



| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Members: Timothy Miller, Chairman | | Ex-Officio and Staff Distribution: | |
| John Fischer, Vice Chair | | Don Robertson, Public Works, Urban Forester | |
| Logan Rink, Secretary | | Bill Joyce, PW Chief Engineering & Construction Management | |
| Andy Sikes, Board Member | | Richard Ball, PW, Traffic Operations Division | |
| Montasser (Monty) Selim, Board Member | | Don Redman, Member of Council, District 4 | |
| James Bailey, Board Member | | Scott Shine, Jacksonville Waterways Commission | |
| Chris Flagg, Board Member | | James Boyle, JTA Representative | |
| Jonathan Garza, Board Member | | Vickie Drake, Ex-Officio Member | |
| Roland Udenze, Board Member | | Terry Lorince, Ex-Officio Member | |
| | | William Lyle, Ex-Officio Member | |
| Ex-Officio and Staff Distribution: | | Joel McEachin, Ex-Officio Member | |
| Paul Crawford, JEDC Acting ED | | Michael Sands, Ex-Officio Member | |
| Eric Lindstrom, JEDC Staff Liaison | | David DeCamp, Public Information Office | |
| Jim Klement, JEDC Staff Liaison | | Michelle Stephens, JEDC Recording Secretary | |
| Jason Teal, Assistant General Counsel | | | |
| | | | |
| I. | CALL TO ORDER – Chairman Miller | | |
| | | | |
| II. | ACTION ITEMS – Chairman Miller | | |
| | Approval of the September 6, 2012 Meeting Minutes | | |
| | DDRB 2012-006, Parador Parking Garage Request for Final Approval | | |
| | DDRB 2012-010, Aetna Building Identification Signs and Deviations | | |
| | | | |
| III. | INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS – Chairman Miller | | |
| | DDRB 2010-001, Pedestrian Bridge connecting the Duval County Unified Courthouse Facility | | |
| | | | |
| IV. | OLD BUSINESS – Chairman Miller | | |
| | | | |
| V. | NEW BUSINESS – Chairman Miller | | |
| | | | |
| VI. | PUBLIC COMMENTS – Chairman Miller | | |
| | | | |
| VII. | ADJOURNMENT – Chairman Miller | | |
| | Next Scheduled Meeting: Thursday, November 1, 2012 at 2:00 p.m. | | |



Thursday, October 11, 2012 – 2 p.m.

MEETING MINUTES

Board Members Present: Chairman T. Miller, A. Sikes, C. Flagg, R. Udenze, J. Fischer, L. Rink, M. Selim, J. Garza, and J. Bailey

OED Staff Present: Jim Klement, Staff Liaison; Eric Lindstrom, Staff Liaison; and Michelle Stephens, Recording Secretary

Representing Office of General Counsel: Jason Teal

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Miller called the meeting to order at approximately 2:04 p.m.

Chairman Miller advised that since the information/discussion item on the agenda “DDRB 2010-001, Pedestrian Bridge connecting the Duval County Unified Courthouse Facility” would only be about a ten minute presentation that they would present following the approval of the meeting minutes.

II. ACTION ITEMS

APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 6, 2012 DDRB MEETING MINUTES

It was noted that on page one of the meeting minutes, “Call to Order” Chairman Miller called the meeting to order not Chairman Sikes.

THE SEPTEMBER 6, 2012 DDRB MEETING MINUTES WERE APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY 9-0, AS AMENDED.

INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEM - DDRB 2010-001, Pedestrian Bridge connecting the Duval County Unified Courthouse Facility

Mr. Klement advised that the project was being presented today for informational purposes only to keep the Board informed as Public Works moves through their review and final design process, noting that the project would return to the Board for approval.

Mr. Tom Goldsbury and John Pappas with Public Works were present on behalf of the project. Mr. Goldsbury provided an updated overview of the project (handout attached as a part of the meeting minutes). Mr. Goldsbury noted that they are not ready for Board approval, but that they do plan to return to the Board for approval, adding that today they are seeking input from the Board in order to direct their architect for the project in the right direction.

