

CITY OF JACKSONVILLE

DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD (DDRB) MEETING

DATE: Thursday, March 14, 2019

TIME: 2:03 p.m. - 4:35 p.m.

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

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William J. Schilling, Jr., Chairman
Christian Harden, Secretary
Joseph Loretta, Board Member
Craig Davisson, Board Member
Brenna Durden, Board Member
J. Brent Allen, Board Member

ALSO PRESENT:

Jim Klement, DDRB Development Coordinator
Jason Teal, Esq., Office of General Counsel
Guy Parola, DIA, Operations Manager
Karen Underwood, DDRB Executive Secretary
Brian Hughes, Mayor's Chief of Staff and Interim CEO
Johnny Gaffney, Council Member At-Large Grp 4

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

Stephanie Shear, Court Reporter
Notary Public, State of Florida

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

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

2 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. Welcome,
3 everyone. We're going to go ahead and get
4 started with the Thursday, March 14th DDRB
5 meeting. And I want to go ahead and welcome
6 everyone and make a couple of introductions.
7 I'll work my way around here. We've got
8 Dr. Gaffney. Welcome.

9 DR. GAFFNEY: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: We've got Mr. Brian
11 Hughes, the interim CEO. Welcome. Thank you
12 for joining us today. All right. We're good.

13 So everyone, welcome to the meeting.
14 We'll go ahead and jump into Item No. -- or
15 action items, and item A which is approval of
16 the February 14th DDRB regular meeting minutes.
17 Are there any of the members that have any
18 revisions, edits, changes, or deletions to the
19 minutes? If not --

20 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: I'd like to
21 propose.

22 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Motion for
23 approval.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Member Durden made
25 the motion with a second by Mr. Loretta. All

1 those in favor, say aye.

2 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

3 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Any opposed?

4 All right. So the minutes have been
5 approved unanimously. And I guess I didn't do
6 an official roll call, but we do officially
7 have decorum. And we have board members Allen,
8 Davisson, Schilling, Durden, and Loretta here
9 for the meeting and for our decorum.

10 All right. We're going to deviate for a
11 minute for an item that is not actually on the
12 agenda, but it has come to my attention that it
13 may be more than a rumor that Mr. Klement --
14 this may be his last meeting serving us or his
15 next to last meeting. It sounds like that may
16 still be being worked out right now.

17 But in the event, Mr. Klement, that this
18 is -- should happen to be your last meeting
19 working with us, we have a resolution that I'd
20 like to read here that the board is going to
21 take action on, but it is Resolution 2019-0301,
22 a resolution of the Downtown Development and
23 Review Board commending and recognizing the
24 contributions of Mr. Jim Klement to the DDRB,
25 and for his dedication and service in promoting

1 the successful revitalization and redevelopment
2 of Downtown Jacksonville. Whereas Mr. Klement
3 started with the Jacksonville Planning and
4 Development Department in 1989 as a senior
5 planner. That was a good year. Whereas
6 Mr. Klement was promoted in 1998 to principal
7 planner within the Planning and Development
8 Department. And whereas after 18 years with
9 the Planning and Development Department,
10 Mr. Klement was recruited by the Jacksonville
11 Economic Development Commission in 2007 to take
12 over as lead staff to the Downtown Development
13 Review Board. And whereas for the past 12
14 years, downtown has greatly benefited from his
15 talents, commitment, and knowledge of urban
16 planning and urban design.

17 Now therefore be it resolved by the
18 Downtown Development Review Board, Section 1,
19 the DDRB recognizes and commends Mr. Klement
20 for his dedicated service to the DDRB and for
21 his overall contributions to the revitalization
22 and development of Downtown Jacksonville.

23 So if I could get a motion for the
24 approval of this resolution and then a second.

25 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: So moved.

1 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: I have moved by
3 Mr. Harden and second by Ms. Durden. All those
4 in favor, say aye.

5 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Any opposed? All
7 right. I didn't think there would be any.
8 That carries unanimously.

9 Mr. Klement, thank you for everything
10 you've done. We will have a signed copy of
11 this framed for you, but I want to say thank
12 you. And if you want to take a minute and
13 maybe share a couple of words.

14 MR. KLEMENT: Thank you. The pleasure
15 has partly been mine for sure. The board and
16 working with the board and the City of
17 Jacksonville has been certainly an adventure.
18 And I actually had a chance to intern with the
19 City early on out of the University of Florida
20 there and was with the recreation department.
21 We did a lot of fun things with Hanna Park and
22 some of the items out there. Certainly a lot
23 of fun. And with that, I would thank you-all
24 for your support. And I see some of the
25 players out here. They've all been great guys

1 and certainly had some fun projects and some, I
2 think, fairly positive contributions to the
3 City of Jacksonville.

4 With that, I'll close and we'll get on
5 with our meeting.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Thank you. All
7 right.

8 MR. TEAL: Mr. Chairman, I do have one
9 question for Mr. Klement.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Yes, sir.

