



city commission agenda

August 13, 2020
1:00 PM
Virtual Work
Session - No
public comment
will be taken

mayor & commissioners

seat 1
Marty Sullivan

seat 2
Sheila DeCiccio

Mayor
Steve Leary

seat 3
Carolyn Cooper

seat 4
Todd Weaver

1. Meeting called to Order

2. Orange Avenue Overlay

- | | |
|--|------------|
| a. Discussion with OAO Property/Business Owners | 15 Minutes |
| b. Kimley-Horn Traffic OAO Analysis | 45 minutes |
| Discussion of data points used to measure potential build-out. | |
| c. Discussion of Financial Analysis & Deliverables from GAI | 60 minutes |

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."



city commission **agenda item**

item type	Orange Avenue Overlay	meeting date	8/13/2020
prepared by	Planning	approved by	
board approval	final vote		
strategic objective	Exceptional Quality of Life, Intelligent Growth and Development, Investment in Public Assets and Infrastructure		

subject

Discussion with OAO Property/Business Owners

motion / recommendation

background

Staff and Commissioners have worked to find business and/or property owners within the OAO to speak with the Commission about their concerns regarding existing conditions and vision for the area. Mr. Thomas Thomas, and Ms. Carol Zurcher of Thomas, Zurcher & White, P.A, at 1302 Orange Ave, have agreed to speak with the Commission at this worksession.

As a starting point, staff included the questions below that were used with the OAO Steering Committee when business/property owners were invited to provide input. The Commission can use questions listed below, add to them, or choose whatever questions they feel are appropriate.

1. What are the biggest challenges that you face being a property/business owner on Orange Avenue?
2. What opportunities for improvement can you envision for Orange Avenue and the surrounding area?
3. Why do you think that development/redevelopment of some of the properties in the Orange Avenue area has not occurred, especially given the demand and high value of land in Winter Park?
4. What is currently missing in the Orange Avenue area?
5. What would help your business/ property to be more successful or reach its full potential?
6. What is your vision for the Orange Avenue area?

alternatives / other considerations

fiscal impact



city commission agenda item

item type	Orange Avenue Overlay	meeting date	8/13/2020
prepared by	Planning	approved by	City Manager, City Attorney
board approval	N/A final vote		
strategic objective	Exceptional Quality of Life, Intelligent Growth and Development, Investment in Public Assets and Infrastructure		

subject

Kimley-Horn Traffic OAO Analysis

Discussion of data points used to measure potential build-out.

motion / recommendation

Planning & Transportation staff, along with consultant Mike Woodward, PE of Kimley Horn & Associates, will discuss the data used in modeling future traffic conditions. Staff wants to ensure that the methods and numbers used are consistent with the expectations of the Commission, prior to submittal of Data & Analysis deliverables.

background

Kimley-Horn has been tasked with evaluating transportation impacts associated with potential future development intensities and densities within the Orange Avenue Overlay District. Per the scope of services determined by the Commission, the development scenarios are as follows:

"... and 45% of each of the other Subarea assumed to develop to their maximum entitled FAR (Subarea A – 65%; Subarea B – 60%; Subarea E – 80%; Subarea F – 20%; Subarea G – 45%; Subarea K – 80%)"

Subarea F consists of the Alford Baseball Stadium, which was assumed to remain at that location in the foreseeable future based on conversations with Rollins College and their future intentions for the property. Since no major changes are anticipated with the stadium, it is not included in this analysis.

The City has identified development levels representing 45% of the maximum entitled FAR for the other Subareas (Subarea A, Subarea B, Subarea E, Subarea G, and Subarea K), and compared the resulting square footage to the current development in these Subareas. The 45% assumption would result in a reduction compared to existing development. It is anticipated that the results are not consistent with the intent of the City Commission. Based on these findings, and city staff's discussions with Kimley Horn, they are recommending we change the scope to use a 60% scenario to get a more realistic picture of the traffic impacts of future development. See attached memo from Kimley Horn, which outlines the 45% versus 60% development scenarios.

alternatives / other considerations

N/A

fiscal impact

N/A

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Kimley Horn Scope Memo

Upload Date

8/11/2020

Type

Backup Material



August 10, 2020

Bronce Stephenson, MPA
Director of Planning and Community Development
City of Winter Park
401 South Park Avenue
Winter Park, FL 32789

RE: Orange Avenue Development Levels for Small Subareas

Dear Mr. Stephenson:

Kimley-Horn has been tasked with evaluating transportation impacts associated with potential future development intensities and densities within the Orange Avenue Overlay District. Per our scope of services, the development scenarios are as follows:

“... and 45% of each of the other Subarea assumed to develop to their maximum entitled FAR (Subarea A – 65%; Subarea B – 60%; Subarea E – 80%; Subarea F – 20%; Subarea G – 45%; Subarea K – 80%)”

The City has identified development levels representing 45% of the maximum entitled FAR for the other Subareas (Subarea A, Subarea B, Subarea E, Subarea F, Subarea G, and Subarea K), and compared the resulting square footage to the current development in these Subareas. The 45% assumption would result in a reduction compared to existing development. It is anticipated that the results are not consistent with the intent of the City Commission. Based on these findings, it is recommended to coordinate with City leadership to agree on a modified assumption. We recommend using 60%.