The following were relative comments from the Board:

- Concerned with treatment of windows suggesting they look at the reveal pattern (too many vertical reveals) and suggested repeating the horizontal limestone detail from the old federal courthouse building.
- Overall, not fond of design.
- Suggested reducing the number of windows and replicating the motif across the top of the old building (window, decorative panel, window).
- Asked if it was absolutely necessary to build the bridge now, suggesting the project be delayed until more money was available. Mr. Goldsbury replied that it would not be cost effective.

DDRB 2012-006, PARADOR PARTNERS PARKING GARAGE REQUEST FOR CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Mr. Klement reviewed the project report for DDRB 2012-006 dated October 11, 2012. He introduced John Norris and Christopher Holmes, Project Principal with Haskell, who were present to provide an overview of the project.

Board Member Udenze advised that he would abstain from voting because he works for the company presenting the project.

Mr. Holmes provided an overview of the project.

The following were relative comments from the Board:

- Related to the courtyard between the garage and the SunTrust Building (Slide 13) - suggested creating some kind of small retail space along the wall (wall is uninviting). Suggested the space could be enhanced to serve as more than an “alley,” more vertical, flag poles, etc.
- Asked the Board to ask themselves if the design standards of the garage compliment the prominence of the site.
- Still looking for the punch from the design and innovative standard. Need to be as creative and innovative as possible to make this not a garage, but a multipurpose building that you happen to park in.
- Referring to the façade along Hogan Street that resembles breaks and indentation - asked if they could do the same with the roof parapets.
- Overall still not impressed with the project and garage concept on prime piece of property downtown.
- Along Hogan Street, trees, shade, and canopies, etc. were discussed.
- Suggested for the first phase that the facade on Bay Street be replicated along Hogan Street.
- Still not convinced that there is a need for the parking garage.
- Referencing an earlier comment about cars parking on the Sister Cities property that are not supposed to - spoke to the parking lot legislation that gave property owners two years to comply (recently extended to three years) is the reason we don't need a parking garage

because there are still cars parking on vacant lots that should not be. If the lots were not an option, the garage could be an asset.

- The first phase of the project should include improvements to the Sister Cities property that create interaction between the garage and the Landing until phase two develops.
- Asked about the ground level where there are openings for parking - does not see delineated what that would be. Mr. Holmes replied that it was still to be articulated. They have discussed it being a big framed opening since it will hopefully be covered up fairly quickly. Suggested it may be a similar solution to parking at the courthouse garage where you have a larger panelized piece with a grillage in that.
- Reiterated to the Board that we have a suburban mentality in this city and we will continue to exasperate that mentality with continuing the perception of no parking and that sort of thing downtown, adding that we are settling. The Board is here to try and maintain the integrity of what downtown we have and hopefully the next steps for our downtown is a positive eventful vital one to the life of the city. Questioned again if the garage matches the proximity of the site. It is the Board's responsibility to maintain the integrity of a true downtown, a true and urban landscape.

A third condition of approval was inadvertently missing from staff's recommendations for approval (Applicant to provide traffic report and air quality modeling program indicating the garage meets the requirements of the Fla. Dept. of Protection regarding such before the issuance of a City building permit).

In addition to staff's recommendations, the Board discussed and agreed that as a condition of final approval, they would like three items to return to the Board for review and approval.

