

MEETING
INFORMATIONVirtual Meeting
To join Virtually:

<https://orlando.gov.zoom.us/j/99228810801>

Time

2:00 p.m.

Board Members Present:

Jill Rose- Chairperson

Clarisse Gates, Vice-Chair

Daniel Gordon

Chad Cowart

Jeff Arms

Board Members Absent

Patrick Panza

Margaret Brock

MEETING MINUTES

July 21, 2022

OPENING SESSION

Jill Rose, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

Gabriella, Recording Secretary, conducted the Roll Call and determination of a quorum was confirmed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: NONE

MINUTES:

Clarisse Gates MOVED to waive the reading of the minutes and to approve the minutes of the May 31, 2022, meeting as written. Jeffrey Arms SECONDED the motion, which was voted upon and PASSED by unanimous voice vote (5-0).

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- None

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Case No: ARB2022-10025, 425 N Orange Ave., Orange County Courthouse Parking

Applicant: William Hockensmith, Florida Engineering Group 5127 S Orange Ave. Orlando FL 32809
Owner: Orange County Capital Projects Division, PO BOX 1393 Orlando, FL 32802
District: Commissioner District 5
Project Planner: Richard Forbes
Description: **A request for a Major certificate of Appearance Approval for the construction of a 17-space surface parking lot fronting on North Magnolia Avenue.**

Recommended Action: Approval, based on the conditions in the staff report.

1. ARB Approval

- Minor modifications to this ARB approval will require additional ARB staff review and approval. Major modifications may require additional ARB board approvals.
- ARB approval does not grant permission to construct and/or install. All necessary permits must be obtained prior to commencement of installation activity.
- Conditions from the Variance case VAR2022-10014 shall be met.
- Streetscape-Any damage to existing streetscape shall be restored to match.
- Landscape-Hedge and additional plantings shall be installed in front of the required street-wall and shall require additional minor staff approval.

Jeffrey Arms MOVED to approve the request subject to staff conditions Danny Gordon SECONDED the motion, voted upon, and PASSED by unanimous voice vote (5-0)

REGULAR AGENDA

Secretary Note:

Item #3 on the agenda case ARB2022-10027 is Now Item # 2. To be reviewed first per the applicant's request.

2. Case No: ARB2022-10027, 504 W Church St., The District Outdoor Patio

Applicant: Thomas Bonds, 534 W Church St. Orlando, FL 32805
 Owner: Thomas Chatmon, Community Redevelopment Agency Director, 400 S Orange Ave. Orlando, FL 32801
 District: Commissioner District 5
 Project Planner: Richard Forbes
 Description: **Request for a Major Certificate of Appearance Approval for the development of an outdoor patio adjacent to the restaurant.**

Recommended Action: Approval, based on the conditions in the staff report.

1. ARB Approval

- A. Permits—ARB approval does not grant permission to construct or install improvements. All applicable permits must be obtained prior to commence of demolition and/or construction activities.
- B. Agreements to use the site must be obtained prior to permitting.
- C. Modifications to the approved ARB plans must be submitted to ARB staff for review and approval. Significant modifications may require additional approval by the Appearance Review Board.

2. Dining Patio

- A. Area under consideration is only the area up to the existing larger transformer.
- B. Remove the double gates shown on east side of the patio and replace with wall/fence.
- C. Proposed window and doors on the east side of the building will require additional ARB minor review.
- D. Outdoor Dining Area Canopy—The profile and material of the outdoor dining area canopy shall be compatible with the material and profile of the Church Street canopy.
- E. Final colors and materials along with physical samples will need additional staff approval.
- F. Landscaping shrubs shown at rear of patio shall continue to wall of existing building at 532 W Church St.
- G. Concrete block transformer enclosures shall have a stucco finish to match the existing building.
- H. Use a more durable material for the patio than the wood decking shown such as pavers or concrete.

3. Mechanical Equipment and Utilities

- A. Venting & Exhaust—All restaurant venting, and exhaust shall be directed to the roof of the building, unless an acceptable alternative is approved by the Appearance Review Officer. Restaurant venting is not permitted on any street facing façade of the building and must not be visible from the public right-of-way. All other vents and exhaust must be a minimum of 12 ft. above grade and must be integrated into the building design so as to be seamless with the overall architecture of the building. Exterior vents shall be painted to match the color of the façade around them.
- B. Mechanical Equipment—All ground mounted, and rooftop mechanical equipment shall be screened to the top of the equipment and meet the screening conditions of the Land Development Code. An interior screen wall or parapet for rooftop mechanical equipment may be required. The interior screen wall or parapet shall be the same height as the installed mechanical equipment height.
- C. Backflow Preventer—Backflow preventer[s] shall be located so as to not be directly visible from the right-of-way and should be screened from view as necessary. They shall be clearly identified on the final utilities plan.
- D. Electric Meters and Switch Boxes — Electric meters and switch boxes mounted to exterior walls shall not be located on street facing facades.

