

66

00:09:35.490 --> 00:09:49.380

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Hello everyone. Welcome to the October 8 2020 board meeting of the downtown development review board. I'm going to start the meeting by reading an opening statement, and some instructions. In an effort to slow the spread of virus and to encourage social distancing governor de Santis has issued Executive Order 20 dash 69. Allowing local governments to hold public meetings using communications media technology, rather than in a physical location. And keeping what the executive or the downtown development review board meeting is held via zoom teleconference which allows interested persons to view and participate in the meeting remotely. I'll take a minute and introduce the board and the staff that I see in attendance. I see staff Lori Radcliffe-Meyers. I see Ina Menzini I see Jason Teal from the Office of General Counsel. Welcome, Jason. I see board member Joe Loretta, Board member Brennan Durden, welcome board member Bill Schilling, I see board member Craig Davisson and board member Christian Harden. And do we have board member Frederick Jones is he is Fred here. I know. No.

75

00:11:02.400 --> 00:11:04.530

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: I don't believe he's coming. Okay.

76

00:11:04.620 --> 00:11:10.620

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): I understand council member Scott Wilson has joined us welcome council member. Thank you for joining us. I understand Lori Boyer is joining us today, CEO of the downtown Investment Authority and Mr. Gaffney has joined us from the mayor's office.

79

00:11:24.420 --> 00:11:25.350

Brent Allen (DDR B): Chairman Lee this is Brent Allen I'm here as well.

81

00:11:28.140 --> 00:11:30.540

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you Brent I appreciate that.

82

00:11:31.350 --> 00:11:37.080

Jason Teal OGC: And, Mr. Chairman. I also believe that we have our new DDR B member Matt Brockelman is also on.

83

00:11:39.690 --> 00:11:42.180

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Welcome, Welcome Mr. Brockelman, and thank you. I apologize I missed you.

84

00:11:48.870 --> 00:11:56.280

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you everyone. If I MISSED ANYONE please recognize yourself so I can read it into the record, we will keep moving. If there's no one else The agenda for this meeting can be viewed and downloaded from the city of Jacksonville website by navigating to dia.coj.net when the meeting has concluded the recorded version may be accessed by emailing RMezini@coj.net The public comment period occurs, the beginning of each agenda item all public comments should pertain only into the items on the agenda and are limited to three minutes and duration. Individuals who are unable to access the meeting or who wish to submit their comments and advanced may do so by submitting their comments via email to RMezini@coj.net with the title Public comment. Public comments submitted by email must be received no later than 2:05pm October 8 2020. Public comments submitted by email will be submitted into the record during the public comment portion of the meeting. Individuals attending the meeting by computer or telephone will be given an opportunity to comment, one at a time and in an orderly fashion upon recognition by the meeting host. Thank you everyone. I've called the meeting to order. And I'd like to move into approval of the September 10 2020 DDRB be regular meeting minutes which is action item A of our agenda.

93

00:13:23.520 --> 00:13:24.240

Christian Harden (DDRB): So moved.

94

00:13:25.140 --> 00:13:28.410

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): I have a motion for approval by Mr. Harden.

95

00:13:28.830 --> 00:13:29.280

Second,

96

00:13:30.390 --> 00:13:35.010

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Second by Mr. Loretta, all those in favor of approving the minutes say I please.

97

00:13:35.370 --> 00:13:36.720

Christian Harden (DDRB): Aye. Aye.

98

00:13:37.500 --> 00:13:38.460

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Any opposed.

99

00:13:40.350 --> 00:13:53.940

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you. The meeting minutes have been approved. Before we move into DDRB 2018 dash 019 I wanted to inform Mr. Allen that he will be taking over the meeting for the special sign exception, excuse me, the JTA special sign

exception by applicant George McGregor, I will be recusing myself since George and I work for the same firm. Otherwise, let's move right into agenda item DDRB 2018-019 VyStar Forsyth garage modification. May I have a staff report Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers.

104

00:14:27.240 --> 00:14:35.880

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Lee. My name is Lori Radcliffe-Meyers with the downtown Investment Authority, and I will be presenting an overview of DDRB application 2018-019 The VyStar Forsyth garage modification. DDRB application 2018-019 is requesting modifications to the final approval of the development plans for the VyStar parking garage located at 28 West Forsyth street. The applicant received a modification to the final approval December 13th 2018 to construct a seven story parking garage with 7730 square feet of retail space and 6037 square feet of future potential retail space. The applicant is now requesting a modification to that final approval, which will modify the VyStar Forsyth street garage layout and design. The request will modify the original design as follows. To create additional retail space of 5749 square feet, including glass storefronts along Main Street. And a redesign of the cladding along all facades of the garage. The current design meets the downtown or relate ordinance and the applicant is not seeking any deviations. Based on the foregoing the downtown development review board STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF modifications as follows. To create additional retail space of 5749 square feet, including the glass storefronts along Main Street and the redesign of the cladding along all facades. This concludes staff summation and staff is available for questions. Thank you.

113

00:16:20.100 --> 00:16:27.570

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers, I'd like to open it up for public comment. At this point, Ms. Mezini do we have any public comments?

114

00:16:29.280 --> 00:16:36.390

Ina Mezini: Yes. We have a couple of hands raised starting first with Nancy Powell I'll lower your hand and you may speak.

115

00:16:37.620 --> 00:16:44.370

Nancy Powell: I just want to commend VyStar for really doing a great job on the design and really caring about how a parking garage, a standalone parking garage really can integrate from a design standpoint and integrating the ground floor retail. So I think it's a it's a good model. And thank you very much.

117

00:17:01.350 --> 00:17:08.070

Ina Mezini: Right and we do have another hand raised. Steve Congro, I will lower your hand and you may speak as well.

118

00:17:09.090 --> 00:17:19.650

Steve Congro: Yes, thank you. So to echo Ms Powells comments. I would agree. I think you know the years I've followed the DDRB and its predecessors is probably the best parking garage I've ever seen come across. I did have two comments. I don't know if it's too late in the process to do this or if this can't be done. One is, you know, I did notice that the vehicle entrance of the garage was adjacent to the main street retail bank. Was wondering if it was considered to move that to be adjacent to the Laura street retail Bay. And the reason I bring that up is because if you were to do that. And then at some point in the future if and when the downtown retail market really took off. You could then convert some more of the Forsyth Street frontage to be retail. Again, if the market so so decided they realize they've added a lot of retail here. You know, by, by doing that it could potentially eliminate. What is it, you know, with the exception of the corners are pretty blank. I mean, it's nice cladding but it's just, you know, it's still not active use, it's still parking along much of Forsyth. The other thing that is was just a design question is in the main street retail Bay, the small portion tt's on Forsyth showed a blank wall. Which which the cladding is certainly better than the previous design, but I was wondering Why they didn't potentially look at windows for that, as it would, you know, especially retailer open after dark could quite, you know, add light to the street. It could be more inviting space. You know, it may be too late in the process to adjust that. And if it is still, like I said, probably the best garage. I've ever seen. But those would be you know what i saw is considerations. Thank you.

128

00:18:58.320 --> 00:19:01.680

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Mr. Congro. Ms Mezini, are there any other hands raised.

129

00:19:02.880 --> 00:19:03.690

Ina Mezini: No additional hands raised.

130

00:19:08.340 --> 00:19:14.640

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you. I'll move into board comments and let's start with Mr. Harden

131

00:19:16.410 --> 00:19:18.900

Jason Teal OGC: To chairman, did you want to hear from the applicant.

132

00:19:19.740 --> 00:19:21.480

Christian Harden (DDR B): Yes, yes.

133

00:19:21.540 --> 00:19:22.800

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Yes, Thank you Mr Teal. Thank you very much. Mr. Hurst would you mind preparing or giving the applicant presentation. Thank you.

135

00:19:30.180 --> 00:19:35.880

Thomas Hurst: Of course, this is Tom Hurst with Dasher Hurst Architects, I want to confirm you all can hear me. Yes, yes. Okay. Thank you, Tom Hurst with Dasher Hurst Architects 1022 Park Street Jacksonville. Yeah, thank you for the opportunity to come back and re-present this project we're very happy it's come back around and moving forward to fruition as Lori mentioned earlier, it's the project is primarily a revision to a previously approved project from 2018. A large percentage of the design in the layout is virtually similar to what it was before with the exceptions that Lori mentioned of the additional retail space on Main Street and the complete redesign of the cladding given the new client customer, which is VyStar and they're kind of expectations for what this garage wanted to be. We had to rethink that old design. Um, is it best if I share my screen and walk you through the presentation or do you want to control that on your end,

141

00:20:32.580 --> 00:20:35.220

Ina Mezini: You can share your screen I allowed that for you.

142

00:20:35.760 --> 00:20:36.030

Okay.

143

00:20:41.070 --> 00:20:54.450

Thomas Hurst: Okay, so. So as I mentioned, those of you who've been around for a couple years have seen this project before it's largely the same garage with a new skin and new kind of new attitude, new, new skin design. The project is primarily designed to provide parking for VyStar and their downtown growth at their headquarters, but it will provide a modest amount of public parking, as well as well as support other downtown development still in the works. I think most of you who've seen all this before you're all familiar with the context. I won't belabour any of the surrounding buildings. But as you all know, on Laura Street and for side street it's surrounded by, you know, the Bank of America tower. The, the Barnett building the Laura Street trio and 11 east in and similar buildings. The property boundary is Forsyth on the north side Laura Street on the west and Main Street on the east. We have updated the site plan layout to reflect the new DIA/DDRB kind of approach with the frontage zone pedestrian zone and amenity zone all kind of articulated on the site plan. We've studied the project from a landscape perspective and made sure that it provides the required amount of shade, given the the growth of the trees. The 40% shade requirement. We've, we've additionally studied the photo metrics to make sure that we're providing a safe walkable street environment in the evening.

The layout, as we mentioned before, it's very similar to what you saw presented two years ago with the retail being added to the east end of the site primarily facing Main Street. I did want to address the one comment that we received about the and just maybe give a little background on the explanation of the entrance of the garage. This garage is still envisioned to provide some of the parking for the future Laura street development and the current master plan for Laura Street. The Laura Street trio includes an alley, or a driveway that exists onto Forsyth Street

kind of at mid block. So the idea is we want to give the people coming from that that motor core from the Laura Trio an opportunity to cross Forsyth Street heading east and get into the garage. So, so, because of that, that really drove the decision to push the entrance and exit to the garage as far east as we could. While maintaining a safe distance from the Main Street intersection. So that really like I said what dictated pushing this as far east as possible, as opposed to placing it further west. It was really a functional and traffic consideration.

The layout. The. I'm sorry, the, the, the facade design has changed pretty radically from the previous design. What we're proposing now is a combination of a fabric, a white fabric that's like a mesh stretched over steel frame and both of the two, what we refer to as the book ends of the building that the Main Street and Laura Street ends of the building. And those of you are familiar with Daily's place at the Jaguars practice facility, you're familiar with this product, it's, it's a white fabric mesh that will be lit up at night and glow and be kind of ethereal and then so those become these lightweight book ends on the two ends of the building and then the whole long Forsyth facade of the building is clad in a combination of gray, blue and white metal panels which are also a corrugated panel that are perforated to ventilate and allow the garage to breath.

So the updated rendering, you see here is taken kind of with your back to the Bellwether restaurant. So on the left corner, you'd see the Laura Trio, of course, in the background you see the Wells Fargo Tower and Regions bank building on the right. This is the corner of Laura and Forsyth on the right side you'll see the fabric screen. So this is a ventilated fabric material. It's white in color and it'll be lit up at night with blue LEDs similar to what Forsyth, I'm sorry, similar to what VyStar recently installed on their new headquarters building further down Laura Street. The North Face of the building as you can see in this image is clad in the gray, white, and blue corrugated panels. There's a lot of retail storefront a lot of square footage facing the both the Laura Street, as well as Forsyth Street so we see this as activating this key intersection in downtown. There's also a kind of a carved out notch in the corner, which is about 20 feet square, which creates kind of an open plaza gathering space of that corner as well, which I think is really nice. And then the nice thing about Laura Street, of course, as you all know, is it is very wide and has plenty of opportunity for sidewalk cafes and things of that nature, which you can see represented in this image. This would be the view from the opposite end from from the main street corner of the building with its back to the 11 East Building. So again, on the left side of this facing Main Street is the same white fabric mesh material with storefronts down here for retail. This corner is the egress towers, the stair tower for the garage, as well as a pedestrian an entrance to the garage. And then you see the same corrugated panels along the north facade with with a special kind of vertical pattern of blue to accentuate where the vehicular entrance will be as a means of kind of way finding as you drive down the street to make sure you identify that from a distance. On the on the roof of the building. You'll notice that we have a series of fabric sails up there that will also provide shade for the parking along the perimeter of the building. So those are cantilevered fabric sails essentially from steel vertical columns.

This is a, this would be a daytime view of the building. Imagine you stepped out the front door of the marble bank building this is what you would see facing south. You'll see the North facade of the garage with the ventilated panels as well as the open staircase, which we wanted to treat as a design feature and make it is safe,

accessible and visible as possible. So we didn't create an unsafe environment for somebody ascending the staircase. Then we have the same retail storefront on the ground level with opportunities for a canopy and signage. And then the garage continues down to the left toward the toward the garage turns. You can see a bit of the fabric facade on the right, peeking out there on Laura Street and then the fabric sails at the roof. This would be the daytime image from Laura Street of the retail storefront and the ventilated garage above it again. It's a very neutral minimalist kind of approach to the facade above, but we sculpted it in a way to create some visual interest some shade and shadow that would be effective, both during the day, as well as at night when we light it up with the LED lighting. And then this is, this would be a nighttime image of the same thing with the lights the LED lights turned on to watch that that scrim facade and of course in the distance, we get the Laura Trio fully restored. The material palette is articulated here. It's a combination of pre cast paint on the pre cast concrete portions of the garage. A wood soffit material around the main staircase and the underside of the canopies, clear anodized aluminum on storefronts and then, like I mentioned the various colors of the perforated material on the lower left, and then this is a snapshot of the fabric scrim that would be cladding the Laura Street and Main Street portions of the building. This slide articulates the signage allowances and square footages showing and we're within the acceptable norms there. And that concludes my presentation.

190

00:29:04.380 --> 00:29:11.760

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Hurst appreciate that presentation and apologies again for heading straight into board comments.

191

00:29:11.850 --> 00:29:12.240

Thomas Hurst: No problem.

192

00:29:13.290 --> 00:29:15.120

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Will do that now, though, and again, I'd like to start with Mr. Harden

194

00:29:21.000 --> 00:29:27.780

Christian Harden (DDRB): All right. Thank you, Chairman Lee, thank you Mr. Hurst for that presentation. I think it's a beautiful garage I echo the sentiment that The public comments shared that they've done a really nice job setting a high bar for garages downtown and I appreciate Mr Hurst for providing that background on the egress, that issue was raised to me by somebody else by one of the members of the public who was heavily involved in parking downtown. So, and I fortunately had a conversation with staff about this to address my concerns. So has my support.

197

00:30:00.090 --> 00:30:01.020

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you Mr. Harden. How about Mr. Allen.

199

00:30:08.670 --> 00:30:28.650

Brent Allen (DDRB): Sorry, I was trying to unmute myself. My apologies. I think it's the best looking parking garage, one can probably design. One question, kind of a compounding question, are we expecting, I'm assuming the retail portion to be built out on day one?

200

00:30:34.470 --> 00:30:47.340

Thomas Hurst: It's an excellent question. I think the retail would likely lag the, the construction of the garage by six months or so I don't have the specifics on who those retailers are yet and I don't I don't believe at this point, they're committed so i don't i don't think i can really comment. Beyond that though.

202

00:30:53.850 --> 00:31:06.930

Brent Allen (DDRB): Yeah, and maybe my, my question was poorly phrased. I'm not talking about, you know, a particular company being identified today or on day one, but is the actual space going to be built out? The shell space be built out. So a retailer can immediately move in, or is this something where we're going to have the garage built out and then phase two of the construction is the build out of the retail.

204

00:31:21.780 --> 00:31:29.310

Thomas Hurst: Yeah, I know. I apologize for misunderstanding you it will absolutely be built out, as a shell space as part of the garage construction.

205

00:31:29.820 --> 00:31:35.280

Brent Allen (DDRB): Gotcha. Thank you very much for that clarification. I think it's a great looking garage and will add to the downtown and that's kind of hard to do with with a garage, but it will be an added piece to downtown. Thank you.

207

00:31:47.520 --> 00:31:51.150

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Allen. How about Mr Davisson

208

00:31:52.710 --> 00:32:10.560

Craig Davisson (DDRB): Um, you know, I think it's a well executed design and a good example for new parking in Jacksonville. The one question I do have it keeps, it was brought up with the comment about lighting. And I guess my question is more for staff. The lighting on the main building the VyStar tower, not this garage, you know. And I guess my question is did we approve that building lighting. When we approve the signage application or did we look over it.

210

00:32:28.920 --> 00:32:41.490

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Board Member Davisson through the chair. This is

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers, the lighting that's around the building doesn't come through us. It's permitted through the planning department their electrical permits. I did look into it to see if if DIA had given approval for that and it never came to us because it was considered an electrical permit not part of the signs.

212

00:32:54.870 --> 00:32:55.260

Craig Davisson (DDRB): Okay. At any rate, I think the garage, it's a good project and well done. That's all.

214

00:33:04.500 --> 00:33:06.960

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Davison. How about Mr. Schilling

215

00:33:08.370 --> 00:33:14.850

Bill Schilling (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I support the changes that are being requested and have no questions. Thank you.

216

00:33:15.720 --> 00:33:18.090

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Schilling how about Ms.Durden

217

00:33:23.220 --> 00:33:24.060

brenna durden (DDRB): Can you hear me.

218

00:33:24.450 --> 00:33:26.160

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Yes. Okay, great.