Further details are provided below.

Development Amounts Per Scope of Services

The total amount of developable area within each Subarea was determined by multiplying the maximum FAR for each Subarea by the 45% cap that was selected. For example, in Subarea A 29.25% of the area can be developed (65% x 45%). Using this method, the maximum FAR for each Subarea is shown in **Table 1**.

Subarea F consists of the Alford Baseball Stadium, which was assumed to remain at that location in the foreseeable future. Since no major changes are anticipated with the stadium, it is not included in this analysis.

Table 1: Resulting FAR for Each Subarea

Subarea	Maximum Entitled FAR (Percentage)	45% of Maximum Entitled FAR (Percentage)
A	65	29.25
B	60	27
E	80	36
G	45	20.25
K	80	36

Multiplying the total area within each Subarea by this percentage results in the following developable area for each Subarea, as shown in **Table 2**.

Table 2: Developable Area

Subarea	Subarea Total Area (SF)	45% of Maximum Entitled FAR (Percentage)	45% Build Out of Max Entitled OAO (SF)
A	1,015,194	29.25	296,944
B	286,294	27	77,299
E	375,357	36	135,129
G	150,892	20.25	30,555
K	125,453	36	45,163
Total	1,953,190		585,090

The developable area resulting from this method was compared to the existing development within each Subarea. As shown in **Table 3**, this method would result in an analysis of less development than what is currently built.

Table 3: Comparison of 45% Development Assumption to Existing Development

Subarea	45% Build Out of Max Entitled OAO (SF)	Current Development (SF)	Difference between Proposed and Existing (SF)
A	296,944	320,891	-23,947
B	77,299	65,826	11,473
E	135,129	187,873	-52,744
G	30,555	29,734	821
K	45,163	65,720	-20,557
Total	585,090	670,044	-84,954

While it is assumed that most of the new development within the Overlay District will occur in Subareas D, I, and J, it is not anticipated that the other Subareas will see a decline in development. It is therefore recommended to consider a limiting percentage that is higher than 45%.

Recommended Change to Scope of Services:

The 45% limit on developable area must be modified if it is expected that the smaller Subareas will maintain or increase their current densities and intensities. We recommend continuing with the overall method of assuming a percentage of developable area, using a higher percentage. Other methods could be used to create more complex assumptions, but the complexity will not likely improve the accuracy of assumptions. It is therefore recommended to assume 60% of the properties will be developed to their fully entitled FAR's, resulting in the total amounts of development shown in **Table 4**.

Table 4: Comparison of 60% Development Assumption to Existing Development

Subarea	60% Build Out of Max Entitled OAO (SF)	Current Gross Area (SF)	Difference between Proposed and Existing (SF)
A	395,926	320,891	75,035
B	103,066	65,826	37,240
E	180,172	187,873	-7,701
G	40,741	29,734	11,007
K	60,217	65,720	-5,503
Total	780,122	670,044	110,078

This recommended change is independent of the assumptions for the major parcels in Subareas D, I, and J.

Please provide confirmation or comments on the recommended 60% limit.

Sincerely,



Mike Woodward, P.E.



city commission agenda item

item type	Orange Avenue Overlay	meeting date	8/13/2020
prepared by	Planning	approved by	
board approval	final vote		
strategic objective	Exceptional Quality of Life, Intelligent Growth and Development, Investment in Public Assets and Infrastructure		

subject

Discussion of Financial Analysis & Deliverables from GAI

motion / recommendation

Staff has invited GAI to present their initial findings to the Commission. Staff wants to ensure that the methods and types of analyses used are consistent with the expectations of the Commission, prior to submittal of Data & Analysis deliverables. At the time of this memo, staff has not received any drafts, but the data will be presented to the Commission at the worksession and any changes that come from the discussion will be made prior to submittal of the draft deliverable.

background

As a part of the continued OAO Data & Analysis requested by the City Commission, a Scope of Services was developed with consultant GAI, which stated the following:

Task 1: Financial and Economic Analysis

GAI will provide rough order of magnitude estimate of cost for each item listed on the menu of incentives as proposed under the OAO. The costs will be developed using data from a range of sources appropriate to each proposed item. Costs will be presented in tabular format.

In order to quantify the market value of an increase in allowable FAR, GAI will develop pro forma models for prototypical development within the OAO using a hypothetical construct for meeting base and maximum FAR, under scenarios to be determined. The parameters of development for all proposed scenarios will be confirmed with City staff prior to commencement of the task. The analysis will include:

- Detailed pro forma estimates, including land value based on a residual land value calculation
- Tabular summary of changes in financial performance attributable to increased FAR
- A summarized calculation of value from a 1% change in FAR (effectively a calculation of elasticity in terms of development profit)
- A general summary of how market and non-market values of incentives

align with potential value created by changes in FAR

alternatives / other considerations

fiscal impact