1. Design for the plaza between the garage and SunTrust Building
2. Treatment of the openings on ground level along Hogan Street
3. Parapet heights

A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER SIKES AND SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER FISCHER GRANTING A DEVIATION FROM SECTION 656.361.16 OFF-STREET OVERLAY TO NOT PROVIDE REQUIRED 50% RETAIL FOR THE BUILDING FRONTAGE ON BAY STREET UNTIL RETAIL MARKET CONDITIONS WARRANT FOR DDRB 2012-006, PARADOR PARTNERS PARKING GARAGE.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 6-2-1 (BOARD MEMBER FLAGG AND BOARD MEMBER RINK VOTED IN OPPOSITION OF THE MOTION (NOT IN FAVOR OF PROJECT OVERALL). BOARD MEMBER UDENZE ABSTAINED FROM VOTING.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER FISCHER AND SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER SIKES GRANTING A DEVIATION FROM SECTION 656.361.18 TRANSPARENCY TO NOT PROVIDE THE REQUIRED 50% TRANSPARENT DESIGN REQUIREMENT BETWEEN THE HEIGHT OF 2 AND 10 FEET ON 80 FEET OF THE BAY STREET BUILDING FAÇADE FRONTAGE UNTIL RETAIL MARKET

CONDITIONS WARRANT FOR DDRB 2012-006, PARADOR PARTNERS PARKING GARAGE.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 6-2-1 (BOARD MEMBER FLAGG AND BOARD MEMBER RINK VOTED IN OPPOSITION OF THE MOTION (NOT IN FAVOR OF PROJECT OVERALL). BOARD MEMBER UDENZE ABSTAINED FROM VOTING.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER FISCHER AND SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER SIKES GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL FOR DDRB 2012-006, PARADOR PARTNERS PARKING GARAGE WITH THREE CONDITIONS.

- 1. IN LIEU OF SEEKING A DEVIATION TO SECTION 656.361.16 OFF-STREET OVERLAY REQUIREMENTS TO REDUCE THE COMMERCIAL/RETAIL REQUIREMENT OF 50% OF STREET FRONTAGE ON HOGAN STREET, THE APPLICANT SHALL AGREE TO PROVIDE BUILDING TENANT OCCUPANCY MONITORING REPORTS FOR THE SUN TRUST TOWER TO THE DIA BOARD STAFF ON A SEMI-ANNUAL BASIS WITH REPORTS DELIVERED IN JUNE AND DECEMBER OF EACH YEAR AFTER DDRB APPROVAL OF PHASE 1 OF THE PROJECT UNTIL THE 65% TENANT OCCUPANCY RATE OF THE SUN TRUST TOWER LOCATED AT 76 SOUTH LAURA STREET IS ACHIEVED. WITHIN ONE YEAR AFTER A 65% OCCUPANCY RATE IS ACHIEVED, THE APPLICANT SHALL COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION OF THE DDRB APPROVED PLAN FOR THE COMMERCIAL/RETAIL SPACE AND COMPLETE THE SPACE WITH ACTIVE TENANTS IN PLACE WITHIN 12 MONTHS OF COMMENCEMENT (APPLICANT'S COMMERCIAL/RETAIL MITIGATION STRATEGY).**
- 2. APPLICANT TO PROVIDE TRAFFIC REPORT AND AIR QUALITY MODELING PROGRAM INDICATING THE GARAGE MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF PROTECTION REGARDING SUCH BEFORE ISSUANCE OF THE CITY BUILDING PERMIT.**
- 3. AS A CONDITION OF THE FINAL APPROVAL, THE APPLICANT TO SUBMIT TO THE DDRB FOR REVIEW AND FINAL APPROVAL THE FOLLOWING THREE ELEMENTS OF THE PROJECT:**
 - 1. DESIGN OF "ALLEY" SPACE CONNECTING THE PROPOSED GARAGE AND THE SUN TRUST BUILDING AND INCLUDE ELEMENTS OF VERTICAL STANDARDS AND PLANTER SPACING DESIGN TO ALLOW "POP-UP" COMMERCIAL,**
 - 2. PRESENT FINAL DESIGN OF PARAPET CAPS SHOWING VARYING HEIGHTS ON PROPOSED GARAGE BUILDING AND**
 - 3. PRESENT FINAL "GRILL" DESIGN AND MATERIALS FOR FIRST FLOOR WINDOWS ON THE PROPOSED GARAGE BUILDING.**

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 6-2-1 (BOARD MEMBER FLAGG VOTED IN OPPOSITION OF THE MOTION (NOT IN FAVOR OF PROJECT OVERALL). BOARD MEMBER BAILEY VOTED IN OPPOSITION OF THE MOTION (NOT IN FAVOR OF THE APPLICANT REQUIRED TO RETURN TO THE BOARD FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF CONDITION THREE). BOARD MEMBER UDENZE ABSTAINED FROM VOTING.