219

00:33:26.910 --> 00:33:34.590

brenna durden (DDRB): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I like the design of the building, very much. I like the new cladding and of course I'd like to the retail expansion. I have some concern about the lighting and I heard that there was quite a bit talk in the applicants. Or mentioned several times about the lighting. And I also have spoken to staff about the fact that the lighting does not come through a DDRB um it's apparently only a an electrical permit. I was surprised to see the lighting on the tower of the VyStar building because in many ways it is it constitutes signage. It in my viewpoint, because you know the color it's VyStar's color and it emphasizes the building. I heard that there's going to be two colors on this. I believe that's what the applicants in, we're going to have white in some basically white lighting or lighting. I believe that's what the applicant said in some areas, and then also on the retail that the view that we're looking at now on the shared screen that's going to be blue. So you know, I'm not sure exactly how to approach this topic. Because I'm not sure that we have any authority, but it certainly seems to be that it would be something that we normally would have authority and it could be that our sign code hasn't caught up with technology and what we you know what we are, have been seeing in the last, I would say three or

four months. An emphasis on lighting that is colored and meant to draw attention you know i i think that there are good uses of that of lighting. I definitely I but I also think that somewhere along the line, I would like to see, you know, DDRB maybe hold some workshops on this topic, so that we can with the stakeholders and see if there is a a reasonable way to address so much lighting that seems to be coming down the pike. And that we're seeing. And yet we're it doesn't seem that the city, in any way shape or form has any regulations that could address the amount of this type of lighting, as well as you know, the degree and locations. So while I'm very supportive of of the project and I will support it with my vote to approve. I would ask VyStar to give the city a chance to take a look at the lighting issues before it moves forward with that aspect of the project. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

249

00:37:30.090 --> 00:37:35.520

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Ms. Durden I appreciate those comments. Let's move to Mr. Brockelman

250

00:37:36.300 --> 00:37:36.930

Ina Mezini: Mr. Chairman. Yes, my apologies for interrupting. Lori Boyer does have her hand raised. I don't know if you want to go through the board and go to her after but I wanted to recognize that.

252

00:37:46.260 --> 00:37:51.000

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Okay, I appreciate that. Let's let the board finish and then we'll come back to Ms. Boyer

253

00:37:53.070 --> 00:37:54.090

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Mr. Brockelman.

254

00:37:55.110 --> 00:38:04.530

Matt Brockelman (DDR B): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's great to be with everyone today. I'll first kind of just start by saying that I'm going to end up recusing myself from this vote, VyStar is one of my clients who I work with in Northeast Florida and elsewhere, but having said that, I'm, also going to assume that it's not every day that we hear from applicants who are bringing modification requests back to us so that they can put more resources into things we care about like retail space and aesthetics. So while I will be recusing myself from the vote today, I very much appreciate VyStars work on this.

257

00:38:28.350 --> 00:38:31.050

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Mr Brockelman I'll recognize your vote, your withdrawal from the vote when we have that. Mr. Loretta.

259

00:38:39.330 --> 00:38:42.600

Joe Loretta (DDR B): I have nothing further to say I'm in support of this application.

260

00:38:44.160 --> 00:39:00.420

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Mr. Loretta. Before we move to Ms. Boyer, could I ask the applicant if there are any illustrations or renderings on the elevation that will be seen above the Regions bank building?

261

00:39:03.150 --> 00:39:07.380

Thomas Hurst: Yes, I can address that we we don't have a rendering per se, of that, but it's you know what, I apologize. I thought it was included in this elevation sheet, but it is not. I'd be happy to follow up and provide that. But it's unfortunately it's not in this presentation package.

263

00:39:21.750 --> 00:39:26.490

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Okay, it would be the South elevation could maybe you describe it verbally for us.

264

00:39:26.490 --> 00:39:39.300

Thomas Hurst: Yeah, it's you know it's it's a firewall, party wall situation so it's it's really required by code to be a solid blank Fire Rated wall. There's, there's not a lot of opportunity to do much with the design of it. It would be white painted pre cast concrete and it would it would be about a story and a half above the roof of the regions bank building. My opinion for what it's worth, is it's it's largely going to be not noticed from the street level but like I said earlier, I'd be happy to follow up and show you some some additional drawings of that. We are wrapping this fabric scrim around the corner above the regions bank building, just to kind of complete the form of that fabric. But beyond that, it's really just white painted pre cast concrete.

269

00:40:22.350 --> 00:40:39.840

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Okay, so, yeah. I mean, I think that would be nice to see. I'd like to have the Board have an opportunity to see that elevation, you know, in a follow up. Let me also ask you, other than the lighting behind the white fabric clouds, is there any other lighting on the building?

270

00:40:40.500 --> 00:40:41.610

Thomas Hurst: There is, there is, you mentioned there's lighting on these clouds here which will be mounted on top of the canopy and upward at it. And if you look close on this rendering here you can see there's basically a light rail. That one's long runs along the length of Forsyth Street that would have LED lighting washing down the facade of the building as well. They're all envisioned to be color changing LEDs. So there's flexibility with color. But as you can see in the

rendering. Here we've kind of suggested kind of a blue lighting along the white fabric and then because the Forsyth facade already has color built into the architecture, we're suggesting using more of a white led in that location. But the client will have flexibility with it.

274

00:41:27.540 --> 00:41:27.870

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Okay. Those are all my comments too. I mean, I really commend the design. I think it's I think it's really beautiful and I appreciate it. I i'm going to express a little bit of concern on the lighting as well. Since the Jacksonville bank or former Jacksonville bank building got it's lighting it's up lighting that's colored approved, we've seen a number of projects begin to add branded color to their to their buildings. I think it's something that we we really probably ought to address. I'm not saying this project or right now is the right time to do it, but it is becoming you know quite the impact on our downtown design landscape. So with that, I'll invite Ms. Boyer to to speak. Thank you.

280

00:42:16.530 --> 00:42:20.520

Lori Boyer: Thank you for that. Can you hear me through the chair to the board. This is a perfect segue in that what I wanted to share with you. In response to Ms. Durdens comments and yours as well, Mr. Chairman, is that as part of our current bid and CRA update professional services contract that has been awarded and that will start within the next two weeks. One of the tasks in that is the design standards update is to come up with lighting standards. So, that is, I heard you. And it's part of the assigned Task. And over the next six months, the consulting team will be working on that. So you will all be engaged in various sessions as we are working on developing those. So, that is, it's in the works.

285

00:43:06.900 --> 00:43:07.980

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Good, thank you. If there are no other comments, I'd like to put the motion to approve up to the board. I don't think we have any items to add to the approval. At this point, we do need a follow up on that, that other elevation. Mr. Hurst if that's possible to get to Mr Parola as soon as possible.

288

00:43:36.120 --> 00:43:36.870

Thomas Hurst: Yeah, of course.

289

00:43:38.850 --> 00:43:41.730

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Otherwise, I'll open it up for a motion to approve.

290

00:43:42.330 --> 00:43:44.100

Bill Schilling (DDRB): The second

291

00:43:44.820 --> 00:43:52.620

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): A great. We have a motion from Mr. Allen to approve and a second from Mr. Schilling, all those in favor say aye.

292

00:43:53.280 --> 00:43:54.240

Joe Loretta (DDRB): Aye. Aye.

293

00:43:55.230 --> 00:43:56.070

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Any opposed. Thank you. The motion carries. And we've given approval to DDRB 2018-019. Thank you, Mr. Hurst.

296

00:44:07.110 --> 00:44:10.560

Jason Teal OGC: And then, Mr. Chairman. Also you will want to reflect for the record that Mr. Brockelman abstained from voting on this item.

298

00:44:13.440 --> 00:44:13.920

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you.

299

00:44:14.640 --> 00:44:16.050

Thomas Hurst: Thank you everybody.

300

00:44:17.220 --> 00:44:17.670

Yes.

301

00:44:22.860 --> 00:44:26.880

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): All right, let's move on to item C. DDRB 2020-014 the Regions bank special sign exception. Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers do you have a staff report.

303

00:44:36.840 --> 00:44:47.700

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Yes, thank you Mr. Lee again. Thank you, Chairman Lee. My name is Lori Radcliffe-Meyers with the Downtown Investment Authority, and I will be presenting an overview of DDRB application 2020-014 The regions bank special sign exception. DDRB application 2020-014 seeks approval for special sign exception to allow for three projecting signs and one roof sign. A workshop was completed on September 10th where the applicant received feedback regarding the sizing, coloring and placement of each of the proposed signs. The applicant has revised three of the four signs proposed by reducing the overall square footage of each and by redesigning the roof sign. The current proposal includes the request for one 36 square foot blade sign, to allow for two signs per frontage and to allow for a 90 foot square foot roof sign. Based on the foregoing the downtown development review board STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF DDRB application 2020-014 for a special sign exception to the Downtown Overlay District to allow for one blade

sign of 36 square feet. Two signs per frontage and one roof sign of 90 square feet as identified in the in the attached signage application request for approval. This concludes staff summation and staff is available for questions. Thank you. Chairman Lee.

310

00:46:10.740 --> 00:46:16.680

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers. Ms. Trimmer, could you prepare the applicants presentation, please.

311

00:46:17.520 --> 00:46:18.630

Yes, please.

312

00:46:25.470 --> 00:46:26.250

Cyndy Trimmer: Let me know when we're up Yeah.

314

00:46:28.410 --> 00:46:28.950

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: You're good.

315

00:46:29.820 --> 00:46:40.500

Cyndy Trimmer: Thank you. So we really appreciate the opportunity to have workshopped this last month and went back and took the feedback that we got from you and also from Jacksonville Historic Preservation Commission into account and have come up with the sign package that we have for you today. So I want to focus on the things that have changed from what you saw. And I think it's really helpful that we got to see the garage. So now you can kind of have this in context. And hope to help understand why the signage has been done the way it has. We heard you on the blade signs and those on the front have both been reduced from 36 square feet to 23.56 so they're now under 24. The rooftop sign we got a lot of feedback from both commissions and we spent a lot of time working on this and trying to come up with a solution that would kind of satisfy both bodies and the feedback that we received, and I want to help everybody understand the amount of work that went into this and the detail and I again have Keith Presley from Regions available and also David Caulkins who is the signage expert. And when these were done, we spent a lot of time looking at the metrics on lighting and size and distance and what the maximum visibility is for these signs, based on the size of the letters. The letters on the rooftop sign are two and a half feet tall. So they're less than a yardstick. And that gives you maximum visibility at 300 feet from the building. And really if we reduce below that two and a half foot mark the 30 inches, we lose the visibility from the building. If you're standing back from it. To give you a point of reference 300 feet from the building puts you kind of smack dab in the circle where the Andrew Jackson statue is. In terms of the background, we got feedback from historic preservation that they would like to see the sign not be flat as though it was painted on a surface they wanted to see a more dynamic feel between the background and then raised letters so that it was kind of more ornamental as the building has a lot more dynamic facade. And then we also heard from this board that

they really don't like the green background. So we've gone with a more neutral and thank you to Board member Loretta for the suggestion on metal that's worked out really well. So this is a bronze metal background and I'll skip the lighting details for just a second. We can come back to them if there are questions. On the up lighting, you're just talking about the concept of colored lighting, we would really like to keep the green accent lighting and there had been discussion about the placement of the lighting. The placement that you see here on these images is meant to up light, the decorative columns that are on the front of the building. If the Commission would prefer that they highlighted the ornamentation above the windows more that's something that we can certainly do. It's here to show that we're complying with the requirement to provide accent lighting and highlight the architectural features of the building. If we're going to have illuminated signage, we absolutely understand that requirement. We're happy to do it in a way that the Commission feels is appropriate, but the intent behind what we have done here was to really feature those columns with the bases and the ornamentation at the top of those columns. And again, trying to put in context, what we were looking at when we did these, I do want to call out on the rooftop sign as well. We looked at other signage and thought about other options. One of the options that we considered was going with just the letters and for illustrative purposes, when we do that, you really lose the letters to the background and it's just not visible. So that option didn't work. But that's how we came up with this kind of Contrast provided by the wire mesh that is a little more accurate in terms of the style of the building. And I'm going to pause there and switch to the illumination questions. So we looked at illumination and heard you loud and clear in terms of one in context for the lighting.

I'm not letting expert. I'll give just the kind of gist of what I understand. And again, I've got Mr Caulkins here available to answer more specific questions. But when I was working with staff and going through all of the old signed packages to see what were people using and what were they saying and what we very quickly realized is that there's not a lot of data in them. Most of what the other applications were citing is just that they're doing led standard led standard industry standard and what I've come to understand is that actually is an answer that that wasn't trying to get away with not providing detail. What that means is that it's using industry standard led which has adjustable lumens that range from 300 to 750 David will correct me if I'm wrong, but those can be adjusted. The lumens on these signs are at the very bottom of that range. They are going to be set to the 375 lumen range. And we frankly don't want them to be higher than that because when you start making them more intense we lose the fidelity on the lettering and our logo. So we're staying in that lower range on these lights and we also looked at the code and really the only place in the code that we have any guidance is under the monument signage provision. And that's talking about what strength would be appropriate at the pedestrian scale under 20 feet. And that was 40% of 1600 Watts, if I'm getting that correct so 640 lumens. So we're at about half of that. So these are not going to be excessive and I will stop there because I have exhausted what I can say in terms of sign lighting and if there are any questions, I'll point those over to David. Thank you.

349

00:52:45.180 --> 00:52:46.410

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Ms. Trimmer.

350

00:52:48.120 --> 00:52:59.400

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): I hope everyone had a access to the presentation. Ms. Trimmer really only kept I think the very first page up, which I believe was the old sign. At least I didn't see my screen change.

351

00:52:59.520 --> 00:53:00.960

Cyndy Trimmer: They were changing on my side.

352

00:53:01.380 --> 00:53:01.740

Okay.

353

00:53:03.630 --> 00:53:09.210

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): I missed it. No, no issue. Let's go to public comments, Ms. Menzini, do we have any?

354

00:53:09.630 --> 00:53:11.790

Cyndy Trimmer: I'm going to try to reshare while you're doing that.

355

00:53:12.570 --> 00:53:20.010

Ina Mezini: Yes, so Nancy Powell has her hand raised. And Ms. Powell, I will start the timer. You may speak.

356

00:53:21.300 --> 00:53:36.870

Nancy Powell: Yeah, I would like to see that. That was one of my questions is, I thought it was a black sign that I saw earlier, or is that the color, Cindy. When you say bronze. Is it a black background with white lettering.

357

00:53:37.740 --> 00:53:43.110

Cyndy Trimmer: Through the chair. Can you see the signage. Now is it up on the screen. I'm getting a lot of shaking heads.

358

00:53:43.440 --> 00:53:46.170

Ina Mezini: What I can do is I can try sharing my screen.

359

00:53:47.040 --> 00:53:51.120

Cyndy Trimmer: If you don't mind please, page four, I think, is the best illustration.

360

00:53:54.630 --> 00:53:58.380

Ina Mezini: I believe this is correct.

361

00:54:01.140 --> 00:54:06.270

Cyndy Trimmer: Up one more. There you go, that shows the bronze metal background with the lettering on it.

362

00:54:06.990 --> 00:54:15.780

Nancy Powell: So it's gonna be bronze meaning that its black, is that black bronze? Is that what that is? I can't. It looks black to me.

363

00:54:15.810 --> 00:54:22.560

Cyndy Trimmer: The color is known as bronze. But yeah, I agree on these pictures. It looks black-ish. Mr. Caulkins can probably speak to it a little bit better.

364

00:54:23.130 --> 00:54:25.140

David Caulkins: Yeah, nice and deep bronze. Almost think like an iron bronze. It's hard to show the difference here, so it does kind of appear black on here, but it is more of a brown a deep bronze.

367

00:54:37.830 --> 00:54:52.290

Nancy Powell: Okay. All right. Well, my comments are this I appreciate the the blade signs that you come back down to 24 feet on those, you know, when you look at this building, it is a beautiful old historic building. There's plenty of branding here already. You've got the green awnings you've got the one sign on each facade, which is, I believe, where the standards are that you get one side one sign on each side. I do have a problem with the rooftop sign just in as a precedent for future buildings that will ask for these types of signs. I don't think it's necessary. For your branding for your for the building. I think it takes away. I think it detracts from this particular building. I understand. There'll be A PARKING GARAGE. You know, on the other side. And then I also understood that part of the rationale here was because there was a sign on the other side of the building, but that was a white sign on a white background. So it was very and it's relatively small. So, This is this is much different. As I mentioned before, I'm a Regions supporter. I'm a customer of Regions, I do worry about the precedent and I'm glad that the lighting is going to be taking up because I also think that that is another really big issue that is going to impact the future of our downtown is how much lighting around all of these buildings, you should know the Audubon Society has a Light Out Campaign going on because of some of the light pollution that happens in different parts. You know that it affects the birds and all sorts of things. So anyway, I would, I support the project, except for the rooftop sign. Thank you, and I represent scenic Jacksonville. Thank you.

377

00:56:37.680 --> 00:56:40.590

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you Ms. Powell. Ms. Menzini, do we have any other public comments.

378

00:56:41.730 --> 00:56:58.140

Ina Mezini: Not in the meeting, but I did receive one via email and I will read that. This one is from Jean Shrimp Shrimp Sign and Design at 11501 Columbia Park Drive West Suite 205 Jacksonville, Florida 32258 And it reads, I hope the DDRB does not allow the Regions rooftop sign. I have worked with several small businesses in my 30+ years of sign making in Jacksonville and sign permitting can be very difficult. It is especially difficult to try to explain why some businesses are allowed blatant disregard for existing ordinances and other, often very small businesses, are not allowed exceptions. This is especially troubling when new signage causes visual blight to an existing historic building. Thank you. End comment.

382

00:57:30.690 --> 00:57:38.040

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Ms. Mezini. Let's open it up to board comments. Let's start with Mr. Loretta.

