

CITY OF JACKSONVILLE

DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD (DDRB) MEETING

DATE: Thursday, April 11, 2019

TIME: 1:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

PLACE: Don Davis Room
First Floor, City Hall
St. James Building
117 West Duval Street
Jacksonville, Florida 32202

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William J. Schilling, Jr., Chairman
Trevor Lee, Vice Chairman
Joseph Loretta, Board Member
Craig Davisson, Board Member
Brenna Durden, Board Member
J. Brent Allen, Board Member

ALSO PRESENT:

Jason Teal, Esq., Office of General Counsel
Guy Parola, DIA, Operations Manager
Karen Underwood, DDRB Executive Secretary
Greg Anderson, Council Member At-Large Group 4
Reggie Gaffney, District 7
Lori Boyer, District 5

This cause came on to be heard at the time and place aforesaid, when and where the following proceedings were reported by:

Stephanie Shear, Court Reporter
Notary Public, State of Florida

First Coast Court Reporters
2442 Atlantic Boulevard
Jacksonville, Florida 32207
904-396-1050

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: I think we are all
3 set, so we will go ahead and call to order the
4 DDRB meeting for Thursday, April 11th. We will
5 get started and recognize that board members
6 Davisson, Allen, Loretta, Lee, Durden, and
7 Schilling are present. So we have a decorum.
8 I would also like to introduce the elected
9 officials we have in the audience or up at the
10 front. We have Council Member Anderson.
11 Welcome.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER ANDERSON: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: We have Council
14 Member Boyer. Welcome today. And Council
15 Member Dr. Gaffney. Welcome today. Thank
16 y'all for joining us.

17 COUNCIL MEMBER GAFFNEY: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. I got
19 everybody. And then let's go ahead we'll move
20 into the action items. Action Item A is
21 approval of the March 14, 2019 DDRB regular
22 meeting minutes. Do any of the board members
23 have any comments, additions, deletions, or
24 changes to those minutes? All right. If none,
25 I'll entertain a motion for approval.

1 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: So moved.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: A motion by Allen,
3 Board Member Allen.

4 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Second by Board
6 Member Loretta. All those in favor say aye.

7 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. That is
9 approved. All right. So we'll move on to Item
10 B, which is DDRB Item 2019-004, which is 530
11 West Union Street, the conceptional review.
12 And I'm assuming Mr. Parola is going to do
13 our --

14 MR. TEAL: He's walking across the atrium
15 as we speak.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Would we like to go
17 ahead -- and I'm hearing that we should move
18 Items C and D in advance, which I have no
19 objection to if no other members have any
20 objection to it. All right. So let's go
21 ahead. We will then table Item B, and then
22 let's go ahead and move forward with Item C,
23 which is Resolution 2019-04-01 recommending
24 that the city council adopt ordinances
25 2019-0195 and 2019-0196 and resolution

1 2019-04-02 recommending that the city council
2 adopt Ordinance 2019-0197, which is
3 quasi-judicial.

4 Mr. Teal, do we need to make an official
5 motion to move those ahead of Item B?

6 MR. TEAL: No. As chairman, you have
7 discretion as to what you call up on your
8 agenda.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Okay. Well, let's
10 go ahead and do that then. And, Mr. Parola, do
11 you have a staff report for those two items, or
12 are we going to go right to Council Member
13 Boyer?

14 MR. PAROLA: To the Chair, I think we're
15 going to go right to Council Member Boyer.
16 There was a Lunch and Learn back in December.
17 We've communicated to you-all pretty thoroughly
18 about the process, I believe. We provided you
19 with a summary. This is an updated summary, so
20 I don't think we need to belabor the issue with
21 the staff report.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Okay. Great.
23 Ms. Boyer.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: Thank you. And I
25 truly appreciate the opportunity to give you a

1 little briefing on these bills today. You
2 should have just received a handout which is my
3 kind of one-page bullet point summary. I think
4 the thing that's important for you to
5 understand is there are three bills in a
6 package.

7 The first -- the second bill was really
8 the meat of it, and that's where we started.
9 And the second bill is an update to the
10 downtown zoning, which includes the downtown
11 design standards that are part of the downtown
12 zoning overlay.

13 As we started working on that and going
14 to meet with various groups and vetting it, we
15 kind of heard a chorus of suggestions that we
16 eliminate minimum parking standards for
17 downtown and let the market drive that decision
18 because it is in such a state of transition
19 right now that having a minimum standard was
20 probably not advisable in the code. In order
21 to do that, we had to do the text amendment to
22 the comprehensive plan, which is the first
23 bill, because it had the standard in it so we
24 had to eliminate that standard as it applied to
25 downtown so that we had the freedom to do bills

1 2 and 3. So that's what the first bill is as
2 we talk about this.

3 Bill 2, which is one of your resolutions
4 relates to the downtown design standards. Bill
5 3 is a rezoning of all downtown property that
6 is not currently a PUD or is not currently zone
7 CCBD to CCBD.

8 So I'm going to go through the
9 presentation real quickly. I think you-all
10 understand -- I'll skip through things because
11 I know you've heard it before and I don't want
12 to go over it, but I'm happy to answer any
13 questions or go back to anything you would
14 like. And then we'll kind of go through major
15 benefits and other things that are in here.

16 So if you can look at the screen, these
17 are the three bills that I mentioned. This is
18 what the existing zoning patchwork of downtown
19 is, so it includes everything from current CCBD
20 through commercial uses, residential uses,
21 industrial uses, recreation uses, and working
22 waterfront, all of those. Each one of those
23 carries with it a different package of uses and
24 a different height restriction.

25 The proposal would be to rezone

1 everything that's not a PUD or not CCBD --
2 those are the cutouts to CCBD -- so there is a
3 consistent zoning category for all of downtown.
4 And then in that consistent zoning category,
5 allow essentially all of the uses that were
6 allowed in any of the other categories with a
7 few exceptions, of course. So the uses that
8 previously were not allowed downtown in most
9 cases have carried forward such as pawnshops or
10 some other uses that may have been previously
11 restricted that they didn't allow, but
12 multifamily residential, commercial office,
13 retail, service uses, banks, schools, day care,
14 hospitals, all of those uses now could be
15 permissible on any particular person without
16 having to go through a rezoning.

17 And then there are some bonus uses by
18 district such as manufacturing, wholesale
19 distribution, et cetera, that aren't universal
20 throughout all of downtown but that are
21 specific by district. So, for example, the
22 sports and entertainment district has
23 manufacturing because we all recognize that
24 Maxwell House is there. And so in every case,
25 we tried to acknowledge the existing uses that

1 might be present in the area and make sure that
2 we weren't rendering someone nonconforming.

3 There are some other kind of specific
4 uses where we've created design criteria.
5 Let's talk about, for example, drive-throughs.
6 This would be relevant to you in particular.
7 Previously in many cases, drive-throughs were
8 prohibited. And the question was raised as to
9 the old -- EverBank -- TIAA building where
10 there is the drive-through in the parking
11 garage and was that something we really
12 objected to. And the thought was no. The
13 reason we were objecting to drive-throughs was
14 because they stacked traffic on the street and
15 they created this line of people outside. And
16 it wasn't about people driving through to pick
17 up their laundry or to pick up a Chick-fil-A
18 biscuit or to pick up -- go to the bank. So
19 basically, it isn't about the use; it's about
20 the location of the drive-through and the fact
21 that all of the stacking occurs inside. So we
22 allowed that.

23 Auto sales and auto rental was previously
24 prohibited. This is another example where --
25 well, it's not the use that troubled anybody,

1 it was taking up an entire surface slot with a
2 bunch of cars that we were showing for sale.
3 So like you might see in London or in New York
4 if you have a storefront with automobiles in
5 the storefront, that would be perfectly fine.
6 And as long as the supply of autos that you are
7 either selling or renting are stored in a
8 garage or outside of downtown, then there is no
9 problem with that being used.

10 So there are any number of examples where
11 essentially we made it a little bit more
12 flexible for uses, but built in a design
13 standard on the use site.

14 This is the existing overlay in the
15 districts in the existing overlay. You can see
16 that the two riverfront districts create a
17 little bit of confusion. The River Park
18 District is where the current Metropolitan Park
19 is, which there certainly has been movement
20 towards relocating that and redevelopment in
21 the area, so some of the criteria that were
22 applicable don't really apply. And so you'll
23 see what we did is we changed that to a large
24 sports and entertainment district.

25 We have a separate working waterfront

1 district that acknowledges an area where there
2 is currently waterfront activity -- working
3 waterfront activity, barges, et cetera, yet it
4 would be zone CCBD. So it could transition to
5 commercial uses or transition to retail or
6 multifamily as time allows or as it develops,
7 but it would also allow those working
8 waterfront industrial uses.

9 Combine the few districts -- the
10 Cathedral District boundary is consistent with
11 the new Cathedral District plan. The LaVilla
12 District boundary moved one block closer to
13 Church and closer to central core into that to
14 really accommodate the historic boundaries of
15 LaVilla so that all of the historic properties
16 were included in the LaVilla District. And
17 it's also consistent with their plan.

18 This is the patchwork of permissible
19 heights you have in downtown today. It ranges
20 from 35 feet to unlimited. It all depends on
21 what the underlying zoning was. And basically
22 the proposed legislation changes it to heights
23 by district. And the Cathedral District is
24 limited to 65 feet, which is consistent with
25 their recent master plan. LaVilla is 75 feet,

1 which accommodates both the JRTC and the two
2 recently approved lofts projects which are both
3 under that 75-foot limit. And that's how we
4 came to that 75-foot limit.

5 And then in Brooklyn from Chelsea Street
6 -- I can't tell where that line is. Both sides
7 of Park Street are in the unlimited, but
8 Chelsea Street to McCoy's Creek is 90 feet. We
9 initially started with 75, but the developers
10 who own a lot of that property and are planning
11 to redevelop it had a building designed at 80
12 something and asked that we move that to 90,
13 which didn't seem to be a problem. The whole
14 idea was we didn't think that was an
15 appropriate area for unlimited. And then we
16 can -- we'll talk about the Riverfront Zone in
17 a later slide.

18 So we took all of the existing design
19 standard that you apply and carried them
20 forward. So we're not eliminating the design
21 standards you work with every day, but in many
22 cases we're providing built-in alternatives
23 that provide flexibility and satisfy the intent
24 without somebody needing a deviation. So I'm
25 going to give you a couple examples of that.

