



Orange Avenue Overlay Appearance Review Advisory Board Regular Meeting Minutes

January 17, 2024 at 2:00 PM

City Hall Commission Chambers
401 S. Park Avenue

Present

Tonya Mellen, Andrew Krecicki, Wade Miller, and Brian Canin.

Absent

Ray Waugh

Staff Present

Director of Planning and Zoning Allison McGillis, Senior Planner John Harbilas, Planner I Corinna Lundgren, Administrative Coordinator Mary Bush

1. Call to Order

Mrs. McGillis called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m.

2. Selection of Chair and Vice Chair

a. Selection of Chair and Vice Chair

Motion made by Andrew Krecicki, seconded by Wade Miller to nominate Tonya Mellen as Chair of the Board. Ms. Mellen accepted the nomination.

By a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously 4-0. (Ray Waugh was absent from the meeting.)

Motion made by Andrew Krecicki, seconded by Tonya Mellen to nominate Wade Miller as Vice-Chair of the Board. Mr. Miller accepted the nomination.

By a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously 4-0. (Ray Waugh was absent from the meeting.)

3. Consent Agenda

4. Public Comments (for items not on the agenda): Three minutes allowed

for each speaker

No one from the public wished to speak. The public hearing was closed.

5. Action Items

- a. **Request of McCraney Property Company** for a Conditional Use request for a 29,500 square-foot, three-story, office building at 1100 Orange Avenue, within the Orange Avenue Overlay (OAO).

Mr. Krecicki recused himself from voting because he works for HuntonBrady Architects, a firm that is part of the design team for the project.

Mrs. McGillis provided a summary of the item. She noted that the applicant was requesting waivers to reduce the required 10-foot step back on the third floor, to increase the allowed encroachment of the third floor overhang, to increase the distance of the articulation change requirement, and to increase the required building height to accommodate a 12-foot-tall screen wall on the rooftop. She went on to note that the property was located at the intersection of Orange Avenue, Denning Drive, and Minnesota Avenue, which is in the Orange Avenue Overlay district. She then discussed the building details, including the setbacks, site plan, floor-area-ratio (FAR), elevations, and parking. She also detailed the architecture for the project, including height, building articulation, overhang projection and supports, and screen wall height. She explained that staff was looking for recommendations from the Board on the architectural details being requested by the applicant.

The Board inquired about the caliper of the existing trees to be removed and if cost was a deciding factor for the applicant's desire for palm trees rather than canopy trees in the open spaces. The Board expressed that canopy trees rather than palm trees would make more sense for shade along the streetscape. Mrs. McGillis noted that staff had recommended to the applicant that they change the palm trees in the open space areas to canopy trees to provide more shade.

The applicant, Steven McCraney of 189 S. Orange Avenue, Ste.1170, Orlando, FL 32801 addressed the Board. Mr. McCraney noted that his team had been working on the project for about 18 months and believed the project would help raise the bar in the Orange Avenue Overlay area.

A member of the applicant's architectural design team, Daniel Gordon with HuntonBrady Architects at 333 South Garland Avenue, Orlando, FL 32801 addressed the Board. Mr. Gordon spoke about the project's meaningful open space, compliance with parking ratios, green space, building height, tree preservation, and primary building setbacks. He indicated that there is an existing specimen tree next to the building footprint that cannot be preserved, so in exchange the applicant had changed

some island configurations and eliminated parking spaces to maintain a few other existing specimen trees.

Another member of the applicant's architectural design team, Maurizio Maso with HuntonBrady Architects at 333 South Garland Avenue, Orlando, FL 32801 addressed the Board. Mr. Maso gave some background on the project and noted that the applicant and the design team had considered about a dozen configurations of the building and its location on the site. He indicated that the idea of the chosen configuration was to have a building that responds to the scale and massing of Winter Park and engages pedestrians on all sides. He then noted that the concept of the landscape was to use oak trees where the parking would be located and surround the building with an architecturally compatible tree species such as date palms. Mr. Maso also noted that shade studies were completed for the project by the urban design and land planning company, LandDesign and were included in the Board's meeting packet. He went on to mention that the FAR for the project totaled less than allowed by code.