383

00:57:38.490 --> 00:57:39.180

Ina Mezini: Mr. Chair.

384

00:57:39.990 --> 00:57:40.650

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Yes, I'm

385

00:57:40.740 --> 00:57:44.850

Ina Mezini: Sorry to interrupt. Mr. Guy Parola has his hand raised and so does, Mr. Schilling as well.

386

00:57:47.160 --> 00:57:49.860

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Mr. Schilling as a hand up right, okay, well let's start with Mr. Parola.

387

00:57:52.560 --> 00:57:54.540

guy parola: Thank you, Board, I just wanted to just kind of give a little, maybe context to why staff is supportive of the roof sign and give a little context as to what signage would be allowed if the applicant and the building owner weren't pursuing a historic designation. So there's kind of a balancing act here right, we we want this building preserved and they're going down that route. But, part of the cost of that is preserving the facade of the building, so the cost of that facade is depriving themselves of wall signage, they would otherwise be entitled to by right if they didn't designate themselves. They can't very well start disrupting that historic facade and if they disrupt the historic facade they can't very well

designate themselves. So what we end up with is, is a roof sign that in staffs opinion, the you know the the applicant has has really gone out of the way to listen to the board and come up with something that we found respectful. But also giving them the signage that that they desire and we do feel that they've really listened to the to the Board. I just kind of wanted to give that a little, little bit of context there. So thank you for allowing me to speak.

397

00:59:20.820 --> 00:59:23.970

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Mr. Parola, I appreciate those comments, Mr. Schilling.

398

00:59:25.110 --> 00:59:34.680

Bill Schilling (DDR B): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to share with you and and the Board that my firm Kimely Horn is providing services to Regions bank on this site. So because of that conflict, it would not be appropriate for me to to vote on this item today. So I'm going to recuse myself and want to make you aware of that. Thank you.

400

00:59:47.460 --> 00:59:55.770

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Mr. Schilling I'll note your recusal during the vote. And if I don't, Mr. Teal will catch me. Thank you.

401

00:59:58.770 --> 01:00:00.570

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Ms. Menzini, any other hands raised? No. OK, let's try Mr. Loretta board comments.

404

01:00:08.400 --> 01:00:09.600

Joe Loretta (DDR B): All right. Thank you. I think it'd be intriguing to see that picture that we just had up with the new building in the background. Which was partially discussed, but not is that there's going to be a large blank wall in the background so that that black sign, you know, may not be as obtrusive as as many are thinking. I do appreciate Regions and the group from going back and listening to our requests and I feel as though, and I also appreciate Mr Parola indication on the effect of the difference between putting it directly on the wall itself versus above. So at this point I'm in support of the application. Thank you.

409

01:00:58.590 --> 01:00:59.520

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Mr.Loretta

410

01:01:01.320 --> 01:01:03.000

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Excuse me, Mr. Brockelman

411

01:01:04.380 --> 01:01:13.110

Matt Brockelman (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just echo what Mr. Loretta said, and Ms. Trimmer, thanks to you and your client for being willing to work with the board on this and I'll be voting in favor

412

01:01:15.180 --> 01:01:18.000

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Brockelman. How about Mr. Allen.

413

01:01:19.530 --> 01:01:20.370

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you, Chairman. Ms. Trimmer wonderful presentation. I thought you and your client really took the recommendations and concerns of the Board to work it into a project and I do appreciate that. I also would like to tag team on top of Mr. Parola's comment on that as well. It's not often that we see an applicant really work hard to incorporate not only the Boards concerns, but a lot of the public's concerns as well. I think the rooftop sign actually looks very, very good. And I think it's a great example of an applicant compromising what they initially thought that they wanted and what they ultimately gave to the city of Jacksonville. I think that the any concerns on the rooftop sign are also a little bit misguided are out of place. This building is surrounded by high rises on all sides. So it's not like this is a 30 story building and we're putting that at the top of the building. It's it's a relatively neutral sign in relatively relatively small in size as well. Ms. Trimmer just echoing slightly onto onto your comment on the up lighting I think the lighting access accenting the columns make it look great it elongates the building. It gives it some more height. And looks really, really good. I think some of that may be missed if it's just shining on the ornaments on the top of the window. So I actually like the elongated lighting and I'll leave those comments and I'm in full supportive of the project. Thank you.

425

01:03:13.740 --> 01:03:16.110

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Allen. How about Mr. Davisson

426

01:03:18.090 --> 01:03:32.430

Craig Davisson (DDRB): Just so I'm clear what's allowable under the downtown guidelines is 24 square foot for a blade sign on each street side. Is that correct, so we're allowing a third sign to exceed that 24 square feet. So they've already basically on the blade signs, they're stepping over correct?

429

01:03:45.330 --> 01:03:55.230

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Board member Davisson through the chair. That's correct. They're allowed the blade signs would be 1 24 square foot blade sign per street frontage that's All of our signs. How about so they're requesting an additional blade sign for that front edge along Laura Street, you're correct.

432

01:04:04.740 --> 01:04:05.130

Okay.

433

01:04:06.480 --> 01:04:26.700

Craig Davisson (DDRB): My opinion, the roof signage and we are not rivaling in with the high rises. This is a two story historic building. So, you know, if you want to talk about context, that roof sign in my opinion is out of scale and doesn't belong on the street. And I guess it also sets I think a poor precedent, you know, for here on out on buildings at this scale. That's all I have to say.

436

01:04:40.860 --> 01:04:44.430

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Davisson appreciate those comments. Board member Durden.

437

01:04:48.540 --> 01:04:50.160

brenna durden (DDRB): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. So this is a this is a hard project for me to wrap my arms around. And one thing I am going to ask Mr. Teal is whether or not the Board can possibly split the vote because I I can live with and and believe that the blade signs are appropriate. Even the third one that is going to be on the far northern end of the building. And I wanted to tell Ms. Trimmer that I appreciate the work and the effort that she makes I know how hard she works with her clients and with staff to find a solution that is is you know meets with everyone's approval. My, my, can I have two questions. I did notice that going back to the Forsyth parking garage on page five of the Forsyth application, you'll see the there's a picture of the existing Region sign that's on that white wall facing north and it's and I think it was Ms. Powell, who said, it's very small and white and there is a triangle. They do have the triangle that's green, but it's quite small, um, you know, I I don't have problems with wall signs. I know that this Board has held the feet to the fire, if you will, in some other projects, when it's come to wall signs and the amount of signage. I have, I cannot support this roof sign it just looks like it's out of, you know, the 1930s, when there were no regulations, no nothing. It just seems out of scale. It seems it will create a precedent, because we do have provisions that talk about what is in the surrounding areas our regulations refer to what's in the surrounding areas. We do not have roof signs that I can recall in the downtown like this. You know, I believe that there could be some other way. I'm facing south. We're talking about a sign that even Ms. Trimmer said is only going to be legible down to the circle where Andrew Jackson is, why do we feel like we need to approve this roof sign when it takes away from the architectural aspects of the building, in my opinion, all of this is of course my opinion. I'm The it takes away from the beauty of the and I'm not an architect, but there the the top of the building has a beautiful series of columns that surround it on the perimeter of the building. I think that the sign just looks like it's been stuck there and it has nothing to do with the building, doesn't blend in with the building at all. And now on the lighting. I have, I actually am glad to hear what Ms. Boyer told us, um, I, I think I have a couple of concerns about timing and that is what do we do in the meantime. Um, and, but the green lighting. Seems to me as a lay person that it will not accentuate the columns, because you won't be able to see the columns with the green. If it was

what, you know, regular, I don't know whether we want to call it white lighting or something, then I think that you'd you do result in a accenting an extenuation of the architectural detail, but to me when I look at the photograph or, you know, the proposed night view, I don't see the columns at all. I see just the green up lighting. So you know I I want to support regions, I, I'm fully supportive of the blade signs. I think that they are appropriate. I can not in good conscience support the roof sign. I may even be able to live with the green lighting. It's the roof sign that just seems to, for me just is is just inappropriate for this building and this location and just seems like it's a direction that I don't think this Board should should go in. So I would like to go back to the idea that that I asked at the beginning. And that is, is there does this Board have the authority if it wanted to or if it wants to, to say that we only want to approve a portion of the application as opposed to all of it. Is that an option for the Board, Jason.

469

01:10:56.820 --> 01:11:05.400

Jason Teal OGC: Through the chair to Board memeber Durden, yeah, you could certainly approve in part and deny in part an application. It all depends on how the motion is framed. So if the if the initial motion which would have to have a second is to approve the project as is then you know if you didn't want to approve the project as as you would vote against that and then a second, if that motion we're not to to pass, then a second motion could be made to approve it, and part and deny it, in part, and then you would go through that same process.

472

01:11:28.950 --> 01:11:31.590

brenna durden (DDRB): Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

473

01:11:33.000 --> 01:11:35.190

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Ms. Durden, I appreciate those comments. Also, just make a few comments. I had ex parte communication with Ms. Trimmer, I need to report that I'd also like to say that I appreciate the work that Regions and Ms. Trimmer have done in response to our initial workshop to try to find a compromise between the needs and the desires of the business and the recommendations by the downtown development review board. I'd like to ask Mr. Parola, Mr. Parola do we have sign regulations that cover specifically rooftop billboard signage.

477

01:12:14.880 --> 01:12:23.430

guy parola: Thank you and through the chair, I do want to kind of parcel out your words, a little bit. Billboards or or off site signage this isn't right, because it's signage that reflects a service or entity that is on site. So I want to make sure that that's clear. Roof signs are permitted by by exception. That's why you have the exception in front of you. Where there seems to be lack of clarity or guidance at least as you walk away from monument signage is the illumination of that sign in the lighting of the sign. So I think that's, that's where make a lot of this discussion is coming from and that is is also why without being particular to any one application that's why Ms. Boyer before said we're going to to go down that road and address it as part of the bid plan and CRA update. So

that's, hope that answers your question.

485

01:13:16.830 --> 01:13:18.690

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): It does. Thank you, Mr. Parola, I think. I'm fairly clear that, you know, this type of signage in general is allowed. There is some issue on the lighting and I think there needs to be some more clarity built into the signage code for these kind of instances. So that we have a better direction to applicants in the future when they, when they do want to add a sort of a free standing rooftop signage for themselves on their own building. And then, you know, I will also say, you know, the lighting. I think Cowford Chop House did a good job on their lighting and its applications. A workbook or show of examples of articulating architectural detail using lighting their corner details is lit up by clear lighting that's that's the way you like architectural details. I think the region's lighting, you know, sort of very clearly falls into the branded lighting sphere which you know is, is becoming very prevalent in our downtown. Also, in the example as VyStar's Call Center Building which has blue up lighting in addition to their headquarters building. And now, in addition to their garage. So the cats out sort of so to speak on on up lighting and branded lighting in our downtown and something else I think we ought to address as it becomes more common. All that being said, I'd like to ask for motion if there, or if there are any ask Ms. Menzini if there are any hands raised.

495

01:14:53.970 --> 01:14:58.290

Cyndy Trimmer: If I might have an opportunity just to address some of the comments that were made before we vote. Sure. I appreciate that. I'll be brief. I didn't want to rehash everything I had said during the original. But I think it's important that we do remember this is one of the most decorated buildings in terms of the facades, we truly don't have the ability to put a wall sign on this building. So when we're talking about the concern about a slippery slope and establishing precedent, it really isn't. This building is unique. There, most of the other buildings downtown are not going to have this problem, even if you look at something like creamers or the apartment that Kramer's has next door. It's really just the bottom floor that ornamental on that one. And they could put it above it and they wouldn't have that problem because the building changes at the second floor. So we're not opening a can of worms here with approving this specific sign package. And then in terms of why we have the number of blade signs we do, it's because we have the Terracotta features wrapping the corner of our building. And we couldn't put it from the corner like Cowford, we looked at it. We tried. We had sign consultants coming and looking and we just don't have the space between those terracotta features to be able to mount something, so we had to go with the sides. And I, in terms of the roof. We spent a lot of time looking at the balustrade and I'm sure I'm probably pronouncing that wrong, but that's why the sign is raised above that, so that it wasn't competing with that architectural feature, but it's still shorter than the tallest feature on the building and we really did put a lot of thought into that. But I, I would really like to give Keith Presley from Regions, just a second to speak and explain why Regions feels that the signage is important. I think we need to hear from them and let them have that opportunity.

507

01:16:37.440 --> 01:16:48.180

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Ms. Trimmer. Before we do that I have made an error on my Board comments section. So please let me go back to Mr. Harden for comments. Mr. Harden and please forgive me.

508

01:16:50.520 --> 01:16:53.280

Christian Harden (DDRB): I'll forgive you. No problem. Just this time. So I think that I think there's a lot of good conversation I had, I did have ex parte communication with Ms. Trimmer and Mr Dibenow about the issue, um, you know, I had a chance to review it and also speak with staff with all members of the DA staff because I had a lot of questions and there's obviously been a lot of work put into this by both sides. You know, I'd say before we workshopped and since we've workshopped it, and I'm okay with the blade signs and I've gotten comfortable with the rooftop sign because the inability to put a wall sign which most other buildings would, but I think on the lighting. I think that the architectural lighting would be the stipulation that I would request. As part of this in the same way you mentioned, Mr. Lee about Cowford having that lit up. And I think that if you could move away from the branded site lighting and move to an architectural lighting I think that it would highlight the building so that way the main focus WOULDN'T BE ON THE SIGN IT WOULD BE EQUAL TO THE signage and the architectural value of the building, which is what we're, which is what I think the applicant was trying to protect in the way that they constructed the signage. So that's, that's my my feedback.

516

01:18:13.920 --> 01:18:14.940

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Harden. I appreciate your graciousness and me skipping you the first round, Ms. Trimmer, you mentioned you'd like another applicant to speak on behalf. Just a reminder name, address, thank you very much.

518

01:18:28.710 --> 01:18:31.680

Cyndy Trimmer: It's Keith Presley and Mr. Presley should be on

519

01:18:36.150 --> 01:18:38.190

Keith Pressley (Regions): Okay, can, can everyone hear me. Okay, Chairman and Board members I appreciate the conversation this afternoon and the consideration of our sign package. I do want to stress that, you know, we, we went to great detail. Since the original presentation of this package we heard what you said. We, we took that to heart and we modified our, our sign package to what we thought was going to meet the requirements of the Board. But one of the things that I want to point out today and I know there's conversation about the height of the building and the roof sign and those type things. In our signage, even on the back of the building that we have currently. But when you look at the surroundings of of our building today. You know, It's pretty open it you know the visibility of our building from West Bay, Laura and for side street is extremely good because there's no seven story parking deck competing with that visibility. You know, when you look at the other

surroundings and you now envision that with this new seven story parking deck and our two story building You've got the the wells fargo building across the street. You've got the parking deck this a little bit further down West Bay. You've got Sun Trust and other buildings. We're going to be dwarfed in a sea of much taller buildings. And you know, we want you know this parking deck is good for the city is ultimately good for the businesses downtown. But we've got to be careful that we don't lose our identity and in the process. And I think our sign package, particularly with the modifications, we've made. We've made a modest attempt to maintain some visibility and viability in that downtown market. You know, we think that the roof sign is an integral part of our visibility in the market, because we do lose it with everything going on around us. We do want to make sure that you know the Board understands that at night. You know when our sign is the latest really the letters and the the Delta there. And when you look at the blade signs. It's really just going to be the letters and the delta. So a lot of that sign, particularly at night, it becomes mostly invisible because its only the lighting of the letters. You know the up lighting that you've referenced on the building, you know, that was our attempt to address what we understood was a requirement. You know, from the Board and maybe even the historical preservation committee as well that we highlight the architectural features of the building, we think it's a beautiful building and we certainly don't want to detract from it. And, you know, you won't realize that during the day that we have done it. But I think is an exceptional job of preserving the historical features of that building. And then, you know, the up lighting, we're talking about is only going to be visible during the hours of darkness and we think that the lighting would certainly be attributable to highlighting those architectural features that that you won't you know won't highlight. So, you know, I would respectfully ask that you know that you're approve this sign package that we've submitted.

547

01:22:52.230 --> 01:22:55.140

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Presley. Please provide your address for the record.

548

01:22:57.030 --> 01:23:00.090

Keith Pressley (Regions): My address is 250 River Chase Parkway Birmingham, Alabama 35244

550

01:23:05.190 --> 01:23:05.700

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you. Are there any other comments from the Board at this time I'd like to open it up for a motion if someone would like to make one. I have a motion to approve without any conditions from Mr. Allen do I have a second?

553

01:23:32.910 --> 01:23:33.330

Christian Harden (DDRB): Second.

554

01:23:34.320 --> 01:23:43.590

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): I have a second from Mr. Harden and so will vote on this motion with no changes to the application. All those in favor please say aye.

555

01:23:44.070 --> 01:23:44.970

Joe Loretta (DDR B): Aye. Aye.

556

01:23:45.300 --> 01:23:45.750

Aye.

557

01:23:47.580 --> 01:23:50.760

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): And are there any opposed please say ne.

558

01:23:52.980 --> 01:23:53.520

brenna durden (DDR B): Ne

559

01:23:54.420 --> 01:24:01.020

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): We have two Nays, Mr. Davisson and Ms. Durden. We have one recusal Mr. Schilling So, Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers, please help me out here, Mr. Teal I believe that the motion passes.

562

01:24:11.610 --> 01:24:18.960

Jason Teal OGC: Yes, Mr. Chairman. It's the majority of those that are present and able to vote so the motion would pass three to two.

563

01:24:20.640 --> 01:24:29.790

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): OK, so the motion carries. Motion to approve DDR B 2020 dash 014 is approved. Thank you, Ms. Trimmer. Thank you Board. I'd like to move on to action item D DDR B 2020 dash 017 the JTA special sign exception. Because the applicant George McGregor and myself work for the same firm I'll be stepping back from the meeting and obviously from the voting. I'll be handing the meeting over to the Vice Chair, Mr. Allen, please take over.