1 We have a defined area called urban open space,
2 which is an automatic alternative to providing
3 the building -- pulling the building forward to
4 the build-to line. So if you want to set a
5 portion of your building back to provide a
6 plaza like you might see at the new MD Anderson
7 on the corner or the Stein Mart building or
8 I'll give you all kinds examples of those, that
9 is certainly an acceptable alternative to
10 having the building pulled -- having the entire
11 front wall of the building pulled forward to
12 the street.

13 Another alternative to wrapping the
14 entire parking garage with retail would be to
15 provide urban open space for some of that. And
16 our example we're referring to is the food
17 court we have down by the Omni which is in lieu
18 of having retail in front of the parking
19 garage; you have a publicly accessible
20 extension of the sidewalk essentially.
21 Setbacks from the water as opposed to the 50
22 foot being a hard fast line. We provided that
23 they could be at an average so that you could
24 encroach up to 40 feet if you had others that
25 you set back.

1 Street trees and awnings are alternative
2 design features to satisfy the goal of street
3 shade. So, again, it was just an option of a
4 way to look at this where there could be some
5 things that wouldn't require a deviation and
6 might otherwise satisfy the initial goal.

7 An illustration of an area where you have
8 some urban open space rather than a street
9 being pulled forward, this shows two
10 alternatives that we built in for residential
11 that wouldn't have to comply with the build-to
12 line. In one case, you can set it back and
13 have some green space. In the other case, you
14 can elevate it. Both of those are designed to
15 try to provide some privacy for residents of a
16 first floor residential unit. So either one of
17 those would be acceptable as an alternative to
18 the build-to. And those are based on -- I
19 think the illustration -- I'm not sure -- it
20 says 8 to 15 which is what the ordinance
21 currently says.

22 We will be doing a substitute that cleans
23 up a few things in the ordinance. And that's
24 going to change to 5 to 15 in the substitute.
25 You still have your facade requirements in

1 here, the massing requirements, but we've tried
2 to provide more illustrations and articulate a
3 little bit more clearly what the overarching
4 goals are.

5 Building entrances, this is an example of
6 where we have a building alternative. You know
7 that right now you have to have a building
8 entrance on every street facade. We said if
9 you have more than two -- so if you have three
10 or four street facades, you only have to
11 provide it on two, but the idea is you do
12 something on the other facades to engage the
13 pedestrian. It could be public art. It could
14 be a whole variety of things, but you don't
15 have to provide entrances on all sides because,
16 as you know, you've had to bring deviations
17 from the security standpoint for folks.

18 We still have transparency, but we've
19 tried to build in some things acknowledging
20 that -- for example, the lofts projects that
21 you approved don't meet this transparency
22 standard without a deviation, so we recognize
23 that we like the way those look. Those are a
24 fine example, and so we've wrote in a provision
25 on residential that what they did would be

1 compliant.

2 Rooftops is an example where roofs are
3 used differently than they were 20 years ago.
4 We encourage people to have garden space or
5 swimming pools or restaurant space on rooftops.
6 So we changed the rooftops to accommodate that.

7 This is getting into the public realm
8 side, and so this is talking about what happens
9 within the public right-of-way. And the idea
10 here is that we've tried to define three zones
11 in the pedestrian realm. The one closest to
12 the street we're calling the amenity zone. And
13 that's where we want to see the trees, the
14 utility fixtures, the street lights, everything
15 that would obstruct passage, put it in one line
16 rather than have it kind of meander through the
17 sidewalk.

18 And then there's a frontage zone next to
19 the building which if you walk downtown if you
20 start paying attention to this, which I did
21 after we wrote it, you notice the stand pipes
22 or the ledges that come out under a window or
23 things that kind of make you move a bit away
24 from the edge of the building. And so we're
25 recognizing that you really don't walk all the

1 way up against the edge of the building. And
2 this is also the zone that can expand to
3 accommodate sidewalk cafes. Again, kind of
4 illustrating those zones and that illustrations
5 is part of the document package. And then
6 waterfront design, we articulated zones along
7 the waterfront so that we provided a little bit
8 of guidance for some of the fuzzy illustrations
9 that you have and language that you have today.

10 So Zone A is the 50-foot setback. It is
11 divided between 25 feet of Riverwalk and
12 25 feet that can be seating associated with an
13 outdoor cafe. It could be a swimming pool
14 associated with a private development, but
15 nothing that's a permanent structure over 4
16 feet high. So it provides some room and space
17 for the Riverwalk and the Riverwalk activities.

18 And then the next two zones have height
19 limitations in them like this. So this tries
20 to illustrate it. It's a 75-foot deep off the
21 water zone. It is Zone B, so is zone C. Zone
22 B is a 45-foot height, Zone C is a 75-foot
23 height. Beyond that is unlimited.

24 The idea within these zone s in my way of
25 thinking is that they're a safe harbor. You'll

1 recall the ventures approval where those of you
2 who were on DDRB at the time granted additional
3 height to someone closer to the river. And
4 then it got to appealed to DIA, and then it got
5 appealed to the city council. And then it got
6 remanded to DDRB. And then it got appealed to
7 the courts.

8 And so in order to provide some certainty
9 for someone making an investment or trying to
10 develop, we were striving to create a safe
11 harbor. So if you complied with this, it was a
12 safe harbor. But you can also take it a step
13 further in that if you own 200 feet of
14 frontage, say, and you could build a building
15 that is 45 feet high, 75 feet deep for the
16 entire 200 feet of frontage, that's a certain
17 volume, certain number of cubic feet.

18 If you make the building narrower, which
19 effectively relieves massing for the Riverwalk
20 and for the folks closer to the water, also
21 provides a bigger view quarter, then you can
22 stack that additional volume on top of the
23 45-foot section. So it gives you a lot of
24 flexibility. And, again, that's part of the
25 safe harbor. So if that's what you're doing

1 and you're taking the volume that you're not
2 using on the side and putting it on top, it
3 really wouldn't be subject to challenge. You
4 still have the ability, if none of that works
5 for you, to go get a deviation, but then you're
6 kind of in the boat that we saw the ventures
7 where somebody can say they don't like the fact
8 that that deviation was granted.

9 McCoy's Creek, the setback there -- and
10 actually we need to fix the slide because it's
11 40, not 50, in the draft. It was 50, and then
12 we decided based on how the depths of the lot
13 adjacent to the creek that we needed to
14 decrease it to 40. So it's actually 40 in
15 there instead of 50.

16 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Is that setback
17 from the edge of the existing ditch, or is that
18 from the center line of a ditch?

19 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: It is from the top
20 of bank (phonetic) today. If you actually had
21 it surveyed and you knew where top of bank was
22 -- or we also allowed an alternative to go to
23 the lot line of private property if it was
24 closer. So the idea there was -- ultimately
25 what we're trying to get down is we recognize

1 and we were meeting folks that own property
2 that as the McCoy's Creek project moves
3 forward, where that top of bank is may change.
4 And we weren't trying to be greedy and take
5 more. If the top of bank ended up widening,
6 the idea was we were not widening the
7 expectation of the setback on the private
8 property. So we were going to work around
9 that.

10 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Would you be open
11 to 50-foot average or 40-foot average setback
12 so that way depending upon the parcel size --

13 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: I think it
14 actually is. And it also -- and I can pull
15 it --

16 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: So it's like
17 minimum 25 feet, average 40?

18 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: And then it has --
19 yeah, I think it is minimum 25, average 40, but
20 within the 40 on McCoy's, you can do a lot more
21 than you can within the 50 on -- and this is
22 McCoy's and Hogan's Creeks. You can do a lot
23 more than you can on the property adjacent to
24 the Riverwalk. So on the property adjacent to
25 the Riverwalk, it has to stay under that 4-foot

1 level or be removal.

2 McCoy's, those both apply, but you can
3 also have things like recreational equipment,
4 swing sets or whatever that might not be
5 removable at night that you might not take in
6 within your 40 foot. So the 25-foot, there is
7 the sacred space that allows for the walkway.
8 And the rest of it, we don't want -- we don't
9 want a heavy building that comes forward there,
10 but there can be a lot of other activity within
11 that space and even activity that is private
12 and associated with the development.

13 So that is, I think -- we have some
14 information on surface slots. So the basic --
15 without reading all of that, let me just tell
16 you what's happening on surface lots of note.
17 Start with the principal, there's no minimum
18 parking standard. The requirement that there
19 can be no new surface lots in the central core
20 district, which is part of the comprehensive
21 plan and is carried forward. So we're not
22 changing that.

23 So in central core, you have to have a
24 parking garage or you can -- what we do -- so
25 there just isn't a surface lot in that area.

1 In all other areas, there are surface lots
2 permissible, but the idea is the surface lot is
3 supposed to be behind your building or wrapped
4 with the building space. You can have a
5 surface lot of up to six paces to accommodate
6 small business on small parcels without having
7 to meet some of the other criteria. And then
8 beyond that, you get into the requirement that
9 you have to build structured parking and/or you
10 can share structured parking with someone else
11 since there's not a requirement that you have
12 parking at all.

13 So it was an attempt to both be
14 responsive to kind of the market and the fact
15 that things are changing with ride share and
16 other uses, but also to preserve the appearance
17 along the street facade.

18 Now, what we did do that is more
19 restrictive than we what have right now is we
20 have a five-year phase in to require that the
21 perimeter of landscape requirements will apply
22 to accessory lots.

23 So back about ten years ago, DDRB put
24 forward in a past city council and ordinance
25 that said perimeter landscape had to -- what

1 became applicable to all existing commercial
2 surface lots. And they had a phase-in period
3 and they were supposed to comply by 2013. I'm
4 not saying everybody has complied, but they're
5 now nonconforming if they haven't complied.
6 They had till 2014 to come in to compliance.
7 We're essentially now taking that up a notch
8 and saying okay, we're now applying it to the
9 accessory lots as well. And so we're asking
10 the accessory lots within five years to provide
11 that fence and hedge along the exterior along
12 the road frontage to give us a little relief
13 from the asphalt that just comes right up to
14 the sidewalk. Not that you can't have that
15 lot. It's an existing lot, but that at least
16 you bring it into conformity.

17 And my hope is -- and I have spoken to
18 Guy about this, that DIA would create some kind
19 of incentive where they would create cost share
20 with someone for the first couple years, and
21 then if you chose to wait to the end, it would
22 all be on you, but to try to give some
23 incentive to do it earlier and help defer the
24 expense of that.

