

030904i

applicable design vehicle requirements. Vehicle loading and service facilities will be designed to provide adequate maneuvering areas internal to the site, rather than using public streets and rights-of-ways.

### **VEHICULAR CORRIDOR DESIGN STANDARDS**

Corridor and drive design standards, as described below, will be the only vehicle access provided:

- 1) **Private Drive:**  
The private entrance drives shall be 24 feet of pavement allowing two-way vehicular traffic access. The two access points to the garage are unique. Therefore, cut-through traffic is not possible between NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street.
- 2) **Restricted Ingress/Egress Drive:**  
The restricted ingress/egress drive shall provide 16 feet of stabilized surface allowing vehicular access to NW 12<sup>th</sup> Street. The restricted access will not allow cut-through traffic. As per Code, 20' of unobstructed emergency vehicle access will be established.

### **SIDEWALKS**

Consistent with the Goals of the City of Gainesville's Traditional City overlay, the development will have both internal and external sidewalks with a minimum of 5 feet of clear widths and will accommodate new public sidewalks on NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and NW 12<sup>th</sup> Street where there currently are no sidewalks on the project's south and east frontage. Existing sidewalks on NW 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street will be retained and enhanced with additional streetscaping.

### **LANDSCAPING**

All plant material will be Florida #1 grade or better as outlined by Grades and Standards for Nursery Plants, Division of Plant Industry, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. The street yard buffer area shall be calculated from the back of curb to the face of the structures. Landscape improvements within the street yard buffer shall contain appropriate materials as defined in the City of Gainesville Land Development Codes. The basins, if any, will be planted at a minimum of 25% and shall include the equivalent of at least one shade tree per 35 linear feet of basin perimeter and other species conducive to growth in or around wet detention systems. Rattlesnake Branch areas will remain undisturbed, but may include the removal of non-native and invasive species by hand or small machinery. Augmentation of the wetlands with additional native or wetland species shall occur with approval of the St. John's River Water Management District.

### **SIGNAGE PLAN**

The project shall conform to the sign regulations stipulated in Division 1, Article IX of the City of Gainesville's Land Development Code for the construction of all site signs.

## **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT**

Consistent with the Goals of the City of Gainesville's Special Area Plan for the Traditional City:

*"All mechanical equipment must be placed on the roof, in the rear, or side of the building, or otherwise visually screened from the street. In no case shall mechanical equipment be allowed along street frontage(s). Mechanical equipment on the roof shall be screened from abutting streets with parapets or other types of visual screening."*

Therefore, all mechanical equipment will be visually screened from the street.

3. **Petition 10PDV-04 PB** Causseaux & Ellington, Inc., agent for Park Central Holdings. Rezone property from OF (general office), MU-1 (mixed-use low intensity 10-30 du/acre), and RMF-8 (multiple-family medium density residential 8-30 du/acre) to PD (planned development) for a 225-unit multiple-family apartment complex on 7 acres more-or-less. Located in the 1200-1300 block between Northwest 7th and 8th Avenues. Related to Petition 9LUC-04 PB.

Mr. Gerry Dedenbach, agent for the petitioner, was recognized. Mr. Dedenbach presented renderings of the proposed structures on the street front.

Mr. Causseaux, engineer for the petitioner, was recognized. Mr. Causseaux discussed the layout of the proposed stormwater system, creek setbacks, wetlands, and the wetland setback based upon the City's new wetland ordinance.