566

01:25:01.950 --> 01:25:03.180

Brent Allen (DDR B): Chairman Lee, thank you. I'll do my best to follow your good lead. If we may Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers have a staff report please.

570

01:25:13.530 --> 01:25:26.940

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Yes, thank you Mr. Allen. My name is Lori Radcliffe-Meyers with the downtown Investment Authority, and I will be presenting an overview of DDR B application 2020 017 the JTA special sign exception. DDR B application 2020 017 seeks approval for a special sign exception to allow for one

monument sign located at the overland hub transit station. The proposed monument sign is six feet by six feet for a total of 36 square feet. The sign will be constructed of concrete masonry block with a 36 inch brushed metal sign attached. On September 10 the Board heard and approved the overland hub mobility mobility modification application. As part of that application JTA was allowed one freestanding informational sign associated with the locations, not to exceed 12 feet in height and three feet in width. With the location redesign the previously approved sign does not meet the needs of the mobility hub. The proposed monument sign will be placed at the corner of Kings Avenue along the main entrance to the mobility hub. The sign does not overwhelm the site and is similar to surrounding monument signs within the area. Based on the foregoing the downtown development review board STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF DDRB application 2020 017 For a special sign exception to the downtown overlay district to allow for one monument sign as identified in the attached signage application request for approval and conclude staff summation staff is available for questions. Thank you.

580

01:26:52.980 --> 01:26:56.730

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you, Ms Radcliffe-Meyers. Ms. Menzini, do we have any public comment.

581

01:27:02.250 --> 01:27:02.880

No. We do not.

582

01:27:04.290 --> 01:27:06.060

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you. We will now move on to hear from the applicant.

584

01:27:12.720 --> 01:27:12.870

Ina Mezini: So, I'm so sorry. I have a hand raised from Nancy Powell.

586

01:27:20.700 --> 01:27:30.180

Nancy Powell: Yeah, I would just, I would just like to ask, it's really helpful for the applicant to make the presentation and then have the public comments versus having public comments beforehand. It's when you have the applicant describe it, it's, it's just awkward to try to do it ahead of time. So that would be my request.

588

01:27:41.700 --> 01:27:42.840

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you. I'm staying consistent with how we've done it the rest of today, we'll move into applicant comment. Can we hear from the applicant, please. And can you state your name and address.

590

01:27:54.090 --> 01:28:08.550

George McGregor: Um, this is George McGregor. I'm with HDR engineering. We're located at 76 South Florida Street here in downtown Jacksonville in the VyStar

building and I'm presenting on behalf of the Jacksonville Transportation Authority.

591

01:28:11.160 --> 01:28:12.420

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you. Please proceed.

592

01:28:13.590 --> 01:28:14.880

George McGregor: Can I share my screen.

593

01:28:16.920 --> 01:28:17.760

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: You should be able to.

594

01:28:20.490 --> 01:28:21.750

Ina Mezini: Yes. Should be able to.

595

01:28:23.820 --> 01:28:24.210

George McGregor: All right. Again, this is a request for a monument sign at the Kings Avenue transit hub. We had called it the Overland Mobility hub in the last application and there's been a request for an official name change by JTA. As a reminder, the Kings Avenue transit hub is a multimodal facility that will handle bus rapid transit as well as regular bus service. It's adjacent to the skyway station at Kings Avenue. It's also going to include the ability to allow the new proposed UTC to service the area. It's also going to be able to accommodate rideshare such as Uber and Lyft, as well as personal vehicles in there is public parking spaces provided. We're going to include an area for Bike Share and EV charger to allow basically any type of public or private transport to use the facility. Again, the overall layout of the facility is divided into two portions with the entrance on the south end into the actual of area and a new egress created at the north end. There is a separate entrance at the north end or access to the skyway station proper. The site boundary shown here is, just a reminder that this is under the interstate 95 overpass by the overland bridge, so nearly the entire facility is shaded by the overpass. As you know, it is in the South Bank area zoning is CC G one, so Again under I 95 i think is going to be a key factor here. The entrance sign will be located at Gary Street and Kings Ave. As stated before, it'll be a six foot tall by six foot wide sign it will be illuminated by floodlights. We had to find a spot and makes sense in accordance with the columns that support the overhead bridge and the best spot we've located is here at the entrance just inside of the column line. Again, looking from the north through the improved area. It would be at the south end where all of the vehicles are going to enter the site. Here are some existing site photos. It's a very shaded area. This will be improved significantly by the lighting that will be attached on the columns and also overhead. There are a few areas that will provide lighting on standalone poles. The lower left photo is the corner where we'll actually locate, the upper right just another view of that same corner where the sign will be located. But basically, between that stop sign and those electric meters. Areas of signage, is basically ground signage and that's what we're proposing also there is a sign over

at Southbank plaza on Prudential Drive. There is a nearby sign for the Naugle funeral home that's a block away. There's a sign for the Kings Avenue parking garage, which is about a block south and also south on the other side of the road, there is a large mounted sign for the hotel.

Here's a concept of the sign. Again, it's six by six CMU block with mounted sign face on it. And it has the JTA logo. And will be a brushed metal finish. There will be lighting, provided that is LED lighting. This is just to show that it is going to meet code for wind speed, and it's a very heavy duty construction sign and the lighting will be up lights, there will be led flood lamps on both sides of the sign. Standard LED lighting. That'll be in the ground with the luminaries up above the ground pointing up to the sign. Rendering of what the sign would look like at night, although additional lighting will be included under the overpass for the hub itself. And last, here's an example of a sign that's already been constructed at another one of the transit hubs on University Boulevard. So that's the same detail that we're using to construct of the sign of approval. And with that, I am ready to take any questions.

634

01:34:12.810 --> 01:34:17.730

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. McGregor will move into board comment. First, I'd like to call on. Sorry, I get some feedback. First, I'd like to call him Mr. Loretta

637

01:34:26.310 --> 01:34:30.600

Jason Teal OGC: Mr. Chairman, you may want to open public comment. Prior to doing more comments.

638

01:34:31.530 --> 01:34:33.390

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you. I thought we already went through that.

639

01:34:34.800 --> 01:34:36.150

Brent Allen (DDRB): Is there any public comment. Is Ms. Powell raising her hand. There are no hands raised moment.

641

01:34:47.760 --> 01:34:48.270

Nancy Powell: I see here

642

01:34:48.780 --> 01:34:50.070

Brent Allen (DDRB): Hold on, I see raising her

643

01:34:50.430 --> 01:34:50.700

Okay.

644

01:34:52.380 --> 01:34:53.760

Nancy Powell: Sorry, I couldn't find the botton.

645

01:34:53.970 --> 01:34:55.200

Ina Mezini: I'm sorry, I have a bad connection.

646

01:34:57.000 --> 01:34:59.250

Brent Allen (DDRB): Ms. Powell, can you state your name and address please.

647

01:34:59.760 --> 01:35:03.780

Nancy Powell: Nancy Powell 1848 challenge Avenue Jacksonville, Florida. I just want to say this is not a very scenic area. So I don't think this is a big deal, but I just, I'm a little curious as to why it needs to be six foot tall. A monument sign really should be lower to the ground and I, it looks like to me from those pictures of the location that there could be a potential safety hazard. I mean, six foot tall you you could hide behind that and nobody would see you. And so if you were lower. You know, like, four feet tall. It would be better. And so I don't really understand the need for the height.

652

01:35:44.910 --> 01:35:47.520

George McGregor: Wendy, are you on the line. Could you address that.

653

01:35:50.580 --> 01:35:56.550

wendi murray: Yeah, yeah, I'm here, I'm Wendy Marie JTA program manager for facilities and the multimodal Yeah, I hear what you're saying there for us the six foot was slotted to match our standard signs elsewhere. It's a good height, especially here with all the columns and and all that going on to make sure when people are driving, they actually can see it and it doesn't get lost. Um, I don't think we've had quite a safety issue concern, i'll have to check at other locations. Although like you did say there's a lot going on here at this particular location. So it's that that right now. We were sticking with our standard six foot sign is what this one is proposed. But we'll hear any Board comment.

659

01:36:45.480 --> 01:36:56.520

George McGregor: And also I just like to add, you know, it's an area that is full of bridge columns. So if somebody is looking to be bad, there are plenty of other opportunities in this area.

660

01:37:00.420 --> 01:37:02.040

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you. Any other public comments.

661

01:37:06.450 --> 01:37:06.930
19046735009: Can you hear me. We can

663
01:37:08.580 --> 01:37:09.810
Brent Allen (DDRB): Can you state your name and address

664
01:37:09.810 --> 01:37:17.340
19046735009: For the record, please. No, I'm sorry, Ina Menzini. I'm just connected on audio differently, a bad connection, but I do not see any additional hands raised at the moment.

665
01:37:17.880 --> 01:37:18.750
Brent Allen (DDRB): Gotcha. Thank you.

666
01:37:20.040 --> 01:37:22.470
Brent Allen (DDRB): Seeing that there's no other comments I will turn to commentary from the Board. I'd like to first call on Mr. Loretta, please.

668
01:37:29.310 --> 01:37:34.980
Joe Loretta (DDRB): Yeah, can I ask that the applicant turn it back to the example of the other signage. There, okay, so then this is good. Do you have the ability to zoom in a little bit more on the block. I'm just trying to confirm in the line is we're using kind of a split faced color block. It's not really just a standard CMU so looking a little bit nicer than than just a standard CMU block you kind of threw me there. A little bit when you made that statement.

674
01:38:07.620 --> 01:38:08.490
George McGregor: Okay, sorry.

675
01:38:11.280 --> 01:38:18.270
Joe Loretta (DDRB): I mean, is that I can see it looks like split face on the edge on the front side of it. I guess it's it's still a little bit split face as well.

676
01:38:19.110 --> 01:38:21.150
George McGregor: Yes, that's correct.

677
01:38:21.510 --> 01:38:31.140
Joe Loretta (DDRB): Yes. Okay. Then I have no objection, I would ask that maybe the mason can do a little bit better job with the mortar than one done on this project here. But beyond that, I had no no negative feedback on the project. Thank you.

679

01:38:37.320 --> 01:38:40.500

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. Loretta next Ms. Durden please.

680

01:38:44.430 --> 01:38:55.800

brenna durden (DDRB): Thank you very much. I could I ask for a point of clarification in regards to the blocks, because the application shows CMU block. And but it does not look like the sign, the existing sign. So could the applicant clarify. Are they proposing to use the same block that is being proposed that is existing on I'm sorry, can you go back. Thank you. To the university transit.

685

01:39:20.790 --> 01:39:23.130

George McGregor: It is a replication of this design.

686

01:39:24.030 --> 01:39:26.070

brenna durden (DDRB): Okay, okay, um, And then my second question is, it's not clear to me. Is there going to be lettering on both sides of this sign because this application makes it look like there will be, but the location, It doesn't make sense that there would be a signage on both sides.

688

01:39:47.010 --> 01:40:04.200

George McGregor: There will be signage on both sides, it's a little bit difficult to see when approaching from the north because of all the bridge columns, but there is spacing, where as you do approach between the columns, you'll be able to see the sign from the north also.

689

01:40:09.120 --> 01:40:11.160

brenna durden (DDRB): Okay, I'm looking at page nine. Is that a car space right where the back of the sign is going to be, if you will, the backside.

691

01:40:19.710 --> 01:40:24.450

George McGregor: I'm Page nine where it's just a photograph that we're looking at now.

692

01:40:24.990 --> 01:40:27.090

brenna durden (DDRB): You're right, it shows it. Okay.

693

01:40:27.270 --> 01:40:31.080

George McGregor: Just, just pointing to the proposed location of the sign itself.

694

01:40:32.130 --> 01:40:39.360

brenna durden (DDRB): Right. So how are you going to see it coming from the I gather that this, this is looking north. Correct.

695

01:40:39.900 --> 01:40:40.410

George McGregor: Yes, ma'am.

696

01:40:40.920 --> 01:40:45.300

brenna durden (DDRB): Okay, so how are you going to see it. IF YOU ARE TRAVELING SOUTH. It, you know what, to see the sign. I don't see how you're going to see that signage with that.

698

01:40:53.790 --> 01:41:08.190

George McGregor: Actually, I did go out and approach it from the North. And so as you go as your vision goes between the columns, there are areas where you'll be able to see the sign from the north approach also.

699

01:41:09.000 --> 01:41:11.160

brenna durden (DDRB): Is there a parking space right next to it.

700

01:41:12.330 --> 01:41:15.450

George McGregor: There are parking spaces. Yes, there are.

701

01:41:17.190 --> 01:41:30.660

wendi murray: Yes. And this goes back to that the six feet high, it helps us a little bit here. But Jay Jay was on site as well with HDR and we walked down and drove down from both directions, and you get pika boo type views between the columns. That's right.

703

01:41:35.340 --> 01:41:35.700

brenna durden (DDRB): Okay. I don't have any further questions. Mr. Chairman, Mr. substitute, Cheers Thank you.

705

01:41:43.740 --> 01:41:46.380

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. Harden, please.

706

01:41:49.110 --> 01:41:50.280

Christian Harden (DDRB): I don't have any comments or questions on this.

708

01:41:53.250 --> 01:41:54.000

Brent Allen (DDRB): Mr. Shilling.

709

01:41:55.530 --> 01:41:57.900

Bill Schilling (DDRB): I don't have any comments or questions. Thank you.

710

01:41:58.740 --> 01:42:00.090

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. Brockelman.

711

01:42:01.440 --> 01:42:06.900

Matt Brockelman (DDRB): I don't have any comments or questions either Mr. Allen, I will just say for the record that like on the VyStar Agenda Item, JTA is one of our firm's clients in Jacksonville, so I'll be recusing on this vote just out of an abundance of caution, even though I haven't been directly involved in this particular project noted. Thank you.

713

01:42:17.670 --> 01:42:18.420

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. Davisson.

714

01:42:19.620 --> 01:42:37.380

Craig Davisson (DDRB): Just a question to the applicant. I'm not, I guess what I'm seeing. I'm not sure if it's the exact location, but you've got electrical boxes switchgear, transformer. I'm not quite sure what I'm seeing is that the reason that the sign was put there was to hide all that stuff.

715

01:42:38.370 --> 01:42:43.830

George McGregor: Not to hide it, but it's the most visible spot that we could find on the site. Where you would see it from Kings Avenue.

717

01:42:49.080 --> 01:42:50.460

Craig Davisson (DDRB): I have no further questions.

718

01:42:51.030 --> 01:42:51.870

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. Davisson.

719

01:42:52.890 --> 01:42:59.640

Brent Allen (DDRB): One question for myself is, is both sides of the sign going to have lighting.

720

01:43:00.510 --> 01:43:01.470

George McGregor: Yes, that's correct.

721

01:43:02.250 --> 01:43:11.250

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you. I don't have any other for further comments. I'm seeing no further comments from the Board or the public And to note the record that Mr. Lee and Mr. Brockelman or going to sit out of voting on this project. I'd like to open it up to a motion, please.

723

01:43:24.420 --> 01:43:25.350

Bill Schilling (DDRB): Move to a approve.

724

01:43:26.400 --> 01:43:26.880

Joe Loretta (DDRB): Second.

725

01:43:28.050 --> 01:43:32.220

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you. We've had a motion and a second. All in favor say aye. Aye.

726

01:43:32.670 --> 01:43:33.150

Aye.

727

01:43:34.170 --> 01:43:35.370

Brent Allen (DDRB): Any opposed say nay.

728

01:43:38.220 --> 01:43:46.710

Brent Allen (DDRB): The motion carries DDRB 2020 dash 017 and I will hand the gavel back to Mr. Lee, thank you.

729

01:43:47.580 --> 01:43:48.480

George McGregor: Thank you for your time.

730

01:43:51.000 --> 01:43:51.330

wendi murray: Thank you.

731

01:43:52.110 --> 01:43:53.970

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Allen. I appreciate that.

732

01:43:55.170 --> 01:44:08.370

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Let's move on to agenda item E DDRB 2020 dash 019 the Jacksonville Naval Museum Conceptual approval, Ms. Lori Radcliffe-Meyers could we have the staff report. Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers, you might be on mute, or are you still

with us.

734

01:44:23.070 --> 01:44:25.200

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: I am. I apologize. That was my bad. Thank you, Mr. Lee. Again, my name is Lori Radcliffe-Meyers for the Downtown Investment Authority, and I will be presenting an overview of DDRB application 2020-019 The Jacksonville naval museum featuring the USS Orleck. a DDRB application 2020-019 seeks conceptual approval for the proposed Jacksonville naval museum featuring the USS Orleck. Their project proposes to moore the USS Orlick to the south pier which is the most westerly pier at the property commonly referred to as the shipyards, and also to provide temporary facilities on the uplands property. The improvement shall consist of guest services area with restrooms access walkways to the ship and guest services and to provide additional landscaping as well. Based on the foregoing the downtown development review board staff supports conceptual approval of DDR be application. With the following recommendations, the landscape plant palette shall be consistent with the Riverwalk plant palette. Placement of trees shall be along the walkways and around the building to provide visual screening. Single trunk trees shall have a minimum four inch caliper at the time of planting. Multi trunk tree shall have a minimum of three trunks and an overall height of 12 feet at the time of planting. Grasses and/or shrubs shall be planted along the walkways and shall be used to create an understory. Prior to submittal for final review the developer shall provide a landscape plan, lighting plan and signage plan for staff review and approval. And there shall be no sales or placement of Memorial bricks on site. This concludes staff summation staff is available for questions again. Thank you, Chairman Lee.

747

01:46:22.200 --> 01:46:34.020

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers. I appreciate that. I'd like to recognize the applicant John O'Neill to provide the presentation. Could you please state your name and your address. Thank you.

748

01:46:40.530 --> 01:46:51.900

Daniel Bean: Actually, Mr. Chair. This is Daniel Bean I'm the president of the navels the the nonprofit and if you don't mind, I would do that. And then I'm just going to defer to my colleague to give the main presentation.