25 So those are the major things that are in

1 the bill. And I will say there's also some
2 process updates to try to address some of the
3 challenges we had with that appeal and knowing
4 who it went to and how it went where, but this
5 meeting brought out another one. So
6 technically, the only bill of those three
7 that's required to come to DDRB is the rezoning
8 bill. And to me, that kind of makes no sense
9 because the most important bill to come to you
10 is the design standards bill because you're the
11 people who work with it all the time. So part
12 of the process would be that if somebody is
13 changing a design standard, I want that bill to
14 go to DDRB for consideration to evaluate it,
15 make a recommendation as opposed to just kind
16 of bypassing you in that process.

17 So, hence, we brought it to you today
18 even though it's not required because I think
19 that you're really the experts on that. So
20 that's kind of -- that's the broad summary.
21 And I'll take questions or I think there is a
22 staff report. Bill Cosef (phonetic) was
23 telling me yesterday or folks that they have a
24 staff report on the zoning which is a
25 recommendation in favor, but I don't know.

1 MR. PAROLA: If I may, this is not the
2 first time, board members, you're seeing this.
3 This was provided earlier in the week. So I
4 just want to, for the record, say that.

5 MS. BOYER: May I have a copy of that at
6 some point?

7 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: So, Council Member
8 Boyer, so I understand, so what -- the decision
9 that's being asked today or what you're seeking
10 is for this board to make a recommendation on
11 all three of the bills?

12 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: Mr. Parola and
13 Mr. Teal, are you asking the board to make a
14 recommendation on all three of the bills or
15 only the latter two? I would just assume they
16 did all three, but I didn't know how you had
17 the resolution structured.

18 MR. PAROLA: If I may, the 0401 is for
19 the text changes, so the design standards and
20 the comprehensive plan. We separated out the
21 rezoning into a separate resolution because of
22 the posture you're sitting in as
23 quasi-judicial.

24 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: So the answer is
25 yes to all three bills, and one in three are in

1 your first resolution, and the rezoning is in
2 the second resolution. And I would, of course,
3 very much appreciate your support.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Let's go ahead and
5 do public comments or public speakers if there
6 are any public speakers. So we have no public
7 speaker cards. Is there anyone in the public
8 that would like to speak? Okay. We'll go
9 ahead and close public comment and bring it
10 back to the board.

11 Guy, was there anything that you wanted
12 to add from a staff perspective before we start
13 discussion?

14 MR. PAROLA: No, just to reiterate that
15 this has been going on for a while, and this is
16 certainly not the first time you've seen a
17 presentation on this or have been handed, you
18 know, the voluminous document, that it's been
19 around for a while. And I think it's just
20 important that the public understand that this
21 has been vetted a number of times by this body.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. So let
23 me share. And I'm interested -- I'll be
24 interested to hear the comments of the other
25 board members. I know -- a couple thoughts:

1 One is the rezoning bill. I think that makes
2 all the sense in the world and that, in my
3 mind, seems very straightforward, but I will
4 share that the bill that updates the downtown
5 standards has quite a bit of complication to
6 it. And I know that there has been a lot of
7 talk about it. There was the Lunch and Learn
8 which was terrific. And I know I was able to
9 attend that, and I saw many of my co-board
10 members there, but I will say knowing that -- I
11 mean, I feel like in the last week, we've
12 gotten the full text to fully comprehend it.
13 And I know at least from my perspective, that
14 criteria is a lot to digest. So I just want to
15 share that.

16 I don't know if other board members feel
17 that way, but I'll be interested to hear their
18 thoughts on how to move forward.

19 MR. TEAL: Mr. Chairman, if I could,
20 maybe Council Member Boyer, could you explain
21 to the board kind of participation of who, you
22 know, who all was involved with the crafting of
23 all of this and that it wasn't really done in
24 the vacuum and who all was in involved in that?

25 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: Absolutely. So we

1 started on this, I would say, last June, and at
2 the time, Carol Worsham, who was on your board,
3 was the DDRB representative who participated
4 kind of in vetting drafts and reviewing things
5 and commenting throughout the process.

6 I also had Ms. Durden, who was on the DIA
7 board, doing the same thing before she came
8 over here. Mr. Parola and Mr. Klement were
9 intimately involved in providing kind of all
10 the information and were really staffed to the
11 whole project and really working on this
12 throughout that time.

13 And in addition to that, once we did the
14 Lunch and Learn and we actually had a draft
15 bill, then we kind of went to any organization
16 that would offer their group to listen. So
17 this went to NAIOP. It went to a meeting of
18 the APA, American Planning Association. It
19 went to AIA, American Institute of Architects,
20 had a meeting on it. We went to Downtown
21 Dwellers. We went to DBI's board meeting. I
22 mean, I kind of go on. I mean, it's been this
23 presentation and that kind of fuller document
24 have been fairly widely distributed for a
25 while.

1 And I've also had, as you can kind of
2 hear, between the time it got distributed and
3 where we are today and I think Mr. Decon
4 (phonetic) can attest to that because I think
5 he had maybe five clients who commented, but we
6 had any number of individuals.

7 So, for example, I know you've done some
8 work with Baptist and Mr. Miller reviewed and
9 it was giving me comments on behalf of that
10 particular client. Other people looked at it
11 for other parcels. We had a conference call as
12 recently as this past Monday with an architect
13 in Miami who was working on parcel on the
14 Southbank to look at how the volume transfers
15 worked and whether that worked for them. So
16 there's been continuous input.

17 Mr. Moore with Vestcor went through and
18 we changed the rooftop design standards because
19 we wanted to make sure we could accommodate the
20 compressors for individual residential units.
21 So, yes, you are right, there are a lot of
22 nuances in it, but those nuances are actually
23 responsive to the comments that we've been
24 receiving from people in the field who are
25 trying to work with it so that we -- we're

1 trying to make it accommodate reality as
2 opposed to create some standard that someone
3 can't comply with and would have to come in and
4 get a deviation from.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Thank you. I'm
6 going to start on the left. I'll start with
7 you, Council Member Anderson, but I'm also
8 anxious to let Ms. Durden speak as well knowing
9 that you've been intimately involved in this,
10 but Council Member Anderson.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER ANDERSON: And I don't
12 know if this is working or not, but I just want
13 to first ask Jason Teal from the Office of
14 General Counsel, this is a noticed meeting.
15 These bills will come in front of me, and I'll
16 make a decision whether to approve them or not
17 to approve them or modify them. I just want to
18 make sure that in your opinion, I could ask
19 questions here since this is a noticed meeting.

20 MR. TEAL: Through the chair, it's
21 interesting you bring that up because I had
22 that same conversation with Council Member
23 Boyer at the beginning of this meeting. What I
24 would caution you on is obviously this is a
25 noticed meeting of the DDRB. It's not a

1 noticed meeting of the city council. And as
2 far as I know, there hasn't been a notice
3 generated for a city council meeting.

4 I would say this, that two of the three
5 bills are legislative in nature. The third one
6 is quasi-judicial. Given the fact that
7 quasi-judicial decisions have to be made based
8 on evidence the board receives or the body
9 receives, I would probably caution you more in
10 terms of participating in that particular bill,
11 but the legislative bills, the only caution
12 that I would give you is don't get into a lot
13 of discourse with Council Member Boyer, but you
14 can freely, you know, offer your comments to
15 the board today.

16 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Well, you know, for
17 eight years, I've said better safe than sorry.
18 I'm going to pass on this one.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Ms. Durden.

20 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Well, first I want
21 to thank Councilwoman Boyer. This was really
22 her -- really at her insistence and recognizing
23 because of the two or three or four years that
24 she has served as the liaison along with
25 Council Member Anderson, I think that they

1 could see the things that both the DIA and the
2 DDRDB struggled with.

3 And we certainly -- when I was on the
4 DIA, we would see what you would struggle with
5 because sometimes DIA members, me included,
6 would, you know, kind of want to trickle into
7 DDRDB's jurisdiction and say maybe we're not
8 sure about this project or we're not sure about
9 the way that it looks. So then all of that, I
10 think, called for this exercise. And I teased
11 a lot for the better part of nine months, 8:00
12 either on Friday morning or sometimes Monday
13 morning, 8:00 a.m. was reserved for meetings
14 with Guy and Jim and Susan Grandon who was, you
15 know, our scribe. And I want to give a lot of
16 credit to her for those efforts because we
17 could talk all we wanted to about the changes
18 that we thought, but then she had the hard job
19 of going back. And I know she worked with Jim
20 and Guy and, of course, all us bringing back.

21 So even though I hadn't been on DDRB, I
22 do think that we had the excellent advice and
23 council of Carol Worsham who had served with
24 you for so many years. And, in fact, we had to
25 make sure that our -- what I call the two step

1 happen simultaneously because we wanted to
2 continue to be able to meet at 8:00 and not be
3 on the same board. So that worked out
4 beautifully.

5 I always say that drafting ordinances in
6 land use has to be the most godforsaken job.
7 It is not easy. It is, quite frankly,
8 miserable. It is never perfect. And we -- as
9 hard as we worked on this, we're going to
10 find -- we as the DDRB -- things that don't
11 make sense. And I would just suggest to the
12 board that -- be patient with that knowing that
13 every code is a work in process -- a work in
14 progress, if you will, that there will be
15 another time in a few years where we come back
16 and say this needs to be fixed.

17 That's the magic of what we do. We can
18 fix it, it just takes -- you know, and if we
19 find something that, you know, in the first
20 year we realize, uh-oh, that's not what we
21 meant -- the intent of what we're doing.
22 That's not what we meant at all, or if we find
23 that there's an abuse that starts to happen,
24 you know, because I'm familiar with that. That
25 can happen also.

1 I would encourage the board to give
2 comments because as you've heard already, this
3 is still -- there is still flexibility here. I
4 don't think a wholesale -- we've got to make
5 changes on every page that that's appropriate.
6 What I've seen reflects what I believe is
7 really good for our downtown and will give
8 flexibility where flexibility is needed, but
9 also provides enough guidance. And this is a
10 really important part for us as the people who
11 are implementing this, it gives us enough
12 guidance to understand, okay, this is what the
13 goal is. And these are some flexibility
14 points, but the main goal is still protected,
15 and if I can use the word "sacrosanct."