4. Signage

- A. ARB Approval—All exterior signage must be submitted for an ARB Minor Review prior to submittal of sign permits.

Richard Forbes, Project Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation that showed Location, Street view, drawings, renderings, and staff conditions of Approval.

Board discussion ensued:

- Utility concrete Pole and transformer relocation.
 - Deck elevation
 - East side ramp
 - Materials
- Thomas Chatmon, 400 S Orange Ave. Spoke on behalf the owner of CRA in favor of this project.
- Thomas Bonds, 534 W Church St. Orlando, FL 32805. Spoke in favor of this project.

Danny Gordon MOVED to approve the request subject to staff conditions Chad Cowart SECONDED the motion, voted upon, and PASSED by unanimous voice vote (5-0)

3. Case No: ARB2021-10010, 802 W Church St., Final Review Office Building

Applicant: Ryan Young, Interstruct Orlando, 814 W Church St. Orlando, FL 32805
 Owner: Ryan Young, 814 Church Partners LLC., 121 S Orange Ave. Ste 820 N Orlando, FL 32805
 District: Commissioner District 5
 Project Planner: Richard Forbes
 Description: **A major review for approval of a new 3 story office building at the southwest corner of West Church Street and South Lee Avenue.**

Recommended Action: Approval, based on the conditions in the staff report.

1. ARB Approval

- A. Minor modifications to this ARB approval will require additional ARB staff review and approval. Major modifications may require additional ARB board approvals.
- B. ARB approval does not grant permission to construct and/or install. All necessary permits must be obtained prior to commencement of installation activity.

2. Design:

- a) Final material selection and color samples will require additional staff review.
- b) Final design of the screen walls shall will require additional staff review.

3. Streetscape:

- a) The streetscape on West Church Street is a special streetscape that was installed several years ago, and that streetscape shall remain. Any damage to the streetscape during construction shall be repaired to match the Church Street streetscape standards.
- b) South Lee Avenue shall use a modified treatment 4 and a sidewalk width of 8 feet where feasible.
- c) Pedestrian Crossings—The pedestrian crossings at driveway entries shall be at the same grade as the sidewalk adjacent to the driveway. A pavement treatment a minimum of 7-feet wide that contrasts with the vehicle lanes shall be used in order to clearly define the pedestrian area. Reflective paint alone is not acceptable, however may be used in conjunction with pavers or other surfaces to define the pedestrian path for nighttime safety. Slope transitions to the street shall occur between the sidewalk and edge of pavement.
- d) The applicant shall work with staff to enhance the Lee Streetscape.

4. Mechanical Equipment:

- a) Venting & Exhaust—All potential venting and exhaust shall be directed to the roof of the building and shall not be visible from the public right-of-way. If visible from the right-of-way the equipment shall be screened with louvers or architectural mesh that extends to the full height of the equipment. Exhaust venting is not permitted on any street facing building façade. All other venting and exhaust for mechanical equipment and other utilities shall be a minimum of 12 ft. above grade, shall be integrated with the building design so as to be seamless with the overall architecture of the building, and must not be directed over pedestrian areas. Exterior vent panels shall be painted to match the building façade color surrounding them.
- b) Transformer Area Screening—Transformer areas outside the building envelope shall be screened on three sides with a hedge that is 36-inches tall at the time of planting and maintained at the height of the transformer.
- c) Mechanical Equipment—All ground mounted and rooftop mechanical equipment shall be screened from view and meet the screening conditions of the Land Development Code. An exterior screen wall or parapet for rooftop mechanical equipment may be required. The exterior screen wall or parapet shall be the same height as the installed mechanical equipment height. Mechanical equipment shall be located at least 10 feet away from any edge of the building.
- d) Backflow Preventer—Backflow preventer[s] shall be located so as to not be directly visible from the right-of-way and should be screened from view where necessary. They shall be clearly identified on the final utilities plan.

e) Final Elevations—The location and configuration of all exterior venting and mechanical equipment shall be depicted on the building elevations. Final building elevations with venting depicted on the elevations shall be submitted for ARB Staff review prior to issuance of building permits.

5. **Signage**— Signage will require additional ARB review.