749

01:46:52.680 --> 01:46:55.380

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Of course, name and address please. Thank you.

750

01:46:55.410 --> 01:47:00.840

Daniel Bean: Thank you. Yes. Daniel Bean 100 North Laura Street 50132. Our Vice President is Justin Weakland he's the one that's been working with the staff and we greatly appreciate all the staffs time and consideration as as to the members of the board as well. Thank you. It's been enlightening to sit through the past two hours presentations and the thoroughness with what you all bring to the task and so

as citizens of Jacksonville. We appreciate you volunteering your time. The USS Orleck is a substitute for the USS Charles Adams, the United States Navy declined to transfer the Adams. And so we shifted, about a year and a half ago to the USS Orleck. Two weeks ago when Hurricane Laura went through Lake Charles, Louisiana, it actually physically blew the USS Orleck from its pier and a mile up the river. We are currently continuing to do assessments of the USS Orleck it did not take on any water it remained upright and battle tested and went through the Korean War, Vietnam War and survived hurricane Laura, apparently. Now there is another hurricane that is pressing down on Lake Charles and it will be there on Saturday. There are applications with insurance companies to see what can happen. But in the meantime we pressed ahead and we appreciate the opportunity to brief you all here today on our concept for bringing a warship and or a Veterans park to downtown. And with that, I would like to defer to my colleague Justin Weakland. Justin.

759

01:48:31.830 --> 01:48:33.570

Justin Weakland (Jax Naval Museum): Good afternoon. Can everybody hear me.

760

01:48:34.920 --> 01:48:37.620

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Yes, thank you Mr. Weakland please state your name and your address.

761

01:48:38.010 --> 01:48:44.070

Justin Weakland (Jax Naval Museum): Justin Weakland 1730 River Oaks Road Jacksonville, Florida 32205. I am somewhat new to zoom. So I'm going to try to share my page here. I get that going right? Yes. Okay. Thank you. So, as Mr. Bean discussed here it is not the Adams. So we'll discuss quickly the, the history of the museum. The idea is it's the US Navy Cold War experience featuring the museum ship the USS Orleck, which has a great tie in to our city. So brief history on the Orleck it is named for Lieutenant Joseph Orleck. He was commanding officer of a what we call a fleet tugg, in the Navy. He was killed in action during the invasion of Italy in World War II and he was awarded the Navy cross. It's a Gearing Class Destroyer. It's about 390 feet long. So it's smaller than what the Adams was. To note. Gearing Class Destroyers there was 14 of those home ported in Mayport here. So that's a tie in. It was known as the Top Gun Vietnam fired 11,000 rounds. It was the Grey Ghost of the Vietnam Coast. So has a great nickname. Earned 14 battle stars in Vietnam another four in the Korean War for a total of 18 battle stars. This is actually the most historic postwar to build ship in the Navy. Another fun fact is it, it actually had a drone helicopter. So it wasn't delivering Amazon packages, but it was delivering torpedoes. Alright so move along. So why naval museum Jacksonville owns the third largest concentration of Navy in the country. 2017 study shows 85,886 jobs right here in Jacksonville, because of the Navy. Norfolk and San Diego have large scale naval museums actually have several. Navy members transition to the area. This can motivate them to stay, myself actually. Great community friendly usage of green space. Add another major Museum to downtown and this is a connection point for active military, veterans and civilians. Alright to elevate tourism, these numbers, the 31 million that was from Four Peak consulting out of Atlanta, and that was prior to covid time. It's a

destination for Navy veteran reunion groups, we are getting many reunion requests and I defer them to visit Jacksonville for hotels. To suitable location for active military ceremonies and functions downtown preserve and safe keep priceless Navy history. And as for any museum its stem educational opportunities and increase historical education. Alright, so for the museum layout as discussed, it's a temporary layout. It's, it's very small there the footprint. That's about it 90 feet by 50 feet that location there is by the the Berkman II pier number one. So the goal is to kind of make it more part of the Riverwalk so it's a small footprint, as discussed an ADA ramp to the ticketing offices office shop bathrooms be included as well because there will be no bathrooms functioning bathrooms on the ship itself. Further along will show you that if the Riverwalk was to extend here, it would actually pass underneath the gangway or you can call it a bridge to the ship. Here's just the overall kind of layout of the size, so it's it's a very small footprint there. And then we have the engineering documents on here as well. And it will show you that. This is just another overhead of the modular building. So it's a temporary building that can be moved later if we need to. The memorial walk, we won't be doing that, as requested by DIA. Here's just another look at it another angle. Okay, so here's the site plan itself. So the building is 28 by 60 feet approximately with 90 feet and 50 feet used there. And like we said it's it's meant to be part of the Riverwalk leaving quite a bit of room there for development or if we need to, we can move it to a permanent location. Okay, so here's that that ramp or what we call gangway, it actually clears the Riverwalk by 10 feet four inches. So that's to help with if the river goes up or down. So to give a clearance over the Riverwalk of eight feet, no matter what. So that gives you the option to extend that Riverwalk there. This is the mooring plan. So the ship itself is not actually right up against the pier. It's up against our, our engineer could explain this better than I can.
Ed are you online?

797

01:54:44.160 --> 01:54:52.140

Ed Morales: Yes, those are those are standoff dolphins that are separated from the pier, but they're based off of the the main bets on the existing pair.

798

01:54:53.580 --> 01:54:54.060

Justin Weakland (Jax Naval Museum): Thank you Ed. This is the outside of the building, we are missing, actually Ms. Radcliffe pointed out to me about a week ago were missing the the ADA ramp that would actually go from the back deck here up to the gangway so ADA compliance and they can walk across or, you know, use a wheelchair. But it's to note that the ship was built in 1947 or excuse me 1945 and the most the wheelchair could actually get around is on the top deck itself of the ship. This is the outside of the module building. So it has two HVAC's for each side of the building there. Here's examples of the modular building this one is down in Daytona Beach. So that's, that's kind of how it looks there when it's put together. Inside you know we'll have the office ticketing office handicap accessible restroom and then these two restrooms on the outside would be for our tour groups or overnight Boy Scouts to use things like that. Here's the vicinity downtown zoning overlay. Here's the property lines. There is the overhead satellite view of the property. This is the available nearby parking to the museum, since we

put this in here to kind of illustrate where nearby parking would be. Since we won't have any there on the location itself. This is just the surrounding buildings of the property there. There's the pier itself, pier number one. Looking south east.

There's Maxwell House coffee north east. Okay, so for the timeline itself. The city ordinance gets approved and then the goal number one is to get the ship to dry dock in Texas. So from there, we, we see if it's feasible or not. If we can actually bring the ship over here to Jacksonville, if it fits within our budget, because the plan is we will paint it from top to bottom. Make it look beautiful brand new before you bring it here. During the same time the pier and up lands work will be done. So we'll get the modular building, place it there at the location and then the work done to pier number one to be prepared for the ship's mooring. We can open fully up two weeks after the ship arrived, because remember this is different from the Adams. The Adams wasn't set up as a museum this ship was already set up as a Museum. It already has static displays inside of it. It's already mapped out, ready to go. So that's the exciting part of the ship here. Let's end there. And then here is our site plans which are Engineer can answer any questions that you may have for the site plans. There's the the dolphins there the standoff dolphins. So it's not right up against the, the actual pier itself. You can see the locations of the ballard's of where the mooring lines will go. Again, there's the the standoff dolphin and then the fender there. There's the ballards and that's our presentation.

826

01:59:50.670 --> 01:59:56.520

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Weakland I appreciate that. Ms. Menzini, do we have any hands raised for public comments.

827

01:59:59.730 --> 02:00:07.170

19046735009: We, we do not, I do not see any hands raised. Let me just double check again because i just got kicked off. Yeah, so no hands raised. I did. Yes No answer. I'm sorry. Oh, good. Okay, thank you.

829

02:00:13.890 --> 02:00:22.260

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): I appreciate that. If there's no public comment I'll go ahead and close the public comments section didn't see any hands raised. So we'll move into Board comments. How about Ms. Durden.

831

02:00:30.780 --> 02:00:32.850

brenna durden (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Um, I was a little bit unclear about how people will other than on the Riverwalk if it's there, how will people walk to this to to the building? I was trying to find where that was showing up on any of the site plans. And maybe that's a question for staff. Or for the applicant.

835

02:01:01.470 --> 02:01:04.980

Ed Morales: Right now they would access it through Catherine's the walkway on

Catherine Street.

836

02:01:08.370 --> 02:01:08.970

brenna durden (DDRDB): Okay. Through the chair to the I guess to Lori. Is there a walkway along Catherine street right now is it improved. Do you recall?

840

02:01:26.040 --> 02:01:46.590

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Board member Durden through the chair. Yes, there is actually a walkway out there and they are proposing a brick walkway that then would connect to their building from that point so yes there and exactly that areas improved to be able to for people to walk on.

841

02:01:47.760 --> 02:01:52.110

brenna durden (DDRDB): Is there anything that shows the brick pathway that they're proposing? Any, anything on the either your report or in?

843

02:01:59.010 --> 02:02:03.360

Trevor Lee (DDRDB Chair): Ms. Durden And it's on the screen right now. Can you can you see it, it's

844

02:02:04.500 --> 02:02:13.020

brenna durden (DDRDB): I can. Yeah, that's one of the I just couldn't tell if that was this thing is that, okay, I'm just trying to get clarification on.

845

02:02:13.650 --> 02:02:14.190

Yeah.

846

02:02:16.980 --> 02:02:26.490

Justin Weakland (Jax Naval Museum): Yes, ma'am. Catherine Street is it's the the end the terminal of the Riverwalk at that end, so it's it's a nice wide pathway.

847

02:02:27.150 --> 02:02:27.570

brenna durden (DDRDB): Okay.

848

02:02:27.600 --> 02:02:36.060

Justin Weakland (Jax Naval Museum): Then our proposals to create a brick pathway to our building. So it, it appears like it's a part of the Riverwalk almost.

849

02:02:36.660 --> 02:02:50.340

brenna durden (DDRDB): Okay. And thank you very much for that clarification. I had

one other question, and that was in regards to the memorial brick and I heard the applicant say that I think that staff had requested that that be deleted. And I see that that's part of the recommendations from staff could, could you tell us why. You felt that that was appropriate and that they should not have a memorial bricks on site.

853

02:03:15.210 --> 02:03:24.990

guy parola: I think I could field that if it's okay with with the Chair, to Board member Durden, it wasn't because we inherently have anything against Memorial brick. It's, it's just said it adds a sense of permanency to the donor. And if this, and if and when this gets redeveloped, and then the offices move into another building, then what do we do with the bricks? We don't want to create a situation where we get sideways with with donors, if that makes sense.

857

02:03:46.590 --> 02:03:49.350

brenna durden (DDRDB): Got it. Okay, thank you very much.

858

02:03:49.560 --> 02:03:50.040

Yeah.

859

02:03:51.840 --> 02:03:55.080

Justin Weakland (Jax Naval Museum): Can I, can I answer that as well, or address that if, if we were to move the bricks, you know, if we were to put Memorial bricks, we would take them with us. We have backup plans if this was not to happen to have Memorial bricks for the ship somewhere else. That would be a VFW or a local Legion office as well so. I live here in Jacksonville, you can leave them on my front yard, if you want.

862

02:04:23.190 --> 02:04:33.660

guy parola: Well, it's not necessarily leaving somewhere. It's just that when people put bricks down they have an expectation that their grandchildren and their grandchildren's grandchildren will be able to look at them. We appreciate the good intentions, just we don't want to create that situation. And that's, that's where we landed. And I think that's where staffs going to remain in their position, but thank you.

864

02:04:50.280 --> 02:04:55.830

brenna durden (DDRDB): I'm supportive of the project. And I think that it's certainly done a good job of expressing and making it clear that it could be moved, if, if that was the long term goal or and it became a reality. And so, you know, I think that I hope that the ship survives the hurricane this weekend. Thank you.

868

02:05:23.400 --> 02:05:25.830

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Ms. Durden. How about Mr. Harden.

869

02:05:28.380 --> 02:05:30.600

Christian Harden (DDRB): I don't have any comments Mr. Chairman.

870

02:05:32.040 --> 02:05:33.780

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Harden. How about Mr. Allen.

871

02:05:35.760 --> 02:05:47.670

Brent Allen (DDRB): I just thank you for your persistence and trying to get this ship to Jacksonville. I think it'd be a nice piece for residents and visitors of our city to see. Thank you. No other comments.

872

02:05:49.080 --> 02:05:51.540

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Allen, Mr. Davisson.

873

02:05:53.400 --> 02:05:56.970

Craig Davisson (DDRB): Well, all I can say is we finally get a ship downtown. One question I understand this is temporary, but am I seeing any kind of landscape. I think I've seen trees in this image.

876

02:06:09.300 --> 02:06:23.130

Justin Weakland (Jax Naval Museum): Yes sir, I'll address that any of our landscaping speaking with our engineer and our unfortunately our landscape artists went on vacation or volunteer landscape artists, but our plans would be the landscaping would be smaller and minimal at, you know, at best, because it is temporary. We could use large pots to put trees and things like that in case we were to pick up and move.

878

02:06:37.320 --> 02:06:40.200

Craig Davisson (DDRB): Okay, well thank you and good luck.

879

02:06:41.160 --> 02:06:41.850

Justin Weakland (Jax Naval Museum): Thank you, sir.

880

02:06:44.640 --> 02:06:46.440

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you. Mr. Davisson and Mr. Schilling.

881

02:06:47.730 --> 02:07:06.600

Bill Schilling (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I just had a couple of

questions and before I ask the questions just share that, that, you know, certainly I'm in support of this and you know I think something that that will be great for downtown and I recognize that this is conceptual review so what I guess one of my questions is, you know, looking at the aerial that's on the screen and, you know, using the Google Maps, you know, it looks like, and it's pretty clear that the parking in that grass field, out in front of the building is allowed and people are doing it right now. So, so would that be available as parking for for patrons that would be coming here or or would you be closing that off. What, what is the plan for that?

884

02:07:37.830 --> 02:07:56.790

Daniel Bean: Mr. Chair, if I might, I think, you know, we've been instructed that parking would not be available there. It is, It is absolutely clear and true that cars are parking there every day. But we're not. We were instructed not to count on that as an available parking spot for us. You know, long term with this is all temporary this this plan long term, we will be working to establish more of a Veterans Park area on the shipyards. This is something that the Iguana and the Jaguars had we had talked to them about it, six, seven years ago, they've included it in different variations of a plan. And so we've, I've talked to a couple of city council folks about this. And so to find a more permanent spot. For veterans Park type of a situation. That's not for discussion. That's not for approval today. But that's why we talk in temporary terms and If we were to move the ship easterly down the shipyards, it would be closer to available surface parking that we have now.

890

02:08:47.940 --> 02:08:55.050

Bill Schilling (DDR): Okay. All right. Terrific. And then the second question I had was just looking at the exhibits and is to clarify is really all access to and from the ship is expected and I guess I would call it the bridge based on the pedestrian bridge from the building across and and there's no plans at this point to reconnect Pier one to the you know, to the bulkhead or or to that Riverwalk it at this point?

893

02:09:16.140 --> 02:09:18.870

Daniel Bean: Not from this, correct, not from this organization.

894

02:09:19.800 --> 02:09:33.360

Bill Schilling (DDR): Okay. Okay, so those are the only questions I had the one comment I'll make is and and to Mr. Davisson's question again. I recognize this as the conceptual review. But I would ask that, that when y'all come back for final if y'all could have maybe a little bit more detail as to, even if it is temporary. What, whatever that landscaping is that y'all are proposing. I saw that staff made that one of the recommendations as a part of their staff report and I fully support that. And then any additional information, you can provide on what what the actual look of this this building. Again, recognizing as modular what that would look like. I think would be really helpful.

898

02:10:05.490 --> 02:10:06.930

Daniel Bean: Christopher, Christopher Flag. Will be doing that for us. He's very, has been a longtime supporter and very excited about it. And as you all know, his imagination has no bounds.

900

02:10:16.560 --> 02:10:17.400

Bill Schilling (DDR B): Yeah. Terrific. All right. Yeah, that's all I have. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

902

02:10:25.050 --> 02:10:28.920

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Mr. Schilling I appreciate that. Mr. Loretta

903

02:10:31.290 --> 02:10:42.450

Joe Loretta (DDR B): Thank you, um, you know, I really wish you all great luck and hope for continued success for y'all. The only thing I would think that maybe we should contemplate Staff maybe making a recommendation. That this is approval for a five year period. And so hopefully the shipyards are built within five years. But if not, and this is still existing, then they may need to upgrade their, their temporary facility, something of that nature.

906

02:11:06.120 --> 02:11:08.910

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Mr. Loretta for those comments, Mr. Brockelman.

907

02:11:10.200 --> 02:11:25.140

Matt Brockelman (DDR B): Thank you, Mr. Chair and some of my questions and clarifications have already been addressed, but Mr. Bean, thank you to you and your board for your tenacity on this project overall, and Mr. Loretta's comments, I thought were smart to me that perhaps staff might look at a scenario where the temporary starts lagging into more of a long term situation and what kind of options the city and the nonprofit can work together on to to have a successful transition. If that ends up being the case. But look forward to supporting it today. And again, appreciate your work. Mr. Bean.

910

02:11:46.380 --> 02:11:47.460

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Mr. Brockelman.

911

02:11:48.750 --> 02:11:58.560

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Mr. Loretta, so let me understand what you're potentially proposing, you want to limit our approval to a certain period of time and I obviously need Mr. Teal to produce an opinion.