16 You know, so I've lived it and breathed
17 it. And so I'm going to be as interested to
18 hear what you-all have to say about it as
19 probably as much as Council Member Boyer is
20 going to be and Guy because, like I said, we
21 have lived it and breathed it. And it's always
22 wonderful to have more input just like you
23 heard.

24 So I think that -- it's not in stone. I
25 want you guys to know it's not in stone. We

1 are marching down, and we're excited about it.
2 It's like -- well, I was going to say it's like
3 birthing a baby, but not quite, not quite, but
4 it is a lot. So, you know, those are my
5 comments on it. I am thrilled, honestly, that
6 we have this. And I think it's going to really
7 be great for our downtown. And I think it's
8 going to give us as the DDRB guidance and for
9 some exciting projects coming to our city.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Ms. Durden, I just
12 want to add, thank you for your thoughts
13 because I know your expertise in this area, and
14 I know how much time you committed to this.
15 And, Council Member Boyer, your expertise in
16 this area, so your comments have been helpful
17 to me. So thank you very much.

18 All right. Mr. Lee?

19 VICE CHAIRMAN LEE: Yeah, I absolutely
20 agree with Board Member Durden. Thank you for
21 all the hard work that you and the team have
22 put in and for incorporating so many different
23 and unique groups and asking them to
24 participate and help even when they didn't have
25 to. I appreciate that. That's really the only

1 comment I've got.

2 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I think, Bill, if
3 you had any ounce of concern, we could make a
4 recommendation that this could be -- is an
5 18-month temporary period, something of that
6 nature, which then, you know. After the 18
7 months gets revetted, so it would be between 12
8 months and 18 months if there is any hiccups,
9 that would be an appropriate time to make any
10 modifications. That may be actually a
11 reasonable thing.

12 Beyond that, though, quite frankly, I
13 feel like if there was going to be issue from
14 the development world, I would have heard about
15 it by now and people would have caused some
16 significant concern to me coming before this
17 meeting that did not occur. So I feel very
18 comfortable.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: If I may add --
20 and I should have mentioned the draft
21 contemplates and actually asks you all to go
22 through their design guidelines and update the
23 design guidelines and make a recommendation to
24 DIA about revising the design guidelines within
25 12 months, which would be appropriate in

1 syncing up time, that if there was something in
2 the actual legislative regulation piece that
3 you were uncomfortable with, that could be
4 changed kind of consistent with the time frame
5 of the updated guidelines. But it contemplates
6 that the old guidelines which were derived from
7 the 2000 master plan and referred to pedestrian
8 retail-oriented streets and all kinds of things
9 that don't exist need to be cleaned up also.
10 And we gave 12 months for that to happen.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Very good.

12 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: In your -- Council
13 Woman Boyer, a couple questions. In your
14 outreach and meeting with landowners and
15 organizations and developers, is there anyone,
16 I guess, overarching concern that anyone shared
17 or any critique that you saw repeated more so
18 than others?

19 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: There were a
20 number of them during the process which all led
21 to changes in the draft. So from my process,
22 it really was, okay, here is our idea. How do
23 you respond to it? And pretty much, I can only
24 think of one comment that has been suggested to
25 me that we haven't incorporated it. And that

1 one comment involved the Church District and a
2 desire to -- the Church District right now, you
3 can have restaurants that sell beer and wine by
4 exception. And that was kind of an expansion
5 of what they had allowed. And I thought that
6 was generous of them, but there has been a
7 request to have alcohol sales in the Church
8 District. And I was not prepared to do that
9 over the objection of the church.

10 So that would be the one that it didn't
11 incorporate. Everything else that I heard, I
12 did. I would say when I went to chamber
13 government affairs on Monday, who I also
14 understand voted to support the legislation, is
15 taking it to the board; they -- Daniel Davis
16 raised a question about the safe harbor portion
17 and the heights. And, you know, my kind of
18 position on that is if, when this gets to
19 council, you want to go back to the existing
20 language and the existing illustration and not
21 make any changes, I'm fine with that.

22 I frankly think from a development
23 perspective, it's better to have something that
24 I know I can do without contest, and then I can
25 still have the fuzzy language over here that I

1 can get a deviation from or we can just go back
2 to the fuzzy language.

3 Again, I don't feel so strongly about any
4 of these that I would say it has to be this
5 way. The only thing I would feel so strongly
6 about is I would feel that strongly about the
7 50-foot setback along the water because I think
8 it's a critically important asset for the city
9 to preserve our riverfront and make it
10 accessible to the public.

11 The other thing that I feel that strongly
12 about is I absolutely would not want to see the
13 rezoning go through without the design standard
14 package because it creates the uses for that
15 district and you would kind of have a mess if
16 you had half of it. Those are the only two
17 things -- anything else is open for your
18 suggestion if you have any.

19 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Thank you.
20 Regarding the -- and I'm referring to this
21 slide that has the stair steps coming off of
22 the water with the different building heights.
23 Do we have any statistics or any numbers of
24 parcels that it would just exclusively
25 eliminate that landowner's ability to build

1 within, say, the 75-foot parameters or the
2 unlimited parameters? For instance, are there
3 pieces of property that only go as deep as the
4 45-foot limitation?

5 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: Mr. Parola did a
6 survey of that when we were coming back with
7 calculating those distance and had looked at
8 kind of all the parcels along the riverfront.
9 And I don't think there was any parcel that,
10 like, only has the 45-foot zone. But even if
11 it did, which I don't think there is, but if
12 there were such a parcel, if the building did
13 not take up the entire frontage, which my goal
14 would be, and I hope your goal is that I don't
15 want to see walls built parallel to the river.
16 I want to see things perpendicular to the
17 river.

18 So this gives people incentive to be
19 perpendicular to the river the more you get on
20 the river frontage, the more you can stack on
21 top.

22 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: And then the last
23 question that I had for right now before I pass
24 the mic along to my colleagues -- the slides
25 are awesome by the way. Thank you. The

1 sidewalks, the 2-foot --

2 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: Frontage?

3 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Frontage area, I
4 guess, that's right against the buildings,
5 you're not saying that that's the only area
6 where one could have patio seating; right?

7 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: No. It doesn't
8 say that, and it does say -- but we were also
9 taking this ordinance and trying to -- you
10 know, one of the challenges is we have a
11 landscape code in part 12. We have sidewalk
12 cafe in Chapter 200. And it was hard reading
13 them all together and making them work. So
14 part of what we tried to do is make them work
15 together.

16 So the way the sidewalks work is 5-foot
17 pedestrian clear area, which is the ADA
18 standard, it's kind of top priority. You have
19 to get to that first. And in areas where you
20 have really, really narrow right-of-ways, like
21 some of the 32-foot right-of-ways in Brooklyn,
22 that may mean that we encroach onto private
23 property, but you've got to have a 5-foot ADA
24 accessible sidewalk. Start with that.

25 Then the goal is to have a minimum of 2

1 feet next to the meeting and a minimum of 4
2 feet for the amenity zone, but if you have
3 narrow right-of-ways, we recognize that amenity
4 zone could be bump outs in the right of way.
5 So if you have those bump outs and you could
6 locate your street lights and you could locate
7 your utilities there; you don't have to force
8 it onto the private property. You could do it
9 that way and sacrifice some on-street parking.

10 And then the next thing that can happen
11 is we encourage that frontage zone to expand up
12 to, you know, because you have to have the --
13 if sidewalk cafes are allowed, you have to have
14 a minimum 6 feet of clear pedestrian area, but
15 I don't care -- we didn't care how wide you
16 wanted to make your sidewalk cafe space if
17 you've got enough room in the right-of-way. If
18 you want to expand that frontage zone to 10 or
19 12 or 20 feet, that's great if there's enough
20 room before you get to the curb to still have 6
21 feet of clear zone and 4 foot of amenity zone.

22 So to Bill's point, you've got to read it
23 because what you're trying to do is say, okay
24 this is the priority. We start with this.
25 You've got to have the 5 feet that people can

1 walk on. And then we want to encourage people
2 to have sidewalk cafes and outdoor retail racks
3 and sandwich boards and all of those kinds of
4 things.

5 We also want to provide trees -- street
6 trees to provide shade for people walking and
7 we know we have to have utilities, but we want
8 fixtures of things. We want to keep those all
9 in one corridor. So that's really how that
10 pedestrian realm section is written.

11 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Thank you.

13 Mr. Davisson.

14 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: My question --
15 first question. If everything goes according
16 to plan, when would the design standards
17 technically be implemented?

18 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: The -- if we did
19 not defer this at all, it would come out of
20 city council the beginning of May and most of
21 the design standards would become effective
22 then. There is a grandfather provision for
23 anybody that's already gone through conceptual
24 with the idea that we certainly don't want to
25 catch anybody and tell them they have to change

1 something midstream that they've already
2 designed.

3 There is also a provision that's kind of
4 a savings clause about the text amendment,
5 because since the text amendment has to go to
6 Tallahassee as a transmittal and then come back
7 and go through an adoption round, the
8 elimination of minimum parking standards
9 doesn't go into effect until after the adoption
10 round. So that's also in the bill. So most of
11 the bill would go into effect in May. The
12 minimum parking standard elimination wouldn't
13 go into effect until probably the earliest
14 would be July.

15 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: And I heard the
16 comments about updating or revising these
17 guidelines like this is a working document or
18 something.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: So between now and
20 the time this goes to LUZ committee, which
21 is --

22 MR. PAROLA: May 7th, I believe.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: Yeah, May 7th, so
24 almost a month from now. We are keeping a
25 running list of things that will be

1 incorporated in the substitute. Some of them
2 are glitches that we have found. Some of them
3 are additional information. We had a long
4 conference call with an architect and a planner
5 from Dwell Design in Atlanta last week who had
6 a couple suggestions that we wanted to
7 incorporate. That's changing the 8 to 5 feet
8 on the distance back on the residential.

9 So there are those kinds of things that
10 would be incorporated in the substitute that
11 would go to LUZ committee. So if there are
12 comments individually or as a board, you know,
13 we welcome them. Again, we don't want to do a
14 wholesale rewrite, but, you know, everybody has
15 their own expertise and their own experience.
16 And it's helpful to us to have that
17 information.

18 And I'm also hoping that we are going to
19 substitute out some of the illustrations
20 because we used old illustrations. And I
21 appealed to the AIA when I met with them about
22 somebody helping provide some new
23 illustrations.

