



Planning and Zoning Board Work Session Minutes

November 30, 2021 at 12:00 p.m.

Virtual

1. Present

Chairman Richard James called the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m. Present: Jim Fitch, Richard James, Michael Spencer, Melissa Vickers, Vashon Sarkisian, Alex Stringfellow, and David Bornstein. Staff: Director of Planning and Transportation Bronce Stephenson, Principal Planner Jeff Briggs, Transportation Manager Sarah Walter, Senior Planner John Harbilas, Planner I Nicholas Lewis, Planning Specialist Aaron Hull, and Recording Secretary Mary Bush.

2. Discussion Items:

A. Discussion of the proposed redevelopment of the Winter Park Christian Church property at 740/760 N. Lakemont Avenue:

Mr. Briggs led discussion on the item. He noted that the applicant recently had two community meetings and it did not appear that the neighbors were upset about the project. He provided some background to the project and the church that has been in existence since the 1950's. He explained that the church feels their location in the back of the property's 6.4 acres and their outdated facilities are not helping to attract any members to the congregation and their numbers have been steadily declining over the years. He added that they are proposing to build a brand new church up on the Lakemont Avenue frontage that would be more visible and would hopefully attract and grow their congregation to a healthier size. They also plan to sell the rear 5.25 acres of land to a development group called Creative Neighbors, LLC, which would build a subdivision of 13 single-family lots and 12 townhouses. He then briefly discussed the logistics of the project. He went on to discuss the generalized site plan of the project noting that the church will be a conditional use with a 150 seat sanctuary. He spoke on the parking details, the stormwater retention, and the church project meeting all code requirements.

Mr. Briggs continued discussion on the development of the residential properties by Creative Neighbors, LLC. He presented the layout and discussed the street system, park, open space, and privacy buffer of trees that would be on the property. He noted that all of the property since it is church property is designated in the Comprehensive Plan as institutional and will need to be changed to a residential future land use category. The developer is requesting single-family residential future land use. Mr. Briggs added that the developer would be limited to five units per acre and a maximum floor-area-ratio (FAR) of 42% with the single-family residential zoning. The developer's privately owned portion of the 5.25 acres produces a 47.2% FAR, so the developer is requesting to amend the Comprehensive Plan policy to increase the allowed FAR to 47.2%. Since the church is well under their 43% FAR, they have agreed to cap the future development of their 1.15 acres so that the square footage of the entire site does not exceed the 43% FAR. Brief discussion ensued regarding if the church did not remain in the future would the land be locked in to what can be developed there due to the cap of the FAR.

Mr. Briggs went on to discuss what changes would need to be made to the zoning map which includes rezoning from single-family zoning to Planned Unit Residential District (PURD) zoning. He noted some examples of existing PURDs in the City and explained the utilization of common areas instead of front and back yard space for the residential units. He then explained the two phase PURD approval process involving a preliminary concept plan approval and a comprehensive development plan approval. Brief discussion ensued regarding the application coming back to the Planning and Zoning Board in the future for certain approvals, the project needing a subdivision plat and Home Owner Association (HOA) required documents, and variances being requested by the applicant. Mr. Briggs noted that the applicant has taken the project completely through preliminary engineering to be certain that it can

be built as planned. He then briefly discussed traffic number estimates for the project and asked the Board to take some time to visit a few of the PURD examples he mentioned to get a better visualization of the what the applicant's project may look like.

Discussion ensued regarding the City's fire department review of the application, trash pickup by Waste Management, the site plan configuration differences, minimum pavement width, the use and maintenance of the perimeter greenspace, fencing, the right-of-way (ROW) in the centerline of the access road, possible other townhomes in the area, feedback from adjacent residential homes, and setting precedence.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 12:59 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Bush

Recording Secretary