913

02:12:02.970 --> 02:12:16.890

Joe Loretta (DDRB): Yeah, yes. I mean, I was just thinking that since it's a temporary use so we should all be in favor, and ideally, this may be able to stay in this location and a commercial shopping center can include you know you know, a mixed use development can include a spatial dimension, the future. But, you know, hopefully they're successful and hopefully the shipyards gets develop and nothing is necessary, but if they're successful and the shipyard doesn't get develop Then, you know, either at a point four or five years from now, even two or three years from now, we should, you know, potentially be looking at, should we be upgrading this facility to be a full time building versus a temporary building.

917

02:12:49.170 --> 02:12:52.500

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Mr. Teal can you provide some guidance. Maybe we lost Mr. Teal.

919

02:13:02.550 --> 02:13:03.210

Daniel Bean: Mr. Chair. Yeah, any agreement that we have for a licensing agreement would be subject frankly to a 90 day removal clause. So I think that that's that was what was true with the Adams, when the city council approved that licensing agreement for us to put the Adams at this pier. I would suggest that anything that that that clause is still there for the Orleck, it has not been approved by city council, but obviously it would remain in that in any licensing agreement. So there would be that 90 day clause. So if, I would suppose that there would be some type of negotiation or improvement made you know for three or four years down the road and and there is no development there. I agree with the Board member that that that is a concern, but I think there's a mechanism that is in the licensing agreement that would require that or allow that type of discussion to occur.

928

02:14:07.290 --> 02:14:15.660

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): So I'm clear, Mr. Bean, so the City Council is able to call your use of this property with a 90 day notice?

929

02:14:16.140 --> 02:14:16.650

Daniel Bean: That's correct.

930

02:14:20.430 --> 02:14:26.610

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Mr. Loretta does it help satisfy your concerns about this temporary facility becoming long term.

931

02:14:28.770 --> 02:14:30.180

Joe Loretta (DDRB): I guess. Right. That's what we're saying. Is. Is that what we're saying with the 90 day notice I mean?

935

02:14:43.830 --> 02:14:48.180

Daniel Bean: I think you were a little broken up what I, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

936

02:14:52.110 --> 02:14:55.260

Joe Loretta (DDRB): I'm sorry. Can you re-explain the 90 day portion for me.

937

02:14:55.440 --> 02:15:07.920

Daniel Bean: Sure. So under our agreement with the USS Adams, which was approved by city council, the terms were, there were many different terms, one of which was that the Adams was subject to a 90 day removal clause. That had that is back into the same type of licensing agreement that will for the USS Orleck that will go before city council at some point. And so that provides the city with, if development comes in that cannot be ignored that needs to be placed there and the developer isn't pleased with having a 390 foot ship warship in its front yard. We would need to move. And that's the 90 day kick out clause. And what I'm suggesting is rather than discuss today whether there, we have a conceptual approval of only three years or four years or whatever, that there is protection for this Board and the DIA and city council, to encourage us to to work on a more permanent location, if that happens, and if that becomes a discussion point. I mean, ultimately what we would like to see obviously is that that Veterans Park is developed somewhere on the shipyards, and that the, a warship anchor that veterans Park and that would be a more permanent location. That doesn't have the type of building that we've contemplated, a modular building that we've contemplated here, and would allow for a brick Memorial brick, and we've sold almost \$20,000 worth of it.

And so it's been a great fundraiser for us, but obviously we don't have a place to put it.

946

02:16:39.270 --> 02:16:40.590

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Bean. Mr. Loretta may I also offer that final approval might be a better time to put constraints on a long term approval, rather than conceptual if we we add a three year or five year window for conceptual, you know, it may have a little bit more teeth for final. Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers?

948

02:17:04.200 --> 02:17:18.990

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Thank you, Chairman Lee. I agree. And then also, Mr. Bean was pointing out there, the resolution that was for the Adams,t does specifically state that there's 90 days but again within the resolution it stated that, let me just go so, for the relocation of the retired naval vessel USS Orleck to downtown Jacksonville as a floating Museum at the former Jacksonville shipyards site on Jacksonville's north bank, said agreement being for a one year period and contingent upon certain conditions. Precedent being met by JHNSA prior to the DIA entering into a 10 year license agreement with JHNSA together with two five year license renewal options. Recommending City Council adopt legislation. So that's already out there in regards to, you know, the agreement that we have with the

JHNSA for the ship. So I'm not sure if we actually need to put something on them regarding that. I may, you know, ask Mr. Teal to weigh in on this as well, but I believe, once the license agreement is signed, and the resolution is passed, that's the the agreement that would be the binding agreement that would give them the ability to continue operations on this facility, permanent And then up to.

958

02:18:43.680 --> 02:18:50.580

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers. Mr. Loretta, are you comfortable with that, or can we move to a vote on conceptual?

959

02:18:54.300 --> 02:19:01.500

Joe Loretta (DDRB): I mean, if I can. I, you know, I'm sorry, I guess I'm I didn't really have a good answer to some extent, I understand. I mean, in the end, I wasn't asking for it to be on a condition on conceptual I was saying that it's my recommendation that staff should be contemplating this for condition on final to Mr. Bean's comment. You know, all I'm looking at doing is, if in two years, the shipyards every five years and ship ER doc develop this is actually successful and then we have a temporary building that's wearing and it's not really looking that good and nothing else has occurred, should we be asking, you know, for them to do something different or re-look at it at that point. That's my point of this and and so you know, nobody else has issued and so be it. But I just, you know,

965

02:19:48.390 --> 02:19:49.290

Daniel Bean: We agree. And I think there are plenty. We agree, and I think that concern can absolutely be addressed.

968

02:20:00.420 --> 02:20:02.280

Joe Loretta (DDRB): Because on my end. I don't want City Council to be voting or putting political pressure. Hey, you have 90 days to upgrade your building facility or we're pulling you out. I mean, that's crazy. And so if we have some sort of something like this. They at least know they've got a five year conceptual grace period on a temporary building minus any development or anything else kind of occurring.

972

02:20:30.090 --> 02:20:36.270

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you for those comments Mr. Loretta and thank you for responding Mr. Bean I appreciate that. I'd like to open it up for a motion if any Board member would like to do so.

975

02:20:39.240 --> 02:20:39.660

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Chairman.

976

02:20:40.860 --> 02:20:42.030

19046735009: Is yes

977

02:20:42.420 --> 02:20:44.310

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Please, Mr. Parola would like to speak.

979

02:20:47.880 --> 02:20:49.620

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): I'll recognize Mr. Parola. Thank you.

980

02:20:50.790 --> 02:20:55.290

guy parola: Thank you, and not to belabor the point, but I think just to get to Board member Loretta's answer. I would say that conceptually I understand what you're saying. And it's appreciated. I would suggest, though, that before either the city or or the Orleck folks even go close to contemplating putting something in it, you know, with any permanency there, they probably want to revisit all the agreements, the license agreement. Everything else first so that they establish by ordinance a sense of permanency there. So by putting any sort of constraints on here, or they're really good intention and conceptually fine, I would suggest that the overriding ordinances themselves are Probably more important. As a first step before we start addressing any sort of sense of permanency. And I don't know if if Ms. Boyer had her hand up as well, but, That would kind of be my observation about it. Thank you.

995

02:21:57.000 --> 02:22:00.660

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Mr. Parola. Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers anything else to add?

996

02:22:02.910 --> 02:22:06.240

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Not from me Chairman Lee. I wasn't sure but I think Mr. Parola stated that Ms. Boyer had her hand raised as well and She's still

1000

02:22:13.320 --> 02:22:16.110

19046735009: I cannot see her hand raised. Oh no. Okay.

1001

02:22:21.840 --> 02:22:22.110

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Okay.

1002

02:22:23.100 --> 02:22:24.330

19046735009: Thank you, Mr. Parola.

1003

02:22:24.840 --> 02:22:29.580

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): If there's no other comments from staff, public officials, or Board members. I'll look for a motion for approval conceptual approval. Okay

thank you Mr. Loretta. I've got a motion for approval. I've got a second from Ms. Durden and thank you very much. All in favor of approving DDRB 2020 Dash 019 Jackson Naval Museum. Conceptual please say I.

1010

02:22:53.970 --> 02:22:54.960

Christian Harden (DDRDB): Mr. I

1011

02:22:55.590 --> 02:22:55.830

Bill Schilling (DDRDB): I need to ask, Mr. Chairman. I was just gonna ask do we need to officially reference the recommendations. A through C in the staff report.

1015

02:23:08.040 --> 02:23:08.550

brenna durden (DDRDB): Yes. And that would have been part of my motion I

1017

02:23:14.490 --> 02:23:17.250

Bill Schilling (DDRDB): Don't know if that was assuming that was a part of the motion. Yes.

1018

02:23:18.510 --> 02:23:19.680

brenna durden (DDRDB): It was part of Joe's

1019

02:23:19.890 --> 02:23:22.830

Joe Loretta (DDRDB): No we'll give it a part of the conditional motions. Yep.

1020

02:23:26.100 --> 02:23:30.750

Trevor Lee (DDRDB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Schilling so Mr. Loretta, would you like to revise your motion?

1021

02:23:31.650 --> 02:23:35.610

Joe Loretta (DDRDB): Yes, I'll make a motion to approve conceptual approval with staff recommendations.

1022

02:23:37.740 --> 02:23:39.030

Trevor Lee (DDRDB Chair): Thank you Mr. Loretta. We have a second by Ms. Durden?

1024

02:23:43.470 --> 02:23:45.810

brenna durden (DDRDB): Yes sir, with staff recommendations.

1025

02:23:46.410 --> 02:23:51.060

Trevor Lee (DDRDB Chair): Wonderful. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Schilling. So, all

those in favor please say aye.

1026

02:23:51.630 --> 02:23:52.530

Christian Harden (DDRB): Aye. Aye.

1027

02:23:53.280 --> 02:23:53.970

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Any opposed. Wonderful. We have conceptual approval of DDRB 2020 dash 019. Thank you. Let's move on to our final action item F DDRB 2020 Dash 012 Brooklyn Yard final approval, Ms. Lori Radcliffe-Meyers, would you please present the staff report.

1031

02:24:20.430 --> 02:24:22.350

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Yes, thank you again chairman Lee. DDRB application 2020-012 Seeks final approval for a new mixed use development, the project site is located at the corner of Forest Street and Riverside Avenue in the Brooklyn overlay district. At the meeting on August 20 2020 the downtown development review review board, excuse me, voted for conceptual approval of application 2020-12 subject to the following recommendations, prior to submittal for final review the developer shall meet with staff to identify any deviation sought, at final review the developer shall provide enough detail so as to illustrate that, that the pedestrian zone meets the definition of such in the ordinance code and meets the various requirements and design features for the pedestrian zone. Streetlights, benches and street furnishings shall be placed in the amenity area. Street furnishings shall be in accordance with the downtown streetscape design guidelines. The applicant has addressed the issues brought up during conceptual and is therefore not seeking any deviations at this time. Based on the foregoing the downtown development review board staff supports final approval of DDRB application 2020-012. This concludes staff summation. Staff is available for questions. Thank you, Chairman Lee.

1041

02:25:39.600 --> 02:25:50.490

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers. The applicant will be Board member Mr. Loretta, I'll have you recuse yourself and then make the presentation for the applicant. Thank you.

1042

02:25:54.690 --> 02:26:00.930

Joe Loretta (DDRB): Thank you. This is Joseph Loretta, I am going to be recusing myself after the meeting today and my address the 7807 Bay Meadows Road East Suite 200 Jacksonville, Florida 32250 no 322 five, six, and with me today I have the architect, a couple of the architects here with Cronk Duke, Joe cronk is here as well as well as Kevin Bennett. Not sure if there's any others with us today the landscape architect assistant is on the project. So I don't want to I know it's 4:20, I Want to go and

1048

02:26:41.760 --> 02:26:42.180

Go on.

1049

02:26:43.980 --> 02:26:49.260

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: I Apologize Mr. Loretta. Christian Harden has his hand up. I'm not sure for

1050

02:26:52.170 --> 02:27:00.330

Christian Harden (DDRB): I did. I raised my hand because we did sort of skip over public comment. But I know this came up previously. Are we gonna wait till the applicants presentation to do public comment? After the presentation?

1053

02:27:06.150 --> 02:27:10.290

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Mr. Harden, we'll wait till the end of the applicants presentation to take public comments.

1056

02:27:16.620 --> 02:27:29.910

Joe Loretta (DDRB): Again, thank you all for your time and service to the city of Jacksonville greatly appreciate it. We're here to discuss the final approval for the Hub Brooklyn, that's going to be Cronk Duke architectures primary office building location into the future, along with a mixed use element. I don't really want to spend too much time showing everybody where this all is and continuing that effort. I do know that everybody did receive a letter from the owner who's property somewhat wraps around us. I will say that we have been in communication with that adjacent property owner on multiple occurrences over the past two months or more. And I really trying to create a plan that can be designed and expanded for future development opportunities onto adjacent properties. So, we're definitely not walling off the adjacent property owner and I can walk you through that as we continue on. These are just some images of the prior project or inspirational projects. Here's a site plan. The primary portions of what did what's included new to the overall project from the prior presentation just discusses the, the overall detailed landscape as well as adding, you know, adding the benches and everything within the rights of way, typically here in in the city of Jacksonville, one would have kind of the furniture zone up on the sidewalk, but due to the speed of Forest and Riverside intersection, along with due to some sight triangle elements we worked with staff to bring some of the benches and trash receptacles up adjacent to the buildings, while also you know, keeping the existing pavement and flow through in a comfortable fashion. So we have some benches and trash stuff goes on either side. Along with kind of a seat wall centering the middle that can be utilized. There is existing lighting that's within this area that will be maintained as well. The overall, you know, Landscape Project and elements to it. There were questions and desires for for larger shade trees to be brought in. There's a decent amount of utilities that are going to be coming through this bank right here that really are kind of prohibiting larger shade trees to be installed. So we are going in with a mixture of crape myrtle and palm trees to be able to assist with the overall shade canopy of the project. The project will meet the shade criteria and will have

approximately 48% shade coverage at full growth of the plant material. The other elements to the project are that have changed from the prior prior concept here is that we have provided a primary ingress into the buildings to the rights of ways. In here and here is this is an angled right of way versus the prior everything was directly internal to the project, although we do prefer folks walking into the project and coming through. You know, we didn't want to meet code and not have that specific waiver request. So as we continue forward architecture elements are very similar to what everybody has seen previously. We provided the glazing criteria, the signage corrected very overall project. This is just some basic lighting elements to it. Nothing fairly simple simple lighting elements to the overall project, nothing too extreme pieces or anything like that. To recall, we will have basically a mixed use piece with two restaurant types of similar similar restaurant tour, but To, you know, types of restaurants potential taco and coffee bar on each side all utilizing the ground floor with opportunities to come up to the second floor deck. And then the second and third floor as primary more office office uses for Cronk Duke architecture as pre integrated design of how everybody's, you know, kind of moving through and I'm glad to answer any of those questions, if anybody does have any but here's just a as well. So when when looking at this overall project we have open passage ways to to connect through in this direction, in this direction. Or The overall project. As as potentially the adjacent property, you know, comes on board or there's more relations there to to make that happen. It's just kind of continued views. Going around the property street level view. The corner street taco this this view doesn't have the benches that included came a little bit later, but there will be benches in those locations. Some internal shots. As you can see, this really utilizing mass material materials and nice overall view of the project there. So at this point, I'll leave it at that and answer any questions, again Joe Cross is here to answer any questions and you know we can get into much more detail, but With staff approval. You know where they feel comfortable that we're prepared to move forward with this project. Thank you.

1095

02:33:20.490 --> 02:33:28.620

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Loretta. I'd like to open it up for public comments at this time after hearing the staff report and the applicant. Ms. Menzini, do we have any hands raised.

1097

02:33:33.240 --> 02:33:34.980

19046735009: Yeah, yeah, Nancy Powell has her hand raised.

1098

02:33:37.020 --> 02:33:38.280

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Okay, I'll recognize Nancy Powell for three minutes. Thank you.

1100

02:33:40.830 --> 02:33:42.450

Nancy Powell: Hi. Thanks. The design of the building looks great from a, you know, very, there's a lot of variety there and the concept really looks looks wonderful. I do understand that's a busy corner there. Can you tell me is this sidewalk there, that I'm assuming there's a curb there is that a curbed sidewalk?

1105

02:34:01.440 --> 02:34:02.280

Joe Loretta (DDRB): Yes, ma'am.

1106

02:34:02.760 --> 02:34:04.290

Nancy Powell: And in the right away. So that's a curb that goes over?

1109

02:34:09.510 --> 02:34:10.110

Joe Loretta (DDRB): That goes over, yeah, so it's 24 inch curb and gutter in this location.

1112

02:34:15.540 --> 02:34:22.830

Nancy Powell: So is. Are any street trees in the right of way not required, and

1113

02:34:22.860 --> 02:34:27.570

Joe Loretta (DDRB): So, so the right away if you like. If, I can, I just lost my screen here. The right of way line is right here. So all of these plants are actually within the right of way. Does that make sense?

1118

02:34:39.750 --> 02:34:41.520

Nancy Powell: It's, The what you're looking at. The visual is kind of Weird. I don't know

1120

02:34:43.860 --> 02:34:45.000

Joe Loretta (DDRB): All of these plants right here are within the right of way. So the right of way, kind of comes through as such. So the existing palms are in the right of way. And these Five, six, crape myrtls and three more palm trees are also within the right of way. And this is kind of at the edge of the right of way.

1130

02:35:05.460 --> 02:35:13.170

Nancy Powell: Okay. And so, tell me again why we can't. I mean, palm trees and and crape myrtles are really are not shade trees.

1131

02:35:13.770 --> 02:35:20.220

Joe Loretta (DDRB): The reason why you know unfortunately there's underground utilities that are wrapping all throughout a bunch of this and so

1132

02:35:21.960 --> 02:35:30.270

Nancy Powell: Are there other types of medium sized trees that can be. It's just that palm trees, you know, they fall down. There, you know, the palms fall down

there are maintenance issues. And then we just have too many of them. I think it's this this corner just begs for some shade trees. So I'm just surprised that we can't figure that out from a tree well perspective underneath the sidewalk.