24 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: Have you had
25 pushback from owners, developers, where the new

1 guidelines would prohibit the entitlement that
2 they had on specific parcels when it comes to
3 setbacks and height that they had previously
4 but now the new design guidelines or the way
5 the language is, have you had any concern or
6 pushback on that?

7 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: No, I have not.
8 And essentially why is -- this essentially
9 gives everybody more. I mean, that's the basic
10 part. It doesn't -- from the standpoint of the
11 uses, the uses are broadened. And there was
12 nothing that someone was allowed to do on a
13 CCG-2 parcel today with their bonus use that we
14 didn't incorporate. So we had Bruce Lewis and
15 Guy and we went through these tracking lists.
16 And we were picking up on every parcel of land
17 they were allowed to do x, y, and z today. And
18 we were making sure they could do it, and in
19 addition, now they could do some other things
20 that would have been in a different district.

21 So the use part tracks. The height part,
22 if you went back to that height standard, we
23 looked at that and I don't think there's
24 anybody that ends up with lower height than
25 what they have right now because I think some

1 of them had 60 feet that now go to 65, but I
2 don't think anyone has lower height, but we can
3 look at that.

4 MR. PAROLA: If I may, the City and FDOT
5 were the most effected in that regard, but, you
6 know, the city-owned properties --

7 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: I know that there
8 are some properties on the waterfront that now
9 the density and capability of what you could do
10 on that property is now limited with the
11 setbacks and height limitations put in this
12 plan. I'm not arguing whether it's good or
13 bad. I'm just asking --

14 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: So my position is
15 that that is not accurate. And the reason I
16 take that position is that this is what you
17 have in your code. This is in the City of
18 Jacksonville code. And the way we calculated
19 45 feet is three stories plus a peaked roof.
20 And the way we calculated 75 feet is the fact
21 that that is a 7-story width of flat roof.

22 So the language that is associated with
23 this is there today. And all we're doing is
24 saying that if you build the 45 and the 75,
25 nobody can dispute what you're doing and we're

1 going to give you the ability if you make the
2 building narrower like this that you could go
3 higher than that in that front zone. So I
4 don't think that we're taking away. I think
5 that we are just trying to clarify and give
6 people some certainty that they can rely on.

7 Some people may perceive that as taking
8 away. But, again, we started from what was in
9 there today. And part of our goal was to give
10 both developers certainty and to give you
11 something to go by.

12 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: Thank you.
13 That's all.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Teal.

15 MR. TEAL: Council Member Boyer, a couple
16 of questions. One is the process that they all
17 are used to using is the conceptual final
18 process. Has that been changed at all?

19 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: A little bit in --
20 probably not in the draft that you have very
21 much at all. It is going to change a little
22 bit based on the comments we got from Dwell
23 Design in the substitute. So part of what --
24 and, Guy, you may help me in being able to
25 articulate that better, but part of the concern

1 was that in conceptual, we require too much
2 detail on some things that people don't really
3 have at the conceptual stage and that we were
4 moving that to the final phase. So do you want
5 to --

6 MR. PAROLA: To the chair -- or through
7 the chair to the board, as I was reading the
8 conceptual requirements and then going over the
9 applications were that we seemed to take a
10 first run at the final after conceptual. So
11 instead of being concerned about things like
12 massing on the site plan, we're now
13 concentrating on glazing. And so the important
14 things that the code guides you to look at
15 conceptual of being overlooked because we're
16 get a little wrapped around the axles on the
17 things you should probably focus on at final.

18 So I think it's geared towards you look
19 at the forest at conceptual and then get into
20 the trees at final, if that makes sense.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: There would still be
22 the two reviews before the board.

23 MR. PAROLA: Absolutely, but it now
24 tracks with what a conceptual is per the code
25 and what happens at final per the code.

1 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Teal.

2 MR. TEAL: And then also, I know that the
3 current guidelines are based in large part on,
4 like, the downtown master plan and some of
5 those historical documents. Are those still a
6 part -- or will they still be a part of the
7 guidance that they will use to evaluate
8 projects, or are all those being rescinded or
9 anything along those lines?

10 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: They are not being
11 rescinded, but they are superseded to the
12 extent there is any conflict within these
13 regulations. And that's the way we wrote it
14 with the intention that if there were things in
15 there that are not in conflict and you still
16 want to rely on them, fine, but that it is our
17 hope that that's within the 12 months we want
18 this group to work on updating with the
19 assistance of Staff, obviously, but that to
20 take a look at those -- the guidelines are very
21 broad in general in some areas and then
22 unusually specific in other areas. And
23 sometimes what they're specific about are
24 completely unenforceable in today's -- the
25 state of downtown today.

1 Some of the things that have happened in
2 downtown just are completely inconsistent with
3 something that that might be in there. And
4 there's just no way to reconcile the two. So
5 we're hoping that that's something you'll do.
6 So you can use them to the extent they don't
7 conflict.

8 MR. TEAL: And then last question is,
9 you're right. This board is used to being
10 requested for deviations from some of those
11 more stringent requirements. Is there still
12 going to be a deviation process, or is it
13 just -- I mean, how can somebody come in and
14 say, I don't want to strictly comply with this?

15 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: It's absolutely a
16 deviation process -- deviation process from
17 almost everything. And the only difference
18 you're going to have is some of the
19 deviations -- so kind of to a point that Brenna
20 made, we started out each section this time by
21 saying, what's the purpose of this regulation?
22 What are we trying to achieve with it to try to
23 give you some guidance of what the goal is.

24 So we have one that we call protection
25 from the elements. And that's kind of where we

1 talk about, well, we want shade. We want
2 awnings or porticos or things people can duck
3 out of the rain under. We want things that are
4 protection from the elements. But clearly, the
5 specifics that we provide on a particular site
6 may not work for that individual. There is no
7 reason they can't get a deviation, but we hope
8 that you are looking to see that there's still
9 some protection from elements.

10 So that's kind of the way all of those
11 deviations are written. So many deviations
12 just kind of have the standard list of criteria
13 that you're used to that you've previously
14 seen. Some of the deviations have their own
15 specific lists. So an example of that might be
16 if someone wants to build additional parking,
17 they have to show that there is a need for
18 parking in that area.

19 MR. TEAL: Thank you. Thank you,
20 Mr. Chairman.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Thank you. Guy,
22 anything that you wanted to add? No?
23 Dr. Gaffney, did you have any comments or any
24 questions?

25 DR. GAFFNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 Not really. I'm not -- the board does a great
2 job; however, when you have an all-star team
3 like Kelly and Ms. Durden and Council Member
4 Boyer, there's no rock that's not unturned.
5 So, you know, she does a very thorough job.
6 And you throw in Councilman Anderson there, he
7 asks a lot of questions. They do a great job.
8 So I'm very impressed, very impressed with the
9 report. Thank you so much. Great job.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Thank you. And I
11 would like -- since I know during the
12 discussion Ms. Grandon came in, I'd like to
13 introduce Ms. Grandon. And thank you for all
14 your help on this as well.

15 MS. GRANDON: Thank you. It was a lot of
16 fun. It was a heroic effort, let me tell you.
17 There was just so many things to go back and
18 cross-check and cross-check. It was tough.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: I do have a couple
20 questions. So one is, I know I haven't heard
21 anything about signage. Is that anything that
22 has been addressed, or is that something that
23 is a future item?

24 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: So we tried to
25 stick only to the zoning overlay that's in

1 Chapter 656. So if signage is in a different
2 chapter, we did not touch it. Noise ordinance
3 is in a different chapter. We did not touch
4 it. Both of those should probably be updated.
5 I mean, there are multiples of those that I've
6 gotten questions about, and it's, like, I just
7 can't make it any bigger.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: That would be the
9 next challenge, signage.

10 COUNCIL MEMBER: Right. I don't
11 disagree. And, frankly, we were -- I would be
12 completely supportive if you or DIA or anybody
13 else wants to go out and get a professional
14 consultant and work on this for two years and
15 come up with a completely better version. It's
16 just that had not happened and the more time
17 passed, the further out of date what we had was
18 getting. And so it was like, let's do what we
19 can at this point and maybe we can hire someone
20 and have an even better work product in a
21 couple years.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: And then,
23 Mr. Loretta, I did want to respond to your
24 comment. As I thought about it as the
25 discussion's gone on, I don't think that it

1 necessarily -- I think it was a good idea to
2 throw out thinking about, like, an 18-month
3 sunset, but I don't know that that, in my mind,
4 is the right approach right now. I think that
5 I've got a level of comfort that a lot of
6 energy and work has gone into this. I feel
7 like it's going in the right direction.

8 And certainly, I agree with what
9 Ms. Durden said. There's still going to be
10 some things that I think we bump into, and
11 those may be things that I think we bump into.
12 And those may be things that we work on in the
13 next update that's 12 to 18 months out, but I
14 don't think the right approach would be to set
15 a hard deadline right now just knowing
16 everything that goes into updating the text.

17 That's everything I had. Knowing that
18 one of these items is quasi-judicial, we do
19 need to declare any ex parte. So before I
20 entertain motions, let me start on the right
21 side, Mr. Davisson, if you had any ex parte to
22 declare.

23 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: Yeah, on the
24 ordinance with regard to the design guidelines.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. Any more

1 specificity?

2 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: I'm currently
3 working on a project with a developer where the
4 text of the design guidelines have a
5 significant impact.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right.
7 Mr. Teal?

8 MR. TEAL: Let me clarify. The ex parte
9 communications that we're disclosing here are
10 only related to the rezoning piece of it.
11 That's the only quasi-judicial component of
12 this, so --

13 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: I'm okay with the
14 rezoning. It's the ordinance with the design
15 guidelines.

16 MR. TEAL: Okay. Which is legislative
17 action, so it's not --

18 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Great. Thank you.
19 Mr. Allen?

20 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: None from me.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: None from me.

22 Ms. Durden?

23 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: On advice of
24 counsel, which I agree with, I'm going to
25 recuse myself from the rezoning. It is a

1 quasi-judicial action. And, of course, I have
2 been intimately involved in working on the
3 proposal that is before you and have an opinion
4 which would then skew the neutrality in making
5 the decision based upon just what we hear at
6 this hearing. So I will recuse myself on the
7 rezoning resolution.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Okay. Thank you
9 very much. Mr. Teal, I may need a little bit
10 of your help. So the first item which is
11 resolution 2019-04-01 -- yes, ma'am,
12 Ms. Durden?