DDRB 2012-010, AETNA BUILDING SPECIAL SIGN EXCEPTION

Mr. Klement reviewed the project report dated October 11, 2012. He introduced Mr. Wyman Duggan who was present at the request of the applicant to reiterate the duplicate request presented to the Board at their September 6, 2012 meeting. He additionally provided history of the building, significance of the applicant's request, etc. Also present was Mr. Mike Lauretano, with Lauretano Sign Group who provided a history of the Lauretano Sign Group and the significance of the applicant's request.

Mr. Duggan emphasized that it is his contention and he thought Mr. Teal would agree that the Board cannot regulate the inherent qualities of the logo. It is beyond the Board's purview to regulate the color, the font, the type face, the thickness of the letters.

The Board reiterated many of the same comments from the September 6, 2012 meeting and then agreed unanimously to approve the project.

Board member Sikes advised that he has had ex parte communication regarding the project signage, as well as Board member Udenze, Board member Rink, and Board member Flagg, but that the substance of their conversations does not influence their votes on the project, as presented today.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER BAILEY AND SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER UDENZE GRANTING FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SPECIAL SIGN EXCEPTION REQUEST FOR DDRB APPLICATION 2012-010, AETNA BUILDING LOCATED AT 841 PRUDENTIAL DRIVE SUBJECT TO THE CONDITION THAT THE APPLICANT IS TO REPLACE THREE EXISTING HIGH-RISE SIGNS 1) ONE REPLACEMENT SIGN OF 1,046 SF FACING NORTH, 2) ONE REPLACEMENT SIGN OF 1,046 SF FACING SOUTH, AND 3) ONE REPLACEMENT LOWER BUILDING SIGN OF 314 SF FACING SOUTH. *THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 8-1-0 (BOARD MEMBER MILLER VOTED IN OPPOSITION OF THE MOTION).*

III. OLD BUSINESS

Asking how to address the issue going forward, Board member Udenze commented that it seems like the Board has an issue with becoming more suburbia than more urban. Asked if this was something that the DIA will do, how do we negotiate deals adding that a lot of the issues the Board is dealing with are beyond the DDRB, but need to be addressed. As an example, he commented that there were several things that needed to be addressed relative to the Parador Parking Garage project. One being increase downtown visitors, how do we get people downtown asking who is doing that. Suggested more collaboration prior to conceptual review/approval.

The new DIA was discussed briefly noting that they were having their first meeting, an organizational meeting on October 17, 2012.

The Board had a brief roundtable discussion about the pros and cons of the current condition of the economy, development, etc. and/or lack of downtown.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no comments from the public.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Miller adjourned the meeting at approximately 5:25 p.m.

The next DDRB meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 1, 2012, at 2:00 p.m.

Witness

Downtown Development Review Board

Timothy Miller, Chairman

Print Name: _____

Vote: In Favor: _____ Opposed: _____ Abstained: _____

Bridge connection, New County Courthouse to Old Federal Courthouse (State Attorney's Office)

Original bridge concept previously approved by DDRB included structural steel frame covered with Alucobond, glazing, and was climate controlled. Due to significant budget controls this concept was found to be too expensive, and would not be included in the project. The using agency, State Attorney's Office, is in agreement that a less expensive facility is more important than no facility at all. In an effort to do everything possible to meet our user's desire, the project team now proposes an open air precast structure, capable of being enclosed and climate controlled at a later date should funding be available, which we believe will reduce the cost by approximately \$750,000.

Given that the new open air bridge design was converting to a precast concrete we thought it best to incorporate some of SHPO's previous comments (highlighted in yellow on the attached correspondence) as the new design would need to be resubmitted to them for their approval.