1136

02:35:49.410 --> 02:35:54.390

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Ms. Powell. Thank you. Thank you for your comments. Could you also please state your name and your address for the record.

1137

02:35:54.930 --> 02:36:02.250

Nancy Powell: Okay, Nancy Powell 1848 challenge. And I'm sorry to be like a broken record about this, but it really, you know, the more we do these palm trees and crape myrtles, the less shade we're going to have in the right of way. So I'm really concerned about, you know, this is the right of way, which is public property and so

1140

02:36:14.220 --> 02:36:15.060

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: That's time

1141

02:36:15.690 --> 02:36:18.750

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Okay. Thank you. Ms. Powell for your comments. So Mr. Loretta, would you like to respond.

1143

02:36:22.230 --> 02:36:28.920

Joe Loretta (DDRB): Is there any other additional comments from anyone else. I think I can maybe wait because there's an email that you may read read into the record.

1144

02:36:30.450 --> 02:36:31.800

Yeah, I do have an email. For the record, I don't see any other hands raised. So I will go ahead and read the email it does come with a map and unfortunately my connection is so bad that I won't be able to share my screen. However, the board does have it. So with that being said, I'm going to ask Lori to time me and the comment is from Curtis Loftin. My address is 2970 St. Johns Ave., Jacksonville, FL 32205. I am a managing Member of L.O. Properties, LLP, the owner of vacant land that surrounds the proposed site. I would like to direct your attention to the attached aerial photo that shows the current status of the immediate area around the property being proposed for development in this Application. The area outlined in green is the proposed development site. The area outlined in red is the vacant property that is owned by L.O. Properties, LLP. The area outlined in yellow is May Street which is a dead-end public street. For the record, I do not oppose the concept of the proposed development. I am just concerned by what my layman's quick review tells me about the implications of this very dense development on such a small, isolated parcel, at the busiest intersection in the Brooklyn area. What is being proposed is not an "in-fill" urban development. It is an "out parcel

“development on a larger vacant site. The proposed development is located on a very heavy traffic corner with no vehicle access to the site. This means that commercial services such as construction deliveries, delivery of supplies, refuse removal, et cetera, will have to be provided by using public sidewalks to transport these items to and from the site to the nearest public side street, which is May Street. May Street is a dead-end street and, as you see from the attached aerial, does not have sufficient areas to handle vehicles bringing deliveries to or collecting refuse from the proposed development without disrupting traffic to and from surrounding businesses. I would suggest that such a dense development, on such a small isolated parcel could have long term negative effects on the prospect of a more attractive, comprehensive development on this last remaining accumulation of vacant developable land in this very important area of our city. It has been our hope that someone with a vision for a unique development, such as the concept presented here, would be willing to combine our two vacant parcels and develop something functional, unique and remarkable. By allowing such a dense development on a very small isolated parcel such as what is being proposed, you could very well be foreclosing a more comprehensive, well designed and functional development in this block. In closing, I ask that you review the aerial site plan that I have attached. Unlike the many slides presented in the subject Application, it will give you a very good idea of current limitations and concerns that I have as an adjoining property owner and citizen. Thank you.

1160

02:38:48.240 --> 02:38:49.260

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Ms. Menzini.

1161

02:38:51.060 --> 02:38:57.990

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Since Mr. Loretta would like to defer to the end of the public comments section to respond to everyone at once. Are there any other hands raised or are there. Any other public comments, Ms. Menzini.

1163

02:39:01.320 --> 02:39:02.250

Ross Bremer: Yes, there is.

1164

02:39:04.380 --> 02:39:08.670

19046735009: Right. There we go. Mr. Ross Bremer. Yes, it is.

1165

02:39:10.860 --> 02:39:12.480

19046735009: Mr. Bremer. Please state your name and your address for the record.

1167

02:39:14.520 --> 02:39:16.920

Ross Bremer: My name is Ross Bremer my address is 1502 Beach Avenue, Atlantic Beach, Florida 323223633. I'm sorry. And she she should have an email from me that she should read into the record.

1171

02:39:33.840 --> 02:39:35.640

19046735009: Okay, I'm sorry, sir, I didn't receive an email. Did you send that today?

1174

02:39:43.200 --> 02:39:44.280

Ross Bremer: I'm sorry, say again.

1175

02:39:45.420 --> 02:39:50.610

19046735009: I'm sorry, sir, I didn't receive an email from you today it could have potentially gone to my spam. Did you send that today?

1176

02:39:52.740 --> 02:39:53.550

Ross Bremer: Did I send it today? Yes.

1177

02:39:58.410 --> 02:40:01.770

19046735009: I can check my junk email. Unfortunately, I did not receive.

1178

02:40:04.350 --> 02:40:08.190

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Yeah, Mr. Bremer it appears we don't have the email from you. Would you like to speak your comments into the record, please.

1180

02:40:10.860 --> 02:40:15.450

Ross Bremer: Yes. Yeah, there are several misleading visual and conceptual representations, on these renderings, and drawings submitted with this proposal. Public parking, which was described, Okay. And the items. At the new Blue Cross Blue Shield building which is on Magnolia Street. Will only be available for Blue Cross Blue Shield employees during the day and it is largely for employees and the parking may be available week nights and weekends, but there's no facility for public parking in that particular areas. Okay. Several drawings on this proposal. Picture a complete project with a car parked in front of this spacious open area around it. In fact, the car is on a busy corner intersection and they moving right turn exit off a four lane divided Forest Street on to a four lane divided Riverside. This is an area where pedestrians should be trying to cross, day and night, views do not show how Forest Street no longer stops at Riverside Avenue, but continues on through to the Riverside Avenue area. The drawing suggests that user not open and spacious as represented as as either no longer represent the layout no will be reality when all the surrounding projects are complete. Project describe the area is derelict in abandoned, which is totally inadequate, the new distillery at the end of May Street, which was recently renovated. It is an asset, a small business that captures the historic character of the area. Our building harks back to the original history. Originals of mid century, but it was a Studebaker Packard dealership. Pedrick Motor Company. Please see the attached photo, 480 May Street

which is which is our red brick building there. Are hopes that this property will be able to be used to create a living hands on educational museum. For transportation and vintage cars. And The demonstration rides exhibits. And a themed restaurant to match something that adds wholesome family entertainment back into the Brooklyn neighborhood. Huge public safety issues. Which would be created by a project to Builds lot line to lot line on a very busy intersection of a four lane divided highways, it will be traffic during and from all the new construction, hundreds and hundreds of the cars parked will exit on the Forest and Riverside streets from the two new parking garages.

In the city's liability for such accidents and potential deaths caused by approving a potential dangers traffic protection situation needs to be seriously considered the burden of proposal.

Garbage. Even if temporary hidden behind the wall. Deliveries concrete construction trucks steel fabrication Cranes Etc makes this are not accessible from Riverside or Forest, it will fall on to May Street, which is in itself only accessible by project by the public sidewalk and as far as the construction again there is Nowhere.To accept the project. Properties.And

For the record see below email submitted by Mr. Bremer.

I am Ross Bremer, owner of the property whose address is 480 May Street, 32204. My property consists of a red brick building that fronts on 480 May Street and goes through to Magnolia St., then extends to Edison Street via vacant lots on the Magnolia side (all of which is directly across from the new Blue Cross Employee Parking garage that exits on to Magnolia St.) It was recently constructed over a former retention pond. Please see attached photo of the 480 May Street entrance to my the building. Although I normally welcome developments in Brooklyn which, like "Brooklyn Yard" alias "the HUB" propose to" continue the community's earlier sense of scale and place in an architectural language that speaks to the future while drawing inspiration from its industrial past" and do not oppose the concept of developing the corner described, I have major concerns about the project as follows:

1. There are several misleading visual and conceptual representations, renderings, and drawings submitted with this proposal.
2. The "Public" Parking has been described in news items, in the end, as belonging to Blue Cross, largely for employees, and parking might have some floors, available week nights and weekends to the "Public." I do not know what parking will be available to the public in the new garage across Riverside Ave, or if that will be largely for employees as well.
3. Several drawings in this proposal picture a completed project with a car parked in front and spacious open area surrounding it. In fact, that car is near the busy corner intersection, in a moving right turn exit-lane off of 4-lane divided Forest St. onto 4-lane divided Riverside. This is an area where pedestrians would be trying to cross day or night. The views also do not show how Forest Street no longer stops at Riverside Ave, but continues as a through street across Riverside Ave.
4. Most drawings suggest views of the area that are not as open and spacious as represented, are either no longer the present layout, or will not be the reality when all the surrounding projects are complete.
5. Originally, the project described the area as derelict and abandoned which is

totally inaccurate. The new distillery on the end of May St was recently renovated and is an asset, a small business that captures an historic character. Our building harkens back to its historical origins from last mid-century, as it was then a Studebaker/Packard dealership, Pedrick Motor Company. Please see the attached photo. (Our hopes with this property are to create an living, hands-on educational Museum of Transportation there with vintage cars , demo rides, exhibits and a themed restaurant to match. Something that will add wholesome family entertainment back into this Brooklyn neighborhood)

6.Huge public safety issues, which would be created by a project built lot line to lot line, on a very busy intersection of two 4 lane divided "highways" that will soon be trafficked during and from all the new construction, and the 100's of parked cars that will exit on to Forest and Riverside from the 2 new parking garages. The cities liability for accidents and potential deaths caused by approving a potential dangerous traffic/pedestrian situation needs to be seriously considered.

7.The burden of disposal of garbage (even if it is temporarily hidden by a wall), deliveries, concrete construction trucks, steel fabrication, cranes etc., will not be accessible from Riverside or Forest. It will all fall on May street, which itself is only accessible to the project by public sidewalk. As far as construction, again, there is nowhere from which to access the project except other owners properties and no place to store materials or equipment except public, heavily trafficked streets or May Street. May St has no parking and is a dead end for good reason. One is the DOT rules regarding driveways and access streets too close to a corner. Others include traffic and need of ingress and egress (turn-around in the cul de sac) for the properties and businesses on May Street. The use of the May Street cul de sac by the May Street property owners for their existing and future planned projects would be heavily compromised during and after construction.

For all of these reasons, I ask the Board to reconsider a hasty, rubber stamp approval where so much is at stake and so little addresses these issues.

Thank you. Ross (You are all invited to tour 480 May Street by appointment.)

1228

02:43:21.810 --> 02:43:22.620

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Mr. Bremer. Thank you for your comments. I appreciate those. Ms. Menzini, are there any other hands raised for public comment or any other emails that need to be read?

1231

02:43:31.410 --> 02:43:35.280

Ross Bremer: Yes. There is no parking. That's a dead end for a good reason. Okay. Team rules regarding the driveway to close to the corner.

1233

02:43:40.200 --> 02:43:42.450

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Yes. Remember, your time has expired. Thank you. I appreciate that.

1235

02:43:45.450 --> 02:43:46.050

Ross Bremer: I'd like to speak. My name is Karen Perrin. I have my hand up.

1238

02:43:55.050 --> 02:43:58.650

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Okay, please state your name and your address for the record. Thank you.

1239

02:44:00.360 --> 02:44:02.220

Ross Bremer: My name is Karen Perrin, I'm the co-owner of 480 May Street with my husband Ross Bremer and he was forced to read this in such a disorganized manner because you did not receive the email and there's no suggestion that it was now I've lost everything. Did we get cut off.If

1245

02:44:24.000 --> 02:44:26.070

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): We can hear you.

1247

02:44:27.690 --> 02:44:30.450

Ross Bremer: Okay, somehow the screen went away. I sent the email in a timely manner and originally it was going to be read by Ina evidently she did not get it, but for him to have to explain all that he took some of the time. But at any rate, the whole issue is the burden of the construction and the use of the property afterwards is dangerous as it's been said by many Thing I wish that the the folks there would be Have access to what was written. But we have invited you to come see what the future is for our project. And some of the paperwork in this project they described the areas derelict and dilapidated and all that. And they obviously weren't looking at a picture of what it looks like right now, when the proposal is up before you I don't know when the pictures were taken the they still have pictures of the retention pond where there's a five story parking garage right now that's going to empty onto for us. It goes right by the corner there. There's a whole bunch of things that I don't think you'd even getting any attention to and we would invite you to come look at our proposed use 480 May so you can see what the traffic that We want you to come and look at what we want to create a museum of transportation vintage cars, hands on, not static for the future there and that's already on May Street and we we need the use of our street. So I think before you approve this final Proposal. You need to get public access and public input. And especially by the property owners in the area, Mr. Loftin is the only reason that we know that this project even exists because there was no I know you don't have to give notice of it out late But that was news to us. And we have no we have no way of responding except by by his accidental mention of it. Thank you.

1272

02:46:36.540 --> 02:46:42.510

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you for those comments I appreciate that. Ms. Menzini are there any other public comments?

1273

02:46:44.820 --> 02:46:46.200

19046735009: I do not see any additional hands raised.

1274

02:46:48.870 --> 02:46:55.770

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you. I'll move on to board comments at this time. Let's start with Mr. Brockelman

1276

02:46:57.990 --> 02:47:04.740

Matt Brockelman (DDR B): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll keep my comments brief. I think this is an exciting project for the Brooklyn neighborhood. I think it meshes well with 220 Riverside and the other developments nearby, and my hope is that despite any logistical challenges that may arise because of the streets around there during construction, ultimately, that the activation of this space creates additional foot traffic for the other property owners around the area who are looking to do their own projects, who would certainly benefit from more people walking around that particular area. So I'm going to be supporting it today and I look forward to the project getting underway.

1285

02:47:34.860 --> 02:47:38.400

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Mr. Brockelman, appreciate those comments, Ms. Durden.

1286

02:47:42.330 --> 02:47:44.700

brenna durden (DDR B): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also liked the architecture. I also like the, the concept and I do have one concern. To do with the property line and and you know, the property line at the corner is basically a cut off, if you will, um, it's a you know it's angled across, it's a straight line, and I'm, when you look at the the plan the landscape plan for instance, is that is that this. I can't tell what's on the screen. You can barely see the line it's, it's adjacent to the line adjacent to the corners of the building I should say. And, and so from a, from a planning perspective, what is the arrangement, because it appears that a tremendous amount of the of the curve, all of that area to the end I'm just going to use the drawing to the right of the actual property line. Is actually part of the right way and so the, the design seems to, you know, utilize that whole area. In what looks like instead of public space private space, and I would like a clarification. On that aspect from staff as well as you know what the, what the applicants intent is there because it doesn't, it's not the typical here's the right of way line and we're going to do the public amenities. But this design. portrays it as really more private space associated with the restaurants that are going to be located here. So has there been discussion on that issue. Through the chair, maybe to staff.

1311

02:50:10.860 --> 02:50:22.350

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Board member Durden through the Chair. No, there is not been discussion on that and I'm, I apologize. I'm not sure. Are you able to give me a page number or what you're looking at.

1312

02:50:22.710 --> 02:50:25.860

brenna durden (DDRB): This is a fine page, what are the zones. It's got a landscape, hardscape. Can you see this what's being shared by Joe

1315

02:50:31.920 --> 02:50:42.120

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: No, I can't. I'm on my phone. I had a bad connection. So my it's really small. So I'm trying to get on my desktop to see what what we're looking at. So, I apologize.

1316

02:50:42.390 --> 02:50:44.190

Joe Loretta (DDRB): I apologize if I may, I can I can probably answer this question. To the best of my ability. So, so yes them a simple but we are creating urban open space. We do have a wall out there for pedestrian safety between vehicles and on site. This property is not gated anybody can walk through into the property, we will have the opportunity for dining within a portion of that outdoor area. And if you contemplate and think of this as being any other portion of downtown that may have a restaurant that may have dining that encroaches into the right of way, which is not an uncommon situation that this is very. This is no different than that.

1323

02:51:35.790 --> 02:51:36.210

brenna durden (DDRB): Well, I understand that that we have many restaurants, but we also require licenses and Basically, you know, provisions to allow for that. So, this is this is different because if you know it. I think that it needs to be clear that that is what is being proposed. I'm not opposed to the idea, Joe, I just think that it needs to be clarified that and that staff should have In my opinion, focused on that aspect of of the proposed development and so Yeah.

1328

02:52:23.880 --> 02:52:26.490

Joe Loretta (DDRB): To answer, you know, simply put, that you know to my my opinion staff has been fully aware that this portion out here is has been within the right of way. We met with Kelsey Cox, City of Jacksonville Engineer and confirmed that they have no issues with regards of that with regards to the new intersection design at Forest, and Riverside. And so, you know, we still have 12 to 20 feet of space of pavement outside of the wall that exists today and so to this point, there's been no concern in that regard.

1334

02:53:16.080 --> 02:53:17.760

Joseph Cronk: Possibly to. Yes. Ms. Durden I think, I think you've got a good point. And possibly an improvement to think, like you said is identifying public. My name is Joe Cronk and with Cronk Duke architecture. I apologize. And I'm, I'm at 1936 San Marco Boulevard, is is is I agree is is that, to some extent, there needs to be clear identification of what's public and what's private i think that the

part of the DNA of this project is to blur those lines. We're creating kind of internal pedestrian streets. But even with that said, I think it's important for you to know where you are. And one of the things that that Joe and Lad have done from a landscape architecture standpoint is if you look at the bottom of of that angled piece of property. There's clearly a way to enter and be in the public realm. But as you go up that line our wall stops you from making that public connection and maybe we could suggest that like they've done on the bottom part is that we just open up the top part and whether or not their our tables there. I mean, I think that's something that's more of an organic element. Yeah, there's probably licensing agreements and permission required but whether or not tables go out there, whether that's just public realm we want it to happen organically. But I would suggest that we open up our wall or pull our wall back a little bit short on the top Joe. So that you could make you could cut that corner. Let's call it if you're walking down and you don't necessarily want to participate in these internal streets. But you can just cut the corner. I do think that that that wall that's there that kind of mimics the curve of a really big round area and mimics the curve up on the north side is more of a It's more of a gesture to to to the place, but I would like to suggest that maybe to keep real clear boundaries of what is public. And what is private, is that we open up we pull that wall back and we have that. Let's call it a cut off opportunity engagement up towards the top.

