

# SITE PLAN EVALUATION SHEET

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 334-5072 M.S. 58

Petition No. 114SPL-05 DB Review Date: 8/9/05  
 Review For: Technical Review Committee Plan Reviewed: 8/9/2005  
 Description, Agent & Location: Regents Park Phase III  
Brown & Cullen 405 NE 1<sup>st</sup> St.


Review Type: Preliminary Final  
 Project Planner: Gene Francis

**APPROVED**  
 (as submitted)

**APPROVED**  
 (subject to below)

**DISAPPROVED**

- Alachua County Environmental Review Required
- Alachua County Environmental Review Not Required
- 100 Yr. critical duration storm event must be analyzed.
- SJRWMD stormwater permit is required.
- Treatment volume must be recovered within 72 Hrs. (F.S. of 2)
- Approved for Concurrency

Comments By:  
  
 Rick Melzer P.E.  
 Development Review Engineer

REVISIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Bi-directional handi-cap ramps must be provided at the North east and South west corners of the site. The North west corner may remain as shown.

8. **Petition 114SPL-05 DB** Brown & Cullen, Inc., agent for City of Gainesville. Development plan review to construct the second phase of a multi-family residential complex. Zoned: CCD (Up to 150 units/acre central city district). Located between Northeast 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenues in the 400 block.

Mr. Gene Francis was recognized. Mr. Francis presented a map of the site and described it and the surrounding uses in detail. He noted that the project under consideration, Regent's Park Phase II, located directly east of City Hall, was the final phase of the Commerce Center Mixed-Use development. He explained that the development consisted of the Commerce Building and Regent's Park Phases I and II. He presented an aerial photo and pointed out the area to be developed. He noted that the photo was several years old and still pictured the City parking lot that was removed to construct Regent's Park Phase I. Mr. Francis presented photos of the site and the surrounding area. He offered to answer any questions from the board.

Mr. Boyes asked if the City was the petitioner, as stated in the record.

Mr. Stuart Cullen was recognized. Mr. Cullen stated that he represented AMJ in the project. He explained that the City was listed as the petitioner because the City owned the property. He noted that the project, the Commerce Center and Regent's Park Phases I and II, were part of an agreement and the property would be transferred to AMJ for the development of the condo units.

Mr. Boyes noted that when the project that included the Commerce Center and condos were first proposed, there was to have been a parking garage on the east side of City Hall.

Mr. Francis indicated that there had been discussion of a parking garage around City Hall for the last 10 or 15 years. He stated that it was not out of the question in the future, but there was no active discussion on the matter at the present time.

Mr. Cullen explained that prior to the construction of the Commerce Center and Regent's Park Phase I, the City undertook streetscaping along NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in order to add medians and parallel and angled parking spaces. He explained that the Commerce Center housed offices and Regent's Park Phase I consisted of condominiums. He indicated that Regent's Park Phase II involved 20 condo units and 20 parking garages. He noted that the sidewalk system would also be finished along NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, NE 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, and NE 5<sup>th</sup> Street. He noted that the board's packets contained a request for a variance for the sidewalks reducing them to 5-foot width rather than 6 feet as required by the Code. He explained that the request was based upon the availability of right-of-way and lack of setback. Mr. Cullen explained that there were a few trees on the site but they were of low quality. He noted that NE 5<sup>th</sup> Street was not a public street but was maintained as a thoroughfare. He described the layout of the building and landscape plan. He noted that stormwater would be handled by the City's east compensating basin. Mr. Cullen indicated that he would agree with all of staff's comments. He offered to answer any questions from the board.

Mr. Boyes asked if there was any treatment of stormwater, or if it ran directly in to the creek.

Mr. Cullen indicated that it would run into the City stormwater system, which then discharged to the creek. He stated that there would be no treatment, but the existing phases of the project were on the same system. He explained that the creek would be treated downstream in a basin.

Mr. Higman pointed out that the basin had not yet been constructed.

Mr. Boyes asked if there would be additional parking over the 20 garages to be constructed.

Mr. Cullen stated that no parking was required in the area, and there would be no additional parking.

Mr. Boyes asked how many bedrooms were in the project.

Mr. Cullen stated that there were 44 bedrooms.

Mr. Boyes asked where persons who occupied the 24 bedrooms that were not assigned parking spaces would park.

Mr. Cullen stated that on-street parking was available. He explained that some of the parking spaces would be metered and others would be City decal. He indicated that there were 13 parking spaces on NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street combined, and several spaces on NE 5<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Francis pointed out that there was also parking for the Thelma Bolton Center and excess parking directly to the east of the project.

Mr. Boyes noted that he recently went to the Commerce Center for a City function and could not find a parking space within blocks of the Center. He indicated that the area around the Commerce Center was a difficult place to park. He asked about the City's involvement in the project and if the Development Review Board could place a condition on the petition that the City modify the parking situation. He pointed out that the City was part of the application and there was an existing parking problem.

Mr. Calderon explained that parking was not required in the district where the project was to be constructed. He suggested that the board make a request to the City Commission on the matter.

