface retention ponds with grass side slopes

that contain no vertical or other walls to increase retention volume, designed to meet the volume requirements of the St. Johns River Water Management District. The outfall of the property to the adjacent city drainage system is in the northeast corner of this property.

5. Architectural diversity is desired amongst the resultant residential products. Builders and contractors selected by the development team shall demonstrate to the city that architectural variety is contemplated amongst the offerings to the residential lot or home buyers.

6. Marketing of the lots shall include a program for some specific time period that markets and sells all or a significant portion of the lots to Winter Park residents and other individuals directly for them to select a builder from the portfolio offered by the Development team before the lots may be offered and sold directly to builders and contractors.

7. The City Commission wants to encourage creativity and flexibility in the redevelopment plans submitted to the City as best benefits the citizens of Winter Park.

The City Commission will retain control over the design and construction of this property in the typical fashion of conditions of approval or a development agreement attached to a final subdivision plat approval or if necessary as deed restrictions and covenants.

MEMBERS OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE

There was discussion on whether a special meeting should be scheduled due to the compressed time frame. Commissioner Eckbert suggested making the evaluation criteria more consistent with the project. Commissioner Storer suggested to remove any references to partnerships.

Regarding the selection committee, there was discussion as to possible committee members. Consensus was that the selection committee should be comprised of three or five members. Consensus was that the selection committee be comprised as follows: Tom Alday as the Planning and Zoning Commission representative, Commissioner Storer as the Commission representative, and the Chairperson or a designee of the Parks and Recreation Commission as the Parks and Recreation Commission representative.

Mr. Briggs noted that although developers are not permitted to contact selection committee members, they are permitted to contact staff about this project. City Attorney McCaghren cautioned the Commission about discussing this issue with possible developers. He said questions from developers should be channeled through staff.

Mayor Marchman adjourned the special meeting at 3:25 p.m.

Mayor Kenneth R. Marchman

ATTEST:

City Clerk Cynthia Bonham