13 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: I apologize. I do
14 want to say something about -- in regards to
15 what you were talking about with Board Member
16 Loretta's comment. As you heard from Council
17 Member Boyer, we are going to need staff to
18 work with this board to look at these
19 guidelines over the course of, you know, the
20 next year or so. So I really believe that
21 that's going to, you know, flush out any
22 concerns that may exist.

23 So, you know, while I agree that you know
24 the concept was, you know, a creative concept,
25 I agree that it doesn't need to be a hard line

1 and that actually through that exercise, we're
2 going to come to that anyway. So thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Good point.

4 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: I apologize for the
5 interruption.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Any other thoughts
7 of any other board members? So, Mr. Teal, the
8 first resolution we have 2019-04-01
9 recommending that the city council adopt
10 ordinances 2019-0195 and 0196. So that I'm
11 following that -- these resolutions, these are
12 the bills that cover the comp plan amendment
13 and the overlay, but not the rezoning is the
14 first -- would be the first motion?

15 MR. TEAL: What I would recommend,
16 Mr. Chairman, is do a motion for each separate
17 bill since we've got some folks recusing
18 themselves on some of them and not others. I
19 would recommend taking them one at a time even
20 though they're postured on your agenda as being
21 one item. There's nothing that says that you
22 can't vote individually on the separate bills.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Okay. That's a
24 great idea. I agree. All right. So our first
25 item would be bill 2019-195, which is the text

1 amendment to comprehensive plan, the
2 transportation element. Is there any
3 discussion or would any board members like to
4 offer a motion?

5 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Motion for
6 approval.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right.
8 Mr. Loretta moves approval. Is there a second?

9 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All those in favor
11 say aye.

12 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Any opposed? None.
14 All right. That carries unanimously. We're
15 going to move to the second bill, which is
16 2019-196 which is the update of the downtown
17 zoning overlay. Is there any discussion on
18 this item or a motion?

19 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I'll make a motion
20 for approval.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. Motion
22 by Mr. Loretta.

23 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Second by
25 Ms. Durden. All those in favor say aye.

1 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Any opposed? All
3 right. That carries unanimously.

4 MR. TEAL: Mr. Chairman, let the record
5 reflect that Board Member Davisson recused
6 himself on that particular item.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Great. Thank you
8 very much. All right. The third bill which is
9 2019-197 the rezoning bill that rezones all
10 property downtown that is not either a PUD or
11 already CCBD to CCBD.

12 MR. TEAL: Mr. Chairman, before we get to
13 the vote on that or the motion on that, I would
14 like to remind the board that you have before
15 you the staff report, which constitutes
16 competent substantial evidence. And the
17 recommendation of your professional planning
18 staff is to approve this particular bill.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Great. Thank you,
20 Mr. Teal. All right. Any discussion or motion
21 on this item?

22 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I'll make a motion
23 for approval.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. Moved by
25 Mr. Loretta.

1 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Second by Mr. Allen.

3 All those in favor say aye.

4 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Any opposed? None.

6 I believe, Ms. Durden, you recused yourself on
7 that item.

8 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: That's correct.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Let the record
10 reflect that.

11 Council Member Boyer, thank you very much
12 for all your work.

13 COUNCIL MEMBER BOYER: Thank you very
14 much for your time today. And, again, I want
15 to remind you if any of you have a chance to
16 read anything and want to get with me between
17 now and early May, I would love to hear your
18 comments or concerns and see if we can't
19 address them.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Great. Thank you
21 very much. And thank you, Ms. Durden, for all
22 your work on that item.

23 All right. We are going to go ahead and
24 go to Item B. So this will be DDRB 2019-004,
25 which is 530 West Union Street. And today,

1 this is conceptual review.

2 Mr. Parola, would you like to do the
3 staff presentation for us?

4 MR. PAROLA: Absolutely. Bear with me
5 one second. Karen, there was another -- don't
6 sweat it. This is the first staff report I'm
7 presenting to you-all, so I hope I do an okay
8 job. Imagine, if you will, the PowerPoint that
9 shows the property. It's located on the corner
10 of Union Street and Broad Street. Both of
11 those are one-way streets. This is an existing
12 gas station that I think its most recent use
13 was -- at least according to a lollipop sign on
14 the property was a check cashing place. This
15 is in the LaVilla area. It's adjacent to a lot
16 of city-owned properties. And I think the lens
17 I would like to capture for the discussion is
18 with the adjoining property to its east. The
19 adjoining property to its east is a church with
20 a building stepped back from Union Street, so
21 they share both primary frontages; however,
22 that property to the east has a new wall that
23 runs its entire length going east to west on
24 its new property line as well.

25 Well, we recognize that at this point,

1 we're not going to be able to move the existing
2 building on this property up because they're
3 actually not taking it down nor are they
4 required to. And they are expanding it
5 westward from east, so it's actually coming
6 closer to Broad Street, but it is remaining in
7 its own area.

8 There is parking that is single row that
9 sits in front of the building on its northern
10 frontage, so it's Union Street frontage. And I
11 believe all of this is in the packet that
12 Mr. Loretta provided you.

13 This is a rather unique site. Broad
14 Street is two lanes, but one direction north.
15 Union Street may be three or four lanes one
16 direction east, so it's not possible to get any
17 single curve cut in here that would allow you
18 even three quarters in and around. So
19 everything is a right-in/right-out. This
20 promotes a challenge that, quite frankly, a lot
21 of our properties in downtown have when you are
22 on the intersection of two one-way streets.
23 You're going to have a losing corner in terms
24 of being limited to right-in/right-out.

25 One thing I do want to point out is that

1 if you look at the site plan, the existing
2 curve cuts both on the Broad Street and the
3 Union side -- there's a total of three.
4 There's one on Broad Street. There are two on
5 Union Street that are relatively wide. They're
6 being narrowed. I think that's important. The
7 Broad Street side is especially being narrowed.
8 And with that kind of discussion, what I'd like
9 to do is say -- is go into the recommendations
10 on page 5 of the staff report because I think
11 these address, again, going to kind of the
12 bigger picture not getting into necessarily
13 into the design.

14 Here is what the first recommendation is.
15 And bear with me that I'm reading it. A knee
16 wall with wrought iron style fence is being
17 constructed along Union Street. Why we're
18 asking this is because this now frames the
19 entire north side of this block. That knee
20 wall line will block in or be in line with the
21 existing wall and from the church that we spoke
22 about. So while we can't move the building to
23 the front to start framing the block, what we
24 can do is frame it another way consistent with
25 its adjoining property. So we have some

1 cohesiveness.

2 We want that wall to continue along Broad
3 Street. So at this point, it's going to head
4 south to its southern property line again to
5 frame the block. The existing building is
6 being moved closer by expansion to Broad
7 Street, but it doesn't quite get to Broad
8 Street nor can it. The reason it cannot,
9 again, is because you have to have a
10 right-in/right-out, and that gets you to your
11 parking. So it's got a little bit of a
12 suburban design, but that has to do with the
13 site and its location, not with the designer.

14 The applicant provides perimeter along
15 landscape and along its west. That would be
16 its Broad Street side that meets the minimum
17 landscaping requirements. There is a lot of
18 concrete there. We feel that there is an
19 opportunity to increase the landscaping. If my
20 memory is correct, what we're showing has a
21 drive from Broad Street is a 20-foot wide drive
22 aisle and I think you can get away with a 16.
23 We would like that, before they go to final, to
24 come back with -- either they show a design
25 that meets it, or they explain why they need

1 the deviation and at that time the board
2 addresses it.

3 The applicant provides an alternative
4 landscape plan for the sites; in other words,
5 it's Union Street. We fully understand that,
6 again, because of the site configuration and
7 the need for parking and accommodating that
8 there is a balance of interest there that we're
9 in no position to, say, build landscaping, and
10 by the way, you get parking in an area where
11 there's no on-street parking. We understand
12 that, but we do feel there's an opportunity for
13 little ball bounce and illuminate situations to
14 at least provide shade trees. And the shade
15 trees would complement that knee wall that we
16 discussed in condition -- in recommendation 1.

17 Should minimum landscaping requirements
18 along the side's eastern boundary not be met --
19 it says nobody met. We'll fix that one. The
20 applicant provides an alternative landscape
21 plan. The reason for that is that particular
22 side of the building looks like it's been
23 neglected for a little bit. It's got some
24 overgrown shrubs. We just think that if you
25 provide something that meets the landscaping

1 requirements or provides something that shows
2 that it's being kept up, it will address some
3 of the transient problems we have in the area.
4 And that really complicates condition number 5,
5 which is the dumpster is to be screened and
6 enclosed. Due to our transient population, we
7 do have dumpster divers and everything.

8 Also, when you look at the site, there's
9 a -- if you're looking east from its southern
10 property line, so you're going behind the
11 building, you look straight on you see the
12 dumpster. We would not like you to see an open
13 dumpster from our right-of-way so that is our
14 recommendation. And I'll let the applicant let
15 you present more detail. That's what it would
16 look like if all the conditions were met. One
17 more slide, please. There we go. That's what
18 it would look like.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. Thank
20 you, Mr. Parola. Thank you for your first
21 official staff report.

22 MR. PAROLA: I'm no Jim Klement.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right.

24 Mr. Loretta.

25 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Hello, everyone.

1 Thank you-all for having me. It's Joseph
2 Loretta. I work for the Genesis here in town.
3 I don't want to take too long, but we came
4 actually before a few of you in December for
5 conceptual approval. Really, the little
6 handout that I provided everybody is probably
7 almost the best to look at, maybe the easiest
8 way to go through.

9 I just really want to kind of focus and
10 start off talking about where this property is
11 located and kind of explain the northern tier
12 of the overall site. You go -- we're on the
13 fifth page or so you've got the zoning plan
14 there. So this is -- you know, I actually
15 thought, Guy, this was in the Church District.
16 So you're saying this is LaVilla District?

17 MR. PAROLA: It just touches the Church
18 District.

19 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: We can't have
20 alcohol I guess, but that's all right. So the
21 future land use is CBD as well. Really, the
22 next page shows the aerial of downtown. You
23 can see the transition to the Landing. This is
24 on Union Street. You can actually see kind of
25 the Union Street, as Guy mentioned, as three

1 ways -- three lanes going east. And actually,
2 it's an exit from I-95 and so -- from north and
3 southbound I-95. And so it's really pretty
4 heavy traffic thoroughfare so on, so forth.
5 The next page shows a little bit more of a
6 detailed aerial still showing the intersection
7 at I-95.

