



Planning & Zoning Board Work Session Minutes

February 27, 2024 at 12:00 PM

Chapman Room
401 S. Park Avenue

Present

Alex Stringfellow, David Bornstein, Jim Fitch, Michael Spencer, Warren Lindsey, Vashon Sarkisian

Absent

Melissa Vickers

Staff Present

Director of Planning & Zoning Allison McGillis, Planning Consultant Jeff Briggs, Senior Planner/Zoning Official John Harbilas, Planner II Nicholas Lewis, Planner I Corinna Lundgren, Administrative Coordinator Mary Bush

1. Meeting Called to Order

Chairman Bornstein called the meeting to order at 12:06 p.m.

2. Discussion Item (s)

a. Discuss upcoming agenda items:

- Community meetings (proposed Ordinance is attached)
- Single-family zoning code updates (proposed Ordinance is attached)
- CRA plan (summary and proposed plan is attached)

Mr. Lewis provided a brief summary of the upcoming agenda item for a lakefront site plan at 1602 Summerland Avenue. He noted that the applicant will be preserving various trees that are located in the buildable area, the neighbors to the south are in favor of the request, and the applicant is requesting one variance on the second story of the home to save tree canopy.

Mr. Briggs provided a brief summary of the upcoming agenda item for a Conditional Use for a bed and breakfast at 221 Holt Avenue, which had been tabled at the last two Planning & Zoning Board meetings. He provided a brief history of the property, noting that the applicant had been illegally running the six-unit condominium as an Airbnb but now wants to comply with a legal use and turn the condominium into a bed and breakfast.

Mrs. McGillis began discussion on the ordinance for community meetings. She noted that the ordinance would place all the responsibility for having a community meeting on the applicant and require them to make a report back to the City's staff regarding the results of the meeting. She expressed that staff was looking to the Board for feedback on when to require the community meetings. She explained that the ordinance listed criteria that would trigger the requirement for community meetings, which included applications that would require a super majority vote by the City Commission, those that have more than 25 dwelling units, and those with a building size of 10,000 square feet or greater. She further explained that some applications would end up requiring a community meeting when they do not necessarily need one.

Discussion ensued and the Board expressed that a proof of mailing like an affidavit signed by the applicant was desired. The Board also inquired about why lake fronts have their own separate criteria for the community meeting requirement. Mrs. McGillis noted that the criteria for lake fronts is the same as written for super majority vote per the City's Land Development code. Discussion continued regarding the square foot threshold requiring applicants to have a community meeting, the appropriate threshold to include all applications that may need a community meeting, the potential competency of applicants to conduct a community meeting, and staff's potential involvement at the community meetings. Some members of the Board expressed a desire for the public notices for the community meetings to be certified mailed to the public. The Board then inquired about the typical square foot threshold in other jurisdictions and the public's attendance at community meetings. Brief discussion ensued regarding concerns with setting the threshold at 10,000 square feet and its effects on staff's involvement with set up and attendance at the community meetings.

Mrs. McGillis reviewed the community meeting notice requirements emphasizing that the notice would have to be mailed to all addresses within 500 feet of the applicant's property at least 15 days prior to the community meeting. She noted that the meeting would have to be held in a place within the city limits that is easily accessible to the public and that the applicant would have to provide staff with evidence of the meeting within 10 days of the first public hearing for the application. She also noted that the applicant would be required to provide a copy of the meeting notice to staff and provide a copy of the applicant's site plan and elevations at the community meeting. She added that the notice must introduce the application and describe the impact it may have on the surrounding properties. The applicant would also need to provide staff with a sign in sheet that indicates the number of people that attended the meeting and a report that states the summary and substance of the concerns expressed during the process. They would also need to describe how the applicant addressed and/or intends to address the concerns from the meeting. The then must provide a statement for any concerns that they are unable to address detailing why they are not able to correct the concerns.

Discussion ensued regarding the City's conditional use criteria, possible public feedback after the community meetings occur, and increasing the 10,000 square foot threshold. The Board expressed that they felt comfortable with whatever staff recommends for the square foot threshold. Mrs. McGillis indicated that staff will look back at the last three years of conditional use applications that were and were not controversial to come up with a recommendation for the threshold. The Board expressed a desire to have a guide for community meeting decorum provided to each applicant as part of the application process. Brief discussion then ensued regarding how the public has behaved at past community meetings.

Mrs. McGillis noted that staff would make the Board's recommended changes to the ordinance, work on the recommended square foot threshold for the community meetings, and then bring the item back to the Board at their April or May public hearing.

Mr. Harbilas began discussion on the single-family zoning code updates. He indicated that most of the changes were grammatical corrections. He then reviewed the major changes that were made, which included the following:

- added a provision for dormers to face lakefronts,
- eliminated the requirement of a certificate of occupancy to determine the front setback,
- re-added the provision to add a front porch within the setback,
- made minor adjustments to the R-2 zoning tables,
- included an allowance for garages to face the public right-of-way at a 35 foot setback,
- adjusted the provision for A/C units to allow the required screening to be a wall or a fence,
- included an allowance for a decorative garage door up to 18-feet wide for new and remodeled homes to accommodate large vehicles,
- increased the carport offset requirement from two feet to three feet,
- updated the provision related to total accessory structures,
- re-added the provision to allow an additional cooking facility in homes over a certain size,
- increased the column height requirement for fences,
- and removed the requirement for a picket style fence if a home is on a street corner.

Mr. Stringfellow inquired if staff had considered a larger allowance for the square footage of front porches. The Board felt that 7-feet would be consistent with R-2 zoning and a good allowance for front porches. Discussion ensued regarding the provision for front facing garages. Mr. Stringfellow asked staff to review the State Statute regarding garage location for residential properties. Mr. Fitch suggested that

shrubs be added for the mechanical equipment screening wall options. Discussion ensued regarding if a 6-foot setback would be enough to provide sufficient air flow for A/C unit equipment. The Board suggested not allowing the screening for A/C equipment to be opaque. Further discussion occurred regarding single and two-car wide garage doors and additional cooking facilities.

Mrs. McGillis briefly discussed the City's Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) plan. She noted that the Board's role was to review and confirm that the CRA plan is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. She added that the plan was being extended and expanded to include Fairbanks Avenue. She then went over the CRA schedule for the Comprehensive Plan review noting that there would be a CRA meeting for the next step in the review process on February 28, 2024. Mrs. McGillis explained that the plan will set the stage for future conversations about annexation and the rationale for annexing into Winter Park. She further explained that the City's goal is to increase affordable housing and make stormwater improvements.

3. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:04 p.m.

ATTEST:

/s/ Mary Bush, Recording Secretary