These incorporated design features include:

1. Recessed window surrounds (similar to those found on the existing fifth floor of the OFC).
2. Simplified horizontal banding.
3. Rectangular columns vs. round.

Although SHPO's recommendation is to match the color of the limestone panels on the OFC, we would recommend matching the precast structure to the color of the new courthouse.

The areas shown around the window openings that appear a different color on the renderings would be the same color but we are recommending they be lightly sandblasted to create slightly contrasting texture.

Integral colored precast concrete panels will only be used at the infill areas of the new courthouse exterior wall where the curtainwall system is removed to make the bridge connection.

The current design will be all exposed concrete with painted finishes on the outside, underside and inside of the bridge.

As with all the previous designs, the sloped walkway surface of the bridge is not expressed from the outside but an effort has been made to reduce the overall height of the bridge to accommodate the 3'-3" difference in elevation between the third floors of the two buildings.

The constant window sill height of the openings is set at 42" above the high side of the ramp on the OFC side.

The parapet of the new courthouse is being slightly notched to receive the new bridge which helps in reducing the height of the bridge and allows for a continuous gentle sloped walking surface between the two buildings which no longer will be classified as a ramp requiring handrails.

In addition, should the bridge pricing not fall within our budget, we have an alternate for an open air secured at grade crossing, consisting of crushed limestone over CMU walls, with standing seam metal roof.



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Kurt S. Browning
Secretary of State
DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Mr. David M. Schneider
Senior Project Manager
Department of Public Works
214 N. Hogan Street
Jacksonville, FL 32202

April 8, 2010

RE: DHR Project File Number: 2010-1077
*U.S. Post Office and Courthouse (8DU1539) - Proposed Pedestrian Bridge
Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) Between the City of Jacksonville and the Florida State Historic
Preservation Officer for the Rehabilitation of the Historic U.S. Post Office and Courthouse
Jacksonville, Duval County*

Dear Mr. Schneider:

Our office reviewed the proposed undertaking in accordance with the referenced MOA and in accordance with 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966* as amended and *36 CFR Part 800: Protection of Historic Properties*.

While we regret that the location of the bridge could not be farther to the north, beyond the bay on which it is now centered, we understand that there are functional issues that make this alternative location infeasible. In general, the massing of the proposed bridge is acceptable; however, by mirroring the architectural character of the new courthouse, it fails to provide an appropriate transition between historic and new buildings. For this reason, the design is not considered to be compatible with the historic building as is required by the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*. To achieve the required compatibility, we recommend the following adjustments to the current design as illustrated in the attached Recommended Alternative Design Approach:

1. Color of the precast and other exposed concrete in the bridge should match the color of the oolitic limestone exterior of the historic Post Office and Courthouse building.
2. The fenestration should be more representative of the windows in the historic building. The type of contemporary storefront system currently proposed is acceptable; however, the manner in which the masonry opening is subdivided by the framing should be reflective of the historic windows.
3. A recessed window surround, a feature employed at the upper level of the historic building, has also been employed to better relate the new bridge to the historic building.
4. The intermediate decorative horizontal molding has been eliminated and the lower horizontal molding has been simplified to a projecting flat band to match the treatment on the historic building.
5. In lieu of the columns in the current proposal, we recommend rectangular section piers with quirk corners, similar to the treatment employed within the projecting pavilions on the north east and south elevations of the historic building.

500 S. Bronough Street • Tallahassee, FL 32399-0250 • <http://www.flheritage.com>

Director's Office
(850) 245-6300 • FAX: 245-6436


Archaeological Research
(850) 245-6444 • FAX: 245-6452

Historic Preservation
(850) 245-6333 • FAX: 245-6437

Mr. Schneider
April 8, 2010
Page 2 of 2

Should you have any questions regarding these recommendations, please contact David Ferro, R.A., of my staff at 850.245.6363.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Laura A. Kammerer". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

Laura A. Kammerer
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
For Review and Compliance

Enclosure