8 And then the third page is kind of
9 showing the detail aerial with the building
10 itself, the church building to the east. You
11 kind of see the church building to the east
12 that's got the white column caps that Guy was
13 talking about. And then the main portion of
14 the building actually is the brown, the dark
15 brown roof. And it's got two kind of overhangs
16 on the north and the west. Most recently, it
17 was more of a check cashing business. I think
18 back in the day, it may have been some sort of
19 fuel station. I'm not truly aware.

20 It has most recently been a haven for
21 vagrants, quite frankly. And myself or survey
22 crews going on-site, it's an interesting
23 situation. But, you know, the next couple
24 pages just kind of shows the existing
25 conditions on-site, the existing conditions

1 off-site, and then also shows the picture of
2 kind of the low knee wall with brick columns
3 and so forth that we're looking at -- in
4 discussion with Guy looking at the potential
5 and so forth.

6 So really, I think some of the waiver
7 requests that we're going to have are going to
8 primarily be more in the future setback, the
9 build-to line, the building. What we're
10 looking to do is take an existing building and
11 expand upon that existing building versus demo
12 and starting from scratch on the property. And
13 then also just some of the landscape criteria
14 around kind of overall parameter of the
15 project.

16 I think pretty much every request that
17 Guy recommended, we should be able to
18 accomplish. On the next page you'll see the
19 survey. The survey of the parcel, you know,
20 you can kind of see it's pretty much
21 100 percent paved right now. There is a couple
22 feet on the southern and on the eastern end
23 that had some landscape and had some existing
24 trees. And then the next page shows the
25 existing proposed site plan. So what the

1 proposed site plan looks like is we generally
2 have a two-way entry off Broadway,
3 right-in/ride-out entry off Broad Street to the
4 west.

5 Based on some discussion and so on and so
6 forth, I think we can reduce that driveway from
7 24, 26 feet down to 20 feet and just more open
8 loading zone in the back side of the building.

9 I'll work with Mr. Parola or the rest of
10 the group to come up with any ideas. The goal
11 here really is to allow some extra kind of
12 parking for workers at the facility and/or
13 loading and/or just the ability for the
14 dumpster to be picked up in a timely fashion.

15 And then you kind of got a one-way drive
16 wrapping around the site. The reason why we
17 really need the overall design working this way
18 is to truly allow access in and out of this
19 thing from both roads without it becoming too
20 difficult where you have to drive around the
21 entire block to get into the property. So that
22 20-foot driveway on the western end, we can
23 reduce to 16 feet. I can make that landscape
24 approximately 4 or 5 feet right now, up to 8, 9
25 feet. And if we can accomplish that, that will

1 show two kind of crate -- could be widened out
2 to maybe two high-rise live oaks.

3 And what you see up there on the screen
4 is a little differently than previously where,
5 based on some prior discussion, with Guy we'll
6 throw some more live oaks on the eastern
7 portion of the property.

8 I do think it will be difficult to truly
9 put any sort of -- there is overhead power
10 running along Union Street, and so to try to
11 put any sort of vertical plant material within
12 that central portion is going to be just, you
13 know -- it just doesn't work with the power
14 lines going right there and the difficulty
15 overall with that area.

16 The landscape area to the south is around
17 3 to 4 feet with the wall going through, then
18 that 16-foot one-way road, which is really
19 minimum by code, and then 20 feet angle parking
20 space, the 60 degree angle parking spaces along
21 with the 6-foot sidewalk up against the
22 building.

23 And so you can see in the site plan
24 tenant space one and two, that's the existing
25 building and then tenant space three which is a

1 1300 square feet is kind of expansion to the
2 west although that dash line is where the
3 existing overhang was on the western portion.

4 So some stuff -- some newer stuff. The
5 next picture is kind of some ideas along
6 architectural elevations and graphics and so
7 forth. We've got two different options to
8 discuss. And then we can show a little bit
9 more in the elevations as well.

10 So these are kind of just the sketches,
11 not really highlighting the landscaping in the
12 front but the wall and the buildings in the
13 background. You know, this actually is
14 utilized in a similar color of brick to the
15 building to the west, which is more orangey
16 brown. I don't know if I completely like that,
17 but it is truly mimicking what is there to the
18 west.

19 The next option is actually more stucco
20 building within a brick wall on the front, but
21 painted white, that brick wall. And both
22 options we could actually, you know, make the
23 fencing white or we could make it black upon
24 everybody's desire. And, you know, quite
25 frankly, my preference might be a mixture of

1 the two if we were going to paint the building
2 white, we go more with the brick than the
3 stucco. But that's also kind of a little bit
4 more of a cost aspect to it as well.

5 I would like to just point out -- and I
6 don't know that Guy -- I haven't talked to Guy
7 about this. One thought process is kind of at
8 the corner where the site's coming in, we may
9 transition a wall and have some sign panels on
10 that corner if that is allowed by code for this
11 commercial site. So just kind of building it
12 into the wall there.

13 This next right here is kind of
14 identifying the floor plan. You've got tenant
15 space one, two, three. This actually -- the
16 floor plan if you were going to line it with
17 the rest of the site plan, you would want to
18 flip it upside down. Again, tenant space three
19 is the new space and one and two are existing.

20 Then these are just kind of the
21 elevations. It's tough to really see them back
22 here, but I can't tell if that's the stucco
23 version or the brick version and so forth, but
24 they're kind of part of the overall plan there.

25 So at this point, you know, we really --

1 we do have a tough parcel that we're trying to
2 do our best to comply with in the overall
3 criteria and guidelines within the City, but
4 with respect to the fact that we got primarily
5 a one-way road on Union Street, you know. Shy
6 of demolishing the whole property and starting
7 from scratch, this really seems to be the best
8 opportunity for redevelopment of this property.
9 Thank you very much.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Thank you. We'll go
11 ahead and do public comments. I see we have no
12 speaker cards and anyone in the audience that
13 would like to comment on this item. We'll
14 start back on this side. Council Member
15 Anderson.

16 COUNCIL MEMBER ANDERSON: Well, first of
17 all, thank you for this. What an improvement
18 it would be. And I really don't have any
19 questions except is this a spec building or do
20 you have tenants already lined up?

21 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: At this point, I
22 am not aware if there is tenants in alignment.
23 My client is out of South Florida, and so the
24 architect is dig Architecture here in
25 Jacksonville and myself, but I'm not aware of

1 any specific tenant.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER ANDERSON: And it's just
3 purely a cost consideration to try to use the
4 existing structure rather than to build
5 entirely new. Is that really the --

6 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I don't know if
7 it's a cost consideration. It's just more of
8 the client's preference. It intrigues me many
9 times. So this architect and myself, we worked
10 on Beach Boulevard at San Pablo, the Florida
11 Cracker Restaurant. I don't know if anybody
12 has been to that or not, but it is existing.
13 Prior it was a Tires Plus type building. And
14 we turned it into a pretty nice-looking
15 restaurant.

16 And, you know, it intrigues me sometimes
17 on rehab versus demo. And I never, still to
18 this day, get a good understanding on which one
19 is more affordable or not because you go to
20 each different client. One client would say
21 that, you know, rehab and expansion is much
22 more affordable than demo and starting from
23 scratch. And then you go to another client,
24 it's the complete opposite. So that's always a
25 very intriguing aspect to the development world

1 for me.

2 COUNCIL MEMBER ANDERSON: Okay. Thank
3 you very much.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Ms. Durden?

5 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: So I have a
6 question for Guy. Are we actually in this --
7 we're not approving signage, we're not
8 approving surface materials; is that correct?
9 That's all at final?

10 MR. PAROLA: Yes, ma'am.

11 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. I just
12 wanted to be sure. So really, we are just more
13 or less looking at the site plan and -- is that
14 correct?

15 MR. PAROLA: Yes, ma'am.

16 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. I would
17 agree with your -- all five of the conditions
18 that are outlined on page 5 of the staff
19 report. I do think that it is a challenging
20 site and also pass that quite often, probably
21 at least three or four or times a week, and it
22 will be a great improvement. So I would
23 support this with the five conditions. Thank
24 you.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Great. Thank you.

1 Mr. Lee?

2 VICE CHAIRMAN LEE: I actually appreciate
3 the rehab nature of the project taking
4 something that's already there and making it
5 better without having to tear everything down
6 and start over seems wasteful. You know, I
7 don't know how big of a pedestrian street West
8 Union is. I came on it this morning and it's a
9 lot of traffic on it, but anyway, I think it's
10 a nice project. And I think the site plan is
11 well-done.

12 You did show some architecture, so I'll
13 take the opportunity to make a comment. I
14 personally would prefer the contemporary vision
15 that was laid out in Option 2. I think that
16 kind of sets a better tone for new projects
17 going forward. That's just my sort of personal
18 opinion. I appreciate the brick and the metal
19 fencing as well duplicating the other one.

20 In terms of the brick, I would encourage
21 the owner to use a white brick, not paint the
22 brick white. I think it would add a little bit
23 more texture. It's a little bit what you're
24 showing in the rendering. That would be one
25 comment.

1 When you come back for final, I think
2 showing an option on anodized darker fence
3 color that would match maybe the store front
4 system would probably be better, especially
5 from a maintenance standpoint. And then just
6 location of mechanical equipment if you're
7 putting it on the roof, you know, let's make
8 sure that it's screened there, that sort of
9 thing. Otherwise, I think it's a nice project.
10 I really do.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Allen?

12 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: I second those
13 comments as well. I think it's a nice-looking
14 project. Conceptually where we are right now,
15 it's well-done just stylistic just to think
16 going forward. And to satisfy my own
17 curiosity, the patio over here, is that going
18 to be concrete, pavers, wood? What is that?

19 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: You know, it's my
20 idea if we're able to get some sort of smaller
21 restaurant-type tenant, deli-type tenant, it
22 just become more of a patio that -- I haven't
23 put actually much thought into it at this
24 point, but I definitely can. I mean, I would
25 probably envision it's -- it would just be a

1 small fence around with, you know, most likely
2 concrete, but possibly pavers. It just hasn't
3 been thought out really at that point.
4 Otherwise, it just kind of becomes landscaping
5 area.

6 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Thank you. Nothing
7 else.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Davisson?

9 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: I think if you
10 look at the site, it's almost identical to the
11 Goodyear to the feet and everything. So I
12 mean, if you want to -- if anybody wants to
13 look at it, that's what it's going to be.