Mr. Boyes pointed out that there were meters all around City Hall, which made it made it difficult to park, particularly for customers who wished to patronize businesses in the area. He suggested that it might be advantageous to remove some of the meters to make parking available during the day.

Mr. Frankenberger agreed that it was difficult to find parking downtown. He pointed out that if a person found a metered parking space, but had to stay longer than two hours and were get back to the cars to add more money, there was a problem.

Mr. Shatkin suggested that if the meters were pulled, residents of the condos who did not have a garages would park in those spots and stay there all day long.

Mr. Calderon suggested that the board make a motion and refer the matter to staff and the Plan Board to discuss the issue of parking.

Mr. Boyes pointed out that it had been suggested that the Thelma Bolton Center was a possible parking option, however, the Thelma Bolton Center parking was already over allocated.

Mr. Cullen reiterated that the project did not require any parking and the developer had provided one space per unit. He pointed out that there was a parking garage 4 blocks from the project.

Mr. Boyes reiterated that the City was part of the petition.

Mr. Francis pointed out that the City authorized AMJ to construct the project, however, he did not believe the City was part of the application.

Mr. Cullen indicated that the City was not involved in the project and transfer of the property to the developer had been closed. He stated that when the application for development was filed, it was correct at that point.

Mr. Boyes indicated that he thought the development was appropriate for the area; however, there was a serious existing parking problem, especially for downtown businesses. He stated that the situation needed to be addressed. He pointed out that the current parking arrangement often did not allow citizens to get to City agencies for City business.

Mr. Cullen indicated that he would try to add additional motorcycle parking to the project. He stated that the on street parking in the area was part of a City Public Works project.

Mr. Boyes noted that the City vacated the right-of-way between the Commerce Center and Regent's Park Phase I at the time of the development.

Mr. Cullen explained that the City vacated the right-of-way because the Code prohibited parking that backed out into that right-of-way, and the parking for the Commerce Center and Regent's Park Phase I was designed with back out parking.

Chair Cooper opened the floor to public comment.

Mr. Dan Lochabella, resident of Regent's Park Phase I, was recognized. Mr. Lochabella stated that he would be opposed to removing the parking meters in the area. He pointed out that there was a parking garage a few blocks away. He suggested that the board should weigh the matter of people living in the area, not just those persons who come downtown to go to City Hall. He stated that, while he did have a garage, there were two cars in the household.

Ms. Su An Guin, tenant of the Commerce Center and resident of Regent's Park Phase I, was recognized. Ms. Guin discussed the parking situation.

Ms. Susanne Moody, representing the owners of businesses at 500 East Properties, was recognized. Ms. Moody stated that parking was a problem downtown. She explained that their building was constructed in 1989 and adequate parking existed at that time. She noted, however, after the main library was constructed across University Avenue, parking became very difficult. She explained that she had offered to purchase property from the City for parking and was turned down, however, she was leased 20 spaces in a City lot near the Bolton Center. Ms. Moody cited concerns about the lack of a staging area for the construction of the new condos and loss of the 20 leased spaces. She stated that it was too far for customers and employees to walk from the parking garage 500 East Properties, especially in poor weather conditions. She noted that the First Credit Union

*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.*

and Melting Pot Restaurant did not have adequate parking, and persons going there often parked in the 500 East Properties parking lot, which left their customers without parking.

Mr. Cullen agreed that the staging area for the condos would be a challenge. He indicated that the developers were working on the problem and would attempt to complete the construction as soon as possible. He agreed that there would be some use of areas immediately adjacent to the project.

Mr. Shatkin asked how trash collection would work for the condos.

Mr. Cullen indicated that it would be the same as Phase I, which had individual containers housed under the front stairs and brought out to a specific location on collection dates. He pointed out areas of the driveways where the cans were picked up.

Ms. Guin discussed how she placed her trashcans for collection.

Mr. Higman noted that the 20 units proposed by the applicant could easily be placed west of I-75 on a hundred acres, which would meet the County's requirements. He suggested that the project was saving green space around Gainesville.

Mr. Shatkin pointed out that, with regards to saving green space, the area upon which the condos were to be constructed was green space at the present time. He noted that much tree canopy had been removed to construct Phase I, and more would be removed to construct Phase II. He suggested that the parking situation would inevitably become a crisis, and the matter should be considered. Mr. Shatkin noted that part of the reason a plan came before the board was that there had not been a resolution of issues between staff and the applicant. He pointed out that there were no comments from the Public Works Department in the board's packets.

<u>Motion By:</u> Mr. Higman	<u>Seconded By:</u> Mr. Frankenberger
<u>Moved To:</u> Approve Petition 114SPL-05 DB, with staff conditions.	<u>Upon Vote:</u> Motion Carried 5 - 0 Yeas: Frankenberger, Shatkin, Ingram, Higman, Cooper

<u>Motion By:</u> Mr. Boyes	<u>Seconded By:</u> Mr. Shatkin
<u>Moved To:</u> Request that the City Commission direct Public Works to revisit the parking situation around City Hall, and possibly reconfigure some metered and non-metered parking east toward the Melting Pot Restaurant.	<u>Upon Vote:</u> Motion Carried 5 - 0 Yeas: Frankenberger, Shatkin, Ingram, Higman, Cooper