1347

02:55:25.920 --> 02:55:34.950

brenna durden (DDRB): Right. Okay. Well, I think that I think thank you very much. Joe, I think it is important that it like I said, I'm not opposed to the concept. I just think that it's important to make sure that there's clarity about the ability to to do what's being proposed in so I like the project I I I understood I believe from the presentation last time that there were some special provisions that were being proposed to address refuse collection and that it would be probably on a daily basis, if I remember correctly. And that you know supplies and You know, obviously restaurants demand products to be brought on site and and supplies. And currently, I believe I recall that you said that all of that would occur on the May street side. Is that still the intent.

1357

02:56:44.370 --> 02:56:54.630

Joe Loretta (DDRB): Yes, ma'am. So the intent is that will be able to utilize May Street and utilize existing sidewalk and delivery will be any bit similar to any other use with an area and you park on May Street. You walk the you know 50 to 100 feet into the site and an access to building no different than really any downtown area.

1359

02:57:06.360 --> 02:57:10.410

brenna durden (DDRB): Right. Okay. Well, thank you very much. I appreciate that. And I appreciate the time Mr. Chairman.

1360

02:57:14.040 --> 02:57:17.370

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Ms. Durden for those comments, Mr. Schilling.

1361

02:57:19.320 --> 02:57:20.370

Bill Schilling (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Joe, I was going to share that thank you for listening to several of my comments before I like what you all have done with that wall and softening it up and really looking at you know what that experience is from From forest and from Riverside. I think it looks really good. And I really like what you've done there. One of the things that I noticed as I was looking a little more closely at it is, is I see the y'all have the misfortune of having the corner, they got the signal cabinet. So, so I see y'all do have the metal signal cabinet out in front of you and and was just going to throw out. I know, and looking at it was you know that may be something as you're talking to the city. See if they may be willing to do like some sort of wrap on that cabinet. To soften it up a little bit. So just wanted to throw that out as an idea but but overall I think it's a great looking project. And thank you for the the revisions that you all have made.

1371

02:58:26.640 --> 02:58:28.380

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Schilling, Mr. Davisson.

1372

02:58:29.670 --> 02:58:40.290

Craig Davisson (DDRB): Yeah, let me just i'd like to throw in my opinion about this right of way in public and private, and I think this projects is a good example of what we should be doing. I think if the applicant took the attitude that we're going to define this right at the property line and allow the city to just maintain their right away. I can only imagine what that portion of the site would be, probably not much more than concrete or more pavers. So yeah, I think what it does well, in which I think some of you see as a liability, is it marries the public right of way with private and I understand that there's probably legal issues involved with an even defining at certain times of the day or certain times at night when you may want to secure specific areas, but I think the attitude of this applicant is reaching out beyond their building and improving that entire intersection. See, so I support this and I also support it without parking. You know, we, as a city, we can only be as I wish we could be so lucky not where we have, we don't have parking and where parking isn't necessary. Where people you know, can find their own way, as far as getting to a point. And we're going to be caught in this vicious cycle we'll never have public transportation working in the city, or people walking any distance until we start eliminating parking, so that's that comment and I support the project. Thank you.

1381

03:00:15.060 --> 03:00:18.000

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Davisson for those comments, Mr. Allan.

1382

03:00:19.170 --> 03:00:30.450

Brent Allen (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. Lee. I think this is a fantastic project. It's in my opinion, the definition of a unique development on a on a parcel of land that is really tough to find something to work there and the development team thought

outside the box and came up with a plan and a building that it's going to really engage that whole block and I'm pretty excited to see it when it's done. Thank you.

1384

03:00:50.250 --> 03:00:52.410

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Allen, Mr. Harden.

1385

03:00:56.580 --> 03:01:06.930

Christian Harden (DDRB): Thank you, Mr. Lee. So I would agree with, with the Board members on the architecture in the design and the modifications that were made since conceptual and it's a brilliant project. And it's a very efficient use of the site. I don't think that you know my issue would be a parking issue, but and I'm not sure you know how this Board addresses the public comments that were made, because I believe they're making the application without any requests for exceptions. But I think it's hard to ignore. You know that the two immediate neighbors there and their concerns. I mean, particularly with with one being, you know, the construction. I'm not sure you know how we would address that. It's more of a legal issue of how they're able to get access to the site. To build it and how that might impair the other properties. And I don't know how this Board deals with that but as far as the access on an ongoing basis. I've seen you know we have a property management company, you know, we deal with restaurants. When you've got refuse removal and deliveries and trucks and so forth. It's going to really you know it's it's a dirty business, you know, and so that's a, that's a public right of way. It's an important intersection. That's access the river riverside I mean that intersection coming off of 95 and I 10 is the gateway to downtown. We want to make sure it stays looking nice and there's really nothing to require the owner to maintain that that would really be on the city, but it's going to be used a lot more than most other city right of ways and so I don't know. Again, this is another I'm really raising the question. To the staff. If you know to the staff. If there's a requirement to if they're going to use that and there isn't a right of way public right away that or I'm sorry, there isn't a private right of way. That they wouldn't be required to, you know, help maintain that so that it doesn't end up being a sore spot where you've got, you know, all of the I mean I think anybody has been through an alleyway behind a restaurant know what that looks like to make sure that it's maintained, because the city budgets, probably not going to be in a position for that little particular spot to maintain it. So, you know, I think I would probably go back to staff again on both the sidewalk maintenance and the access and then you know, back to staff again, if you guys have any thoughts on how we address the public comments because I think they're, they're very real.

1402

03:03:36.210 --> 03:03:48.900

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Harden, appreciate those comments. I'd like to go back to the applicant and give them an opportunity now to respond to public comments but also any other Board comments comprehensively.

1403

03:03:49.770 --> 03:03:56.070

Joe Loretta (DDRB): Yeah, so, um, you know, there were three comments and Ms.

Powell had her comment and I've spoken to that with her, you know, really, we are kind of keeping a similar theme to that across the street of 220 Riverside, but again there are utilities that are precluding the ability you know, for larger shade trees within this area. To Mr Lofton who is the property owner who is wrapped around us. I mean, you know, I've attempted to explain this in pretty good detail. But we have a 24 foot passage way that will open up to expansion on this property and and expansion on this property and we we have been working with the gentleman, we cannot control his property. And if he's open to working with our team to master plan his piece and and so forth. We can easily organically grow this onto his property. We've looked at bits and pieces of that. But it's not our property to design and develop at this time and then to Mr Bremmer who spaces back here, you know, again, parking is not required by code, we will need to coordinate the construction access and so that'll be something we do need to work through I'll be at the likelihood is it's going to be through an agreement with Mr Lofton but you know as this all plays out. We will continue to utilize access, you know, for delivery and things such as that on May Street to the north and, you know, we're To answer the last question, and I can't remember Board member Harden referred to in regards to the sidewalk in the refuge and so on and so forth. I understand your comment and, you know, We have a successful business by maintaining a clean and nice looking entry and walkway. And so it would behoove us negatively to to have that look like a back alley. And so I'd like to think based on that fact that will will be looking to make sure that we maintain this portion of the right away and clean for the future.

1417

03:06:12.300 --> 03:06:14.130

Joseph Cronk: Yo, can I say a couple things as well, sir.

1418

03:06:14.820 --> 03:06:15.210

Joe Loretta (DDRB): Yes, sir.

1419

03:06:17.220 --> 03:06:29.790

Joseph Cronk: I think, I think those are all great comments and I think it's this project has tended to be seen as an isolated island our, you know, our goal, you know, for this project is to be a catalyst to this kind of last Old Brooklyn fabric that is that is kind of touching the edge of Riverside. And I think there might be a tendency to say, hey, it should be a solid building on the corner. And that the whole thing should kind of, you know, mimic what's going on in Riverside and because of the cleave at the corner it really changes the geometry of how you would normally engage the corner in a fabric. So we've kind of done the reverse corners, but most importantly is between the previous submissions this submission is we've traded two axes. In both directions to really reach out and to be a catalyst to this surrounding properties and give engagement points for that to take place because we see a lot of value in May. We see a lot of value in what the Bremmers are doing and what the distillery is doing. And in the last kind of remaining Brooklyn buildings, you know, stylistically, I think it's hard to define what is Old Brooklyn. I think it's an industrial working language outside of the residential piece. And I think we've tried to, you know, to capture that. I think

what one important component that might bring some confidence is that a project that's unique like this and different and its operation as kind of a strange hybrid mixed use is the operation is critical. And we're fortunate enough that we wouldn't even start a project like this unless we knew that operating it from a single source and someone with experience was a part of our team is that we really wouldn't present it and Southern Grounds has proven some difficult sites. I mean, they're they're San Marco project has very little parking. It has remote parking and crosses a railroad track. And what they found is that their morning and midday, and even late afternoon business really relies on a combination of the local neighborhood, but people who find their way in the community to park and walk. Their project that is in Neptune Beach is very similar in nature. It's a courtyard. It's a series of cobbled together buildings of different uses that become a secondary internal street and they have to deal with the same issues every sidewalk every door is the front door, in a sense. And keeping it clean and dealing with refuge and dealing with schedules and deliveries are almost more difficult there. And we've also studied several restaurants and cafes. At our office in Palm Beach and in the Meissner courtyards couldn't be any more complicated. So I think without a single source operator, Southern Grounds will run both of these facilities. They spent a great deal of time on how to do it and how to do it within this context and how to do it in a way that that really builds up the area as opposed to taking it down to most of their client base is going to be morning and between eight and 10,000 people that are in this area is walking through the day. This is not primarily a business of late night time so if it is there's parking structures that are available. So I think that having an operator. He knows how to do this as a track record of doing it. Should be a level of confidence that that addresses, at least some of these concerns. Thank you.

1443

03:09:46.560 --> 03:09:51.990

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Thank you, Mr. Cronk. Thank you, Mr. Loretta, I'd like to add a couple of comments as well. I I can appreciate this project on a lot of different levels I value what Mr. Davisson and said about how carefully. This project has tried to weave in the public space into its project. Oftentimes we'll see the opposite where a project will run to a property line set up a barrier and really define that has a hard edge. I think that's You know, both a very generous move to the public, but operationally risky. This is office and retail and so inviting the public and freely can be a real challenge at that they're willing to take on. I can appreciate the operational challenges of not only building this building, but maintaining it. And caring for it and operating it as those two businesses are going to be really incredibly difficult, but I don't think those difficulties and those challenges should stop a project like this at the corner, or whether it's tucked back in the neighborhood. I think both Brooklyn and downtown need an abundant supply of these type of projects. And I feel like we should be encouraging them at every opportunity we get a lot of craftsmanship is in this project. You can tell just by the renderings and I suspect it will follow through to its ultimate construction. So I'd like to congratulate the team on, you know, a very tough project getting this far and dealing with, you know, this the substantial issues you've got and overcome and the ones that are going to come to you and your team. I'd also just, just a quick reminder that I do see a little bit of rooftop equipment showing up. On a couple of projects rooftop equipment needs to

be fully screened from the pedestrian walkway. So I'd encourage you guys to be cautious and careful when you're looking at how your rooftop equipment is going to be mounted and please make sure they're screened 100%

1456

03:11:51.120 --> 03:11:51.540

Absolutely.

1457

03:11:53.730 --> 03:11:57.210

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): That being said, do we have any more comments from from the board. Or do we have a motion.

1459

03:11:59.850 --> 03:12:00.660

Matt Brockelman (DDR B): I'll move to approve.

1460

03:12:02.070 --> 03:12:02.550

brenna durden (DDR B): Second,

1461

03:12:03.780 --> 03:12:12.690

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Wonderful. We have a motion to approve by Mr. Brockelman and a second by Ms. Durden. All those in favor of approving DDR B 2020 Dash 012 Brooklyn Yard final approval with the recusal by Mr. Loretta please say aye.

1463

03:12:23.640 --> 03:12:24.030

Aye.

1464

03:12:25.230 --> 03:12:27.270

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): And are there any opposed please say nay.

1465

03:12:29.700 --> 03:12:35.610

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): Wonderful. You have your approval and thank you for the presentation and the hard work and good luck.

1466

03:12:35.670 --> 03:12:36.270

Joseph Cronk: Thank you Board.

1467

03:12:40.710 --> 03:12:43.170

Trevor Lee (DDR B Chair): That closes the action items list for this DDR B meeting move into Old business. I'll look to the staff, if there are any old business or look to the board members to bring up any old business.

1472

03:12:58.350 --> 03:13:00.000

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: No old business Chairman Lee.

1473

03:13:00.570 --> 03:13:08.820

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers. Will close old business and we'll move on to new business. And before I open it up to the staff for any new business. I'd like to welcome Matt Brockman to the board. This is first board meeting, I apologize. I was unprepared for your visit today, certainly won't happen again. But, welcome to the board and very happy to have you serve.

1475

03:13:21.960 --> 03:13:22.620

Matt Brockelman (DDRB): Thank you, sir.

1476

03:13:24.660 --> 03:13:27.480

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): To the staff. Is there any new business. Other than that.

1477

03:13:28.440 --> 03:13:29.400

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: No Chairman Lee.

1478

03:13:31.410 --> 03:13:32.130

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you Ms. Radcliffe-Meyers

1480

03:13:35.640 --> 03:13:36.630

brenna durden (DDRB): This is Brenna.

1481

03:13:39.300 --> 03:13:39.690

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Please.

1482

03:13:40.500 --> 03:13:47.100

brenna durden (DDRB): I, I, I have. I don't know if it's appropriate under new business. There's really no other Place. I'm not sure for comments, but I would like one minute of of time.To the board. I am thinking about the signage and the lighting issue and I was wondering if this is something that this Board would like our staff to come back with a report to us, at the next meeting if they don't know what their time frames are, but in the next before the end of the year, let's say with something that could tell us what the current state of our sign provisions are as well as the lighting because i think i think it would help us as board members, but I also think that is probably a precursor for the work that I heard that, that Ms. Boyer mentioned also, and you know there's, I feel like there's a great deal of information that either, we're not aware of or that is confusing. And that, I

think that it would help us to be more productive and effective in our discussions and deliberations and so i i i want to suggest that the Board, you know, or I'd like to hear what my fellow Board members think whether or not they think that that would be a you know, an appropriate a request from the Board to the staff to bring us back a report so that you know to explain you know where we stand right now on those issues. Thank you very much.

1494

03:15:49.710 --> 03:15:56.670

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you Ms. Durden. I'll open it up for just general conversation to the Board to respond to Ms. Durdens comments.

1495

03:16:00.660 --> 03:16:02.790

Joe Loretta (DDRB): I'm a, you know, To some extent Brenna. I've been harping on this a little bit for the last year, you know, in regards to me right now. You know I'm concerned we're going to have a bunch of dead trees downtown because we currently allow for a four by four pit. And so there's a multitude of things and we can't get the update design guidelines to be done as soon as possible. You know, I mean, it's unfortunate. I'm sure it's going to be another year before they're done and enacted but you know specifically to your request. I have no no concern asking staff to provide a little bit better background for us.

1501

03:16:44.940 --> 03:16:47.340

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Loretta, anyone else.

1502

03:16:48.510 --> 03:16:49.320

Bill Schilling (DDRB): Mr. Chairman.

1503

03:16:49.770 --> 03:16:50.580

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Yes. Mr. Schilling.

1504

03:16:50.940 --> 03:16:58.470

Bill Schilling (DDRB): What I was going to add and and I fully support Ms. Durdens request i think it's it's it's a really good request. But, but I was going to suggest that hearing from Ms. Boyer that it sounds like a consultant has been selected to look at certain aspects that that may be at a minimum, as a part of the next meeting. There may be a part of I don't know if it's old business or new business there be a little bit more of a discussion of what the items are going to be that that consultant reviews. So the, the, you know, I think, to Ms. Durdens comments we can we can share and provide feedback as a part of that discussion as those specific areas that we think need attention and and and have that consultant in and staff as well, provide us updates, again, maybe with the timeframe of end of year or first of next year updates on on the progress they're making on those areas.

1509

03:17:53.760 --> 03:17:54.750

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you, Mr. Schilling. Any other Board members would like to comment on this topic? Okay. I'd like to suggest that we follow up with staff on this issue and try to put together, a potentially an action item to follow up with the next board meeting. Related to the comments by Ms. Durden, Mr. Schilling and Mr. Loretta, Ms. Lori Radcliffe-Meyers I'll work with you and Guy Parola to to further those comments.

1513

03:18:29.850 --> 03:18:32.070

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: That would be great. Thank you, Chairman Lee. I appreciate it.

1514

03:18:32.520 --> 03:18:35.490

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Thank you. Any other new business? Thank you, Ms. Durden.

1515

03:18:36.570 --> 03:18:37.170

brenna durden (DDRB): Thank you.

1516

03:18:39.660 --> 03:18:44.490

Trevor Lee (DDRB Chair): Okay. We'll move to the public comments section. Ms. Menzini. Are there any public comments waiting or hands raised. Thank you. I'll go ahead and close the public comments section and we'll move to adjourn. Thank you everyone for your patience. I know it was a long agenda item this this week and I wish you all the best. Thank you.

1520

03:19:08.730 --> 03:19:09.540

Christian Harden (DDRB): Thank you. Thank you.

1521

03:19:09.600 --> 03:19:11.010

Bill Schilling (DDRB): Great job today, Mr. Chairman.

1522

03:19:11.520 --> 03:19:11.850

Lori Radcliffe-Meyers DIA staff: Thank you.

1523

03:19:14.220 --> 03:19:14.550

Craig Davisson (DDRB): Thank you.