Richard Forbes, Project Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation that showed map location, site photos, survey map, 802 W Interstruct tower ground + 2-unit plan, landscape plan, façade elevations, color renderings, materials, perspective, images, and Staff conditions of approval.

Board discussion ensued:

- Parking lot screen wall
- Design
- Streetscape

Board agrees that the Church Street frontage has a great opportunity to activate that space and to make the Lee streetscape pedestrian friendly.

Danny Gordon MOVED to approve the request ARB2021-10010 subject to staff conditions with the addition of condition 3.D, Clarisse Gates SECONDED the motion, voted upon, and PASSED by unanimous voice vote (5 -0)

COURTESY REVIEW

4. Case No: ARB2022-10029, 924 North Magnolia Avenue Courtesy Review

Applicant: Vanessa Vedelago, Baker Barrios architects, 189 S Orange Ave. Orlando, FL 32801
 Owner: North Magnolia Owner, LLC Acram Group., 411 W Putnam Avenue. Greenwich, CT 06830
 District: Commissioner District 3
 Project Planner: Richard Forbes
 Description: **Request for a Courtesy Review of a 20 story, 386-unit multi-family project with 8-story attached parking garage.**

Recommended Action: Courtesy Review, No Action Required

Richard Forbes, Project Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation that showed Location, Site photos, Weber Ave Plat, gross area floor plan, architectural site Plan, elevations, 3D views, renderings, and conditions of approval.

Wayne Dunkelberger, Baker Barrios gave a PowerPoint presentation that showed Map of site, gross area floor plans, diagrams and perspective.

Board discussion comments:

- Sidewalk level
- North retail
- East retail
- Pedestrian Level access
- Building Height

Board member Cowart expressed concerns about the Pedestrian level, retail access to the North and East side. Mr. Dunkelberger indicated that they are going to set the finished floor at three feet above the crown of the road and throw three steps above the crowd of the road; he stated that the renderings aren't entirely accurate yet, expressed that the road goes up and then down. What they are planning on doing is setting the three steps above the crown of the road along with stair stepping and cascading to meet the roads that are dropping and falling to Lake Ivanhoe rather than taking the entire site and just sloping it down as a hill. The pedestrian

experience is important, and they care about articulating access for pedestrians and Plaza-type steps that are longer and broader for seating and walking also the ADA access also provides the appropriate ramps to get there. Looking at the survey he noticed a hump in the middle of the site which he asked for clarification on that area.

Mr. Dunkleberger expressed that they are in early phases, however that is a top priority, it is part of the essence of the project and part of what the client wants it's going to take some study however, they will have a well-defined street presence because it will define the project.

Board member Gates echoed Mr. Cowart's comments and expressed that this is a massive project. She indicated that working with the retail front edge. Scaling that down will add more benefits to that senior Center and overall area.

Board member Arms expressed that he is very impressed with the design, orientation, and perspective. With the Senior Center standing for itself and the others, there will be something behind it that does not have that distraction.

Mr. Cowart asked for clarification on height and the difference between the three towers. The other two being so much further north and north of the parking garage perhaps gives some interest to the massing of the building and creates less of an imposing backdrop. As a concession to the developer, instead of reducing the height, maybe, reducing the height closer, but then stepping it up further away seems like that could be a potential strategy that might work.

NEW BUSINESS:

- No Items

OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Board members may attend the Appearance Review Board meetings virtually via Zoom Webinar. If in person quorum is required, the Board Secretary will work with board members to determine if attendance will be in person or via Zoom. Board members are not permitted to attend by telephone only due to the inability to view visual presentations provided at the meeting for consideration of the projects to be recommended for approval/denial.

B. ARB Minor Reviews completed since the May 31, 2022, ARB Meeting:

6 Minor Reviews since the May 31, 2022, meeting.

- ARB2022-10021
- ARB2022-10022
- ARB2022-10024
- ARB2022-10028
- ARB2022-10031
- ARB2022-10032

C. Creative Village Development Review Committee Projects for Approval.

- None

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairperson Jill Rose adjourned the meeting at approximately TIME 3:30 p.m.

THE NEXT MEETING OF THE APPEARANCE REVIEW BOARD WILL BE THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 2022, AT 2:00 PM

STAFF PRESENT

Melissa Clarke, Assistant City Attorney II
Richard Forbes, Appearance Review Official
Doug Metzger, Chief Planner
Shannan Stegman, Community Planning
Yesenia Martinez, Business Development

Walter Hawkins, Executive Secretary
Fernanda Paronetto, City Planning
Gabriella Isaac, Recording Secretary
Jason Burton, City Planning



Walter Hawkins, Acting Executive Secretary



Gabriella Isaac, Recording Secretary