14 And I use that as -- you know it's good
15 to see that part of town. I think I'm seeing
16 more predominantly brick. It's my opinion,
17 subjective opinion. The more natural tones,
18 especially on the Florida campus community
19 college across the street. At any rate, since
20 Mr. Loretta is carrying the torch on this, I've
21 got no further comments. I know it will be an
22 outstanding project.

23 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: We'll do the best
24 we can.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Teal?

1 MR. TEAL: Nothing.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Parola?

3 Dr. Gaffney?

4 DR. GAFFNEY: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: I think the board
6 members here have echoed my thoughts as well.
7 So I don't know that I have anything -- oh, I
8 did have a question. So -- and you may have
9 mentioned this, and I apologize, but is Broad
10 Street one way northbound?

11 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Yes, sir.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: I don't know that I
13 have anything to add other than I think it
14 looks like a great project. So any other
15 thoughts or questions or I'll be happy to
16 entertain a motion.

17 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: So moved.

18 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: I thought I had a
19 thought or question.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Yes, Ms. Durden.

21 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: So help me on this
22 if -- I'm looking over at Guy. Are we, as part
23 of the conceptual, approving the waiver, or
24 does that happen at the final?

25 MR. PAROLA: It happens at the final.

1 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. PAROLA: You are welcome.

3 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: I know Mr. Allen, it
4 sounded like, was about to make a motion, but
5 just for the official motion, the
6 recommendation from staff since we're not here
7 considering every waiver -- or deviation. I'm
8 sorry, would be to a recommendation for
9 approval with the five conditions.

10 MR. TEAL: At this point in time, all
11 you're doing is voting on whether to approve it
12 or not conceptually. And then once somebody
13 gets past conceptual, they'll come back with a
14 final and then that would -- that's when it
15 will take up each of the individual deviation
16 requests.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Okay. Very good.
18 All right. Thank you.

19 VICE CHAIRMAN LEE: I'll make a motion to
20 approve.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. Motion
22 by Mr. Lee.

23 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Second by
25 Mr. Davisson. All right. All those in favor

1 say aye.

2 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

3 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Any opposed? All
4 right. That carries unanimously. Thank you
5 very much, Mr. Loretta. That's excellent.
6 That covers all of our action items.

7 MR. PAROLA: Mr. Chairman, it goes
8 without saying I think to all of us here, but
9 for the purposes of the record, let it be known
10 that Mr. Loretta was not sitting with the board
11 as a board member for this particular item and
12 therefore did not vote on it.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: That's a great
14 point. Thank you.

15 All right. So we don't have any items
16 listed under old business or new business, but
17 -- Mr. Parola?

18 MR. PAROLA: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to
19 interrupt you. It's not on our agenda, but the
20 Cultural Council is here. As you know, we
21 contributed about 406,000 a couple years back,
22 and this is one of their last projects. And I
23 think per the contract on an abundance of
24 caution to be consistent with the contract
25 that the DIA has with them, they're here to

1 present very briefly one project, I believe.
2 And their new director, Glenn Weiss -- I hope
3 I'm pronouncing it correctly, is here to
4 request approval. It does not look to be very
5 voluminous, so it should not take long if it's
6 the pleasure of the Chair.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Yes, please. Let's
8 go ahead and hear the item.

9 MR. WEISS: Hi.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: And it's Mr. Weiss?

11 MR. WEISS: My name is Glenn Weiss. I'm
12 the director of Public Art Program, the
13 Cultural Council and Mason Martin is with me
14 who has been managing this project. I have
15 only been here -- I think I'm up to eight days,
16 so actually I've never even been to the site,
17 so if you have questions, Mason will answer
18 those better than I would. But I just wanted
19 to introduce myself today.

20 But just as a reminder, this was already
21 presented at the February meeting, but we did
22 lose an artist. So we had to replace that
23 project with a new artist. This is a simple
24 project on a 27 and a 48-inch tall wall. It
25 runs about 100 feet in which the artist will

1 create a mural, a low scale mural on that wall.
2 And then we're trying to figure out how we can
3 get a kind of blue linear light running along
4 the top of the wall to complement the other art
5 works that are going to be in the same area.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Just out of
7 curiosity, which is -- and I remember us seeing
8 the other three or four items. Which of those
9 items is this going to replace?

10 MS. MARTIN: May I?

11 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Yes.

12 MS. MARTIN: Mason Martin, Cultural
13 Council. Hello, everyone. In February, you
14 approved three of our four projects. We did
15 not present one that's not going to happen now.
16 So you approved the three. And this is the
17 fourth one that we didn't present at the time
18 of the others because the design's original
19 artist had been rejected by the panel and so we
20 had to go to the alternate artist. And she has
21 stepped in and is continuing the same timeline.
22 And this is her design that she's presented.
23 It's been approved by the panel and the Art
24 Committee. And now it's your turn and then
25 she'll start in May.

1 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Great.

2 MS. MARTIN: Any more questions?

3 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: We may have some
4 more questions. I will quickly officially open
5 for public comment, but seeing as we don't have
6 any public so I don't think we have any public
7 comments. So we'll close the public comments
8 period.

9 So, Mr. Teal, I assume that we need to
10 officially take action on this. And would it
11 be to approve this item, or is this
12 informational?

13 MR. WEISS: No. By contract, we're
14 required to gain your approval before we can
15 move forward.

16 MR. TEAL: By contract, they're required
17 to gain your approval.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. So with
19 that, we'll take any input starting on the
20 right side. Dr. Gaffney, any questions or
21 comments?

22 DR. GAFFNEY: No questions. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Parola?

24 MR. PAROLA: Thanks for your work.

25 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Love it. I wish it

1 could go further than the beginning and the end
2 that you already have, but it looks awesome.
3 Thank you.

4 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I have no comment.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Lee?

6 VICE CHAIRMAN LEE: No comment. Thank
7 you.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Ms. Durden?

9 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Well, you can tell
10 who's not the architect in the room. I'm
11 looking at the very last page, and I'm just
12 confused about what this top portion is. Is
13 that going to be a wall?

14 MS. MARTIN: You can't really tell, but
15 that's the down ramp of the exit to Union
16 Street from the Main Street Bridge.

17 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: So is the bottom
18 portion -- and then so really we're just
19 talking about the bottom portion. Is the same
20 height as the same knee wall -- I'll call it a
21 knee wall.

22 MS. MARTIN: She's painting the existing
23 wall.

24 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. And then
25 she's talking about putting the blue light --

1 MS. MARTIN: Yes.

2 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: -- the neon along
3 the top? Okay. Great. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Council Member
5 Anderson?

6 COUNCIL MEMBER ANDERSON: Thank you for
7 this as well. So I guess this is a current
8 picture that you --

9 MS. MARTIN: Yes. We're planning on
10 moving the bush.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER ANDERSON: Okay. That
12 would be good. I guess you can do that. Check
13 and make sure you can. Why does it stop there?
14 I mean, it sounds like an interesting question
15 that sort of will stop and start right there,
16 but why is that?

17 MS. MARTIN: Why is it not going under
18 the bridge?

19 COUNCIL MEMBER ANDERSON: Yeah.

20 MS. MARTIN: Part of the wall is starting
21 to crumble there. And we went out there with a
22 contractor and he suggested stopping there.

23 COUNCIL MEMBER ANDERSON: So we're not
24 painting the part of the wall that's crumbling?

25 MS. MARTIN: Right.

1 COUNCIL MEMBER ANDERSON: That seems
2 prudent. I like the design, by the way, and
3 the idea that you're going to put -- it's going
4 to be -- you know, have an LED feature to it
5 will add a lot of interest, I think.

6 MS. MARTIN: And you'll be able to see
7 this wall kind of serves also as a background
8 to that environmental sculpture that was by the
9 kaleidoscope that you saw. Those two artists
10 work together on how to make the best of both
11 of them.

12 COUNCIL MEMBER ANDERSON: I look forward
13 to seeing it.

14 MS. MARTIN: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Council Member
16 Anderson, you raised a good point. And not to
17 belabor the point, but even if the end could be
18 extended maybe another 20 feet just to that
19 edge of the structure for the bridge, at least
20 in my opinion, would look like a much more
21 logical end point, maybe not going all the way
22 down, but just to where the grass ends right
23 there by that structure. And I don't know that
24 that's too much further.

25 MS. MARTIN: We can investigate that.

1 MR. WEISS: We can investigate it and see
2 if there's a way to repair the wall, rather, to
3 see if it's feasible economically.

4 MS. MARTIN: I'm sure the artist would
5 love to do that.

6 MR. WEISS: I think we all agree it would
7 be better to go farther. We'll see what the
8 costs are.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: We'd love to see
10 more, yes. That's the only thought I have.
11 Any other thoughts or a motion?

12 VICE CHAIRMAN LEE: I'll make a motion to
13 approve.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Okay. Mr. Lee has a
15 motion.

16 MR. TEAL: You might want to consider
17 approving it with the condition that they
18 investigate the extension of the artwork to
19 that supporting column and instead it be
20 extended there if feasible, something like
21 that.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Okay.

23 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I'll second that.

24 VICE CHAIRMAN LEE: Do you need me to
25 repeat that?

1 MR. TEAL: You don't have to repeat it,
2 but just say, yeah, we'll go with that.

3 VICE CHAIRMAN LEE: We'll go with that.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Again, assuming it's
5 feasible.

6 Okay. And I think I heard a second from
7 Mr. Loretta. So we have a first and a second.
8 All those in favor say aye.

9 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Any opposed? All
11 right. That carries unanimously. Thank y'all
12 very much for everything you're doing.

13 MS. MARTIN: Thanks to Guy for his work
14 on this.

15 MR. PAROLA: I'm the artist. I didn't
16 want to say anything.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right.
18 Mr. Parola, any other items that we need to
19 cover today?

20 MR. PAROLA: Not that I believe. Thank
21 you.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Okay. Any other
23 items that any of the other board members have
24 that they would like to bring forward? And,
25 again, we are without public, so I will ask for

1 any public comments and I see none.

2 Since there are no other items, we will
3 adjourn the meeting. Thank you very much.

4 Have a good afternoon.

5 (Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF DUVAL

I, Stephanie Shear, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did report the foregoing testimony and proceedings; and that the transcript, pages 1 through 91, is a true record of my stenographic notes.

DATED this 18th day of April, 2019.



STEPHANIE SHEAR, Court Reporter