Mr. Dedenbach presented a site plan layout and described it in detail. He pointed out three large oak trees that would remain as part of the project. He noted that there was one central parking garage that was internal to the site. He explained that the PD allowed for up to 15,000 square feet of commercial uses consistent with the Mixed-Use Low Zoning category. Mr. Dedenbach indicated that there was consensus on most of staff's conditions, but he did wish to discuss others. Regarding Condition 2, he requested that commercial uses be located in a multi-story building rather than the 2-story building required by staff. Regarding Condition 4, which called for fencing, Mr. Dedenbach presented language that would allow options other than a fence. He agreed that the idea was to keep people out of the environmentally sensitive areas, but it did not seem appropriate to fence the creek on both sides. He noted that there would be an above grade boardwalk system with a railing. He explained that the boardwalk would provide passive recreation and a view of the creek. Regarding Condition 6, he requested language that allowed construction of a fence or an above grade boardwalk system and stormwater management in the areas delineated as setbacks. Mr. Dedenbach requested that Condition 7 be modified to allow the building setback to be 15 to 30 feet rather than the 20 to 30 feet requested by staff. He stated that the project would unify the pedestrian system around the block. He indicated that he wished to clarify that the height restrictions in Condition 10 were measured from the finished floor elevation to the top plate of the highest story and excluding stair towers. Regarding Condition 16, he requested that the traffic analysis with the petition be accepted as the analysis required in Condition 16. He noted that the primary access points would be on NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street and NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and there would be limited access points on NW 12<sup>th</sup> Street for emergency access and controlled access for residents. Regarding Condition 19, he requested that a specific context area be proscribed, rather than the open ended potential of the staff condition. On Condition 23, Mr. Dedenbach requested that it be specified that the NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue access was a vehicular access. He indicated that the same specification of a vehicular access applied with Condition 24 as it had with Condition 23. Regarding Condition 25, he requested that the language read, "...consistent with the intent of the Traditional City," rather than, "...consistent with the intent of the Traditional City and Central Corridor Overlay," as requested by staff. On Condition 26, he requested that the sidewalks be provided along the project roadway frontages. Mr. Dedenbach indicated that the cover sheet stated that the Development Review Board should review the project. He requested that the Plan Board review the site plan rather than the DRB. He offered to answer any questions from the board.

Chair Pearce requested that there be a motion to continue the meeting past the regular 10:30 PM cut-off time.

*These minutes are not a verbatim account of this meeting. Tape recordings from which the minutes were prepared are available from the Community Development Department of the City of Gainesville.*

<u>Motion By:</u> Mr. Gold	<u>Seconded By:</u> Mr. Polshek
<u>Moved to:</u> Continue the meeting until 11:00 PM, then again review the time factor.	<u>Upon Vote:</u> Motion Carried 6 – 0 Ayes: Andrews, Cole, Gold, Pearce, Polshek, Reiskind

Mr. Calderon stated that the plan would have to meet Comprehensive Plan concurrency. He indicated that he wished to state for the record that staff had made the determination that the project was in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and met the concurrency requirements. He stated that staff had concerns about the area north of the creek and the setbacks. He pointed out that there were conditions proposed to address those concerns and staff felt the plan would be internally compatible with those conditions. Regarding external compatibility, Mr. Calderon noted that the project was surrounded by a number of uses and because of the requirements for façade treatments, sidewalks and the type of streetscape, the project would meet the external compatibility requirements. He noted that any commercial development would have to occur along NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street. He agreed that the environmental concerns were better met since there would be no residential units north of the creek, but he wanted to make it clear, that the provision was only an opportunity to explore the stormwater development on the north side of the creek. He explained that any stormwater development would have to meet all requirements and there had to be a positive recommendation from the environmental consultant. Mr. Calderon stated that he had reviewed all the conditions and amendments as presented by Mr. Dedenbach and staff's recommendation was for approval as such.

Chair Pearce asked if Mr. Calderon agreed with the changes to the conditions proposed by Mr. Dedenbach.

Mr. Calderon indicated that he did.

Chair Pearce asked if that agreement included bringing the petition back to the Plan Board for site plan review rather than taking it to the Development Review Board. He explained that he did not know the procedure required by the Code for such matters. He asked if the plan was allowed to come back to the Plan Board rather than go to the DRB.

Mr. Calderon indicated that he believed the board had that option.

Chair Pearce opened the floor to public comment.

Mr. Sam Harris was recognized. Mr. Harris cited concerns about vehicle impacts 5 blocks to the west of the site on NW 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He pointed out that traffic calming on streets around the site was approved for previous developments on the site. He indicated that, as he read the plan, the building orientations would be interior rather than exterior, which was not consistent with traditional neighborhoods. He suggested that the fence on NW 12<sup>th</sup> Street and NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue be removed and the buildings have their primary entrances on those facades. He asked about the installation of bus stops and a possible connection from NW 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue to NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street at the overpass. He noted that there was existing foot traffic where people climbed the hill.

Mr. Dedenbach presented the design drawings of the proposed buildings and noted that the buildings on NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and NW 12<sup>th</sup> Street would have entrances, balconies and windows, and the proposed fencing would be residential scaled. He explained that there would be entrances on both sides.

Mr. Polshek asked why NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue was selected as a primary access point rather than NW 12<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Dedenbach explained that the access on NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street was the primary entrance. He noted that NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue would allow an exit without going through the neighborhoods.