The Board inquired about the amount of space available for oak trees placed along Minnesota and Denning Avenues. Mr. Maso responded that there is enough space for oak trees but the applicant wanted to have the corner of the building very transparent due to its prominence at the intersection so the applicant chose to use date palms. He then reviewed the renderings and discussed the design details of the project, noting that the applicant felt that the deeper canopy of the date palms would make the space more functional and aesthetically pleasing. He also noted that the applicant was thinking about using a wood-like material on the underside of the canopy to add warmth, and engage the building with the pedestrian experience.

Mr. Gordon addressed the Board and discussed the third floor step back and the overhang allowance. He indicated that the prominent corner element at the intersection of Orange Avenue, Denning Drive, and Minnesota Avenue is important to have as it would create an anchor and iconic feel. He also indicated that the overhang allowance would provide more shade, and enhance the architecture of the building. He then provided and discussed renderings showing what the building would look like if compliant with all code requirements. He expressed that the design submitted by the applicant would be a more superior design configuration than if the project complied completely with Code.

The Board briefly discussed the 5-foot setback on the first floor, the setback of the overhang, and the proposed occupants of the building space. The Board expressed favor for the applicant's proposed overhang position and desired to see more softening of the building facade. Mr. Maso suggested that the glass facade could be softened up by adding shading elements that are part of the glazing system, and it could be broken down by adding warm, wood-like elements so it doesn't look like one giant glass element. The Board expressed that they would like to see the proposed wood-like

elements be included on the first and second floor levels, a use of landscape to also soften the building, and a rendering with oak trees instead of palm trees used. Discussion then ensued regarding the use of a species of trees that would work with the architecture and provide adequate shade and why the applicant chose to use palm trees. Mr. McCraney indicated that the palm trees were chosen to achieve a variegated look with open views. The Board expressed that palm trees do not fit the character of Winter Park. Discussion then continued on articulation, shade elements, and design details of the building facade.

Mr. Maso addressed the Board and briefly discussed the proposed 12-foot-tall screen wall on the rooftop. He indicated that the screen wall was pushed as far east as possible. He added that based on the line of sight on both Denning Drive and Minnesota Avenue, it is less prominent than it might seem due to its setback from the right-of-way. He then expressed that the 6-foot height requirement per code is not realistic to fully screen standard rooftop A/C units. The Board expressed that they did not feel the proposed height of the screen wall would be an issue.

No one from the public wished to speak. The public hearing was closed.

Brief discussion ensued as Mrs. McGillis clarified with the Board their recommendations and approved variances for the request.

Motion made by Brian Canin, seconded by Wade Miller, for Conditional Use approval to build a three-story, 29,500 square foot commercial building at 1100 S. Orange Avenue, with the following variances and recommendations:

Variances:

- **Third Floor Step back – Within the OAO, a 10’ additional setback is required for any more than 2 stories. The proposal is providing a 3 story continual glass feature that maintains the same first floor setback all the way up and supporting structures within the setback.**
- **Third Floor Overhang- The Code allows roof overhangs to encroach 3.5’ into the required setback (30’ and 25’ to each street front for the third floor). The proposal includes an overhang that encroaches out 11’ to just beyond the walls of the lower floors.**
- **Articulation – Elevations do not conform to the requirement to provide articulation offset four feet, material change, window, entryway or other breakup of the building façade at least every 30 feet, both vertically and horizontally.**
- **Screen wall height – 59’ requested where 53’ is the max allowed, subject to Building Official approval.**

Recommendations:

- **That the eyebrow awning be carried along the blank wall on the east side of the building and be made out of the same wood material as the roof overhang.**
- **That wood elements be added to the awnings as well as the projections inward along the first floor.**
- **That vertical wood elements be added to create wood-like structural columns to the glass feature.**
- **That oak trees rather than palm trees be used along the prominent corner, along Minnesota and Denning Avenues.**

The motion carried by a 3-0 vote. (In Favor: Brian Canin, Tonya Mellen, and Wade Miller. Recused: Andrew Krecicki.)

6. Non-Action Items

7. Staff Updates

8. Board Comments

9. Upcoming Agenda Items

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:14 p.m.

ATTEST:

/s/ Mary Bush, Board Secretary