Mr. Polshek asked if the developer would provide bus stops on NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Dedenbach stated that it was a staff condition and the developer had been working on the matter.

Mr. Polshek cited a concern about amount of residential development on NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street. He asked why more commercial area was not proposed.

Mr. Dedenbach explained that it was a similar situation to living in the downtown area. He noted that people would choose where they wished to live. He pointed out that there was a mix of uses along NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Polshek asked if the ground floor would be reserved for commercial/retail use.

Mr. Dedenbach stated that it was not reserved, but a certain percentage of the frontage could be commercial uses, though it was not mandated to be on the bottom floor. He explained that there could be commercial offices on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor.

Mr. Polshek asked if the apartments facing NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue would have stoops.

Mr. Dedenbach stated that there would be stoops.

Mr. Polshek asked if there would be additional bicycle striping.

Mr. Dedenbach explained that NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street was not wide enough to have bicycle lanes. He explained that he would be coordinating with the City on the matter. He noted that on street parking would be added to NW 12<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Polshek indicated that he agreed with Mr. Harris concerning the pedestrian access at NW 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the overpass at NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street. He asked if the developer could consider constructing some type of access.

Mr. Dedenbach stated that it was one of the items discussed during development plan review, but there were difficulties in the tremendous grade change and making it handicapped accessible.

Mr. Polshek asked why there was a maximum of 3 stories on NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He asked if the petitioner would have proposed more stories if possible.

Mr. Dedenbach stated that the design of the development was 3 stories.

Mr. Polshek suggested that, if 5 percent of the units were affordable, it would only be 11.25 units. He recommended that the petitioner consider reserving that 5 percent. He asked about the traffic calming on NW 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue that was proposed by previous developers who wished to build on the site. He stated that he would like to make some of his comments conditions.

Mr. Dedenbach noted the agreements about traffic calming on NW 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue were private agreements between the previous developers and the neighbors. He stated that the petitioner had not entered into any private agreements with the neighborhood.

Chair Pearce requested that the board make a determination on the hour and how to deal with the remaining petitions.

<u>Motion By:</u> Mr. Andrews	<u>Seconded By:</u> Mr. Gold
<u>Moved to:</u> Continue the meeting until discussion is completed on Petition 10PDV-04 PB, then recess until March 25, 2004.	<u>Upon Vote:</u> Motion Carried 6 – 0 Ayes: Andrews, Cole, Gold, Pearce, Polshak, Reiskind

Mr. Reiskind suggested that NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street was dangerous for bicyclists, and the enhancements might be better used on NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue, west of the development.

Chair Pearce stated that he had a concern about the proposed width of the sidewalk on NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street. He suggested that it be a minimum of 8 feet. He noted that the petitioner had requested that the building setback on NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street be as close as 15 feet. He indicated that he believed 15 feet was insufficient distance for an 8-foot sidewalk and functional street trees.

Mr. Dedenbach explained that the City had placed street trees along the section of NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street and the FDOT requested that the trees be removed. He cited a concern that the same might occur with any trees planted by the developer. He indicated that there had been discussion of methods to enhance the space in front of the building.

Chair Pearce indicated that he was referring to the private space and not public right-of-way.

Mr. Buford Davis, landscape architect for the project, was recognized. He explained that the space in front of the building was tight, but the buildings articulated back and forth and the 15 to 30 feet would give space to work with the whole area. He noted that there were street buffers required.

Mr. Polshak indicated that he would like to add 5 conditions to the petition. He requested that the petitioner work to insure that there are enhanced bicycle stripes on NW 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue from NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street to NW 17<sup>th</sup> Street; that a percentage of the ground floor on NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street be required to be retail/office/commercial use; that the project accommodate a percentage of affordable housing.

Chair Pearce suggested that it was inappropriate to require the petitioner to have commercial type uses when he wished to have residences. He stated that he saw no reason to deny a petition because of that issue.

Mr. Dedenbach noted that there was the option for commercial, if it was feasible.

Mr. John Fleming, speaking for Park Central Holdings, stated that the market would not allow commercial. He stated that the number of people in the apartments would help support the existing commercial development along NW 13<sup>th</sup> Street. He explained that market would not dictate affordable housing either.

*These minutes are not a verbatim account of this meeting. Tape recordings from which the minutes were prepared are available from the Community Development Department of the City of Gainesville.*