11 MR. TEAL: I want to know what he's going
12 to be doing in his retirement.

13 MR. KLEMENT: It hasn't been fully
14 disclosed, and there will probably be some
15 intermittent activity, but I have been
16 approached and been asked to help some
17 large-scale developers with some of their
18 projects to move forward. So I'm going to get
19 a chance to get back into the private sector
20 for a short while.

21 I spent a good number of years in the
22 Orlando area with a couple of Fortune 500
23 companies doing their acquisitions and
24 developments. And so some of them remembered
25 me and invited me back to help them with some

1 of their larger projects. Seddon Island was
2 one of the projects that we had which is in the
3 Tampa area. And that one was a fun one. So
4 we'll see where we go. We'll see.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Well, best of luck
6 with everything. And knowing that today is
7 possibly your grand finale, we'll be expecting
8 two of the best staff report presentations
9 we've ever seen today. So we're looking
10 forward to it.

11 MR. TEAL: I will qualify that knowing
12 the applicants, both of the projects that you
13 have here, I think have done -- have made our
14 job -- I won't say easier, but at least we're
15 able to certainly see the work that they've
16 participated. And you'll see it in our project
17 recommendations.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Great. All right.
19 Well, we're going to go ahead then and move
20 into the regular agenda. The next item is Item
21 B, which is DDRB-2019-003, the WCH Critical
22 Care Baptist Medical Center conceptual and
23 final review.

24 And, Mr. Klement, before I turn this over
25 to you, I know that I do need to declare ex

1 parte and also declare that Kimley-Horn, the
2 firm I work with, is doing work on this project
3 with Baptist. So I'm going to need to recuse
4 myself from voting on this item. So I'm going
5 to pass the gavel to my left to Mr. Harden so
6 that he can lead as chair on this item.

7 And if any other folks have ex parte,
8 please feel free to go ahead and declare.

9 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: In full disclosure,
10 I'm a lawyer. I represent Baptist in
11 healthcare-related projects, nothing to do with
12 this project, but in full disclosure, I do work
13 with Baptist. It does not affect anything on
14 me reviewing this application or making a
15 decision today in an unbiased view.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. I'll
17 turn it over to you, sir.

18 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: I'll let
19 Mr. Klement provide the staff review for this
20 report.

21 MR. KLEMENT: All right. Thank you.
22 Briefly, the application that we're looking at
23 today is the Critical Care Baptist Medical
24 Center, 800 Prudential Drive. What is
25 important to remind the board about this

1 particular project, we'll be looking at
2 collapsing the review with a conceptual and a
3 final review. And the final review does
4 include deviation for height. The project is
5 located on the Southbank. The existing zoning
6 is PBF-2, which gives us a height limitation
7 which is where it necessitates the deviation to
8 extend the overall height to 125 feet. We will
9 come back and address that as we move through
10 the design criteria.

11 Again, briefly, you will take action and
12 discussion with legal. You will take action on
13 the conceptual review vote, and then we'll move
14 to the final review vote with -- excuse me.
15 We'll have a deviation previously to the final
16 review, and then we'll conclude the final
17 review vote procedurally is what we're looking
18 at as the board moves through.

19 Very briefly, when you looked at the
20 criteria to bring -- and to bring the board
21 back to some of the staff's thinking, we've
22 always looked at the Baptist Hospital area kind
23 of as a campus project. This particular
24 building has been referenced through some of
25 the different projects this board has seen over

1 time.

2 Just recently, we did see the large
3 parking facility that is immediately across the
4 street and east of the existing building that's
5 being proposed with the frontage on Palm
6 Avenue. What's unique about that particular
7 building, it's in the -- was a new structure.
8 And we got a little taste and an invitation to
9 this building coming forward, which started
10 maybe -- when I say start, was maybe more
11 quickly initiated with or directly initiated
12 with the demolition of the existing parking
13 garage, which is where this building kind of
14 fits into that puzzle configuration.

15 Having said that, Staff felt that the
16 building being proposed, which has a deviation
17 height request of 125 feet overall height, sits
18 actually in a complex or an association was --
19 adjacent building that ranged anywhere from the
20 200 feet to 125 feet. So it actually sits
21 within and behind some of these buildings and
22 certainly facilitates and offers an opportunity
23 to go through the height without bringing any
24 negative impacts on the adjacent properties --
25 the adjacent properties and also entities and

1 monitored and managed by the Baptist Hospital
2 entities.

3 With that being said, when we look at the
4 conceptual review and the final review with the
5 deviations, I'm going to go ahead and move into
6 the final review and take you into the
7 deviation process. The deviation process has,
8 in the past, has the criteria that are A
9 through E, which are unique in the sense that
10 they address both height and river setback.

11 In this particular case, river setback is
12 not applicable. And then also that criteria
13 for the river views and height of buildings is
14 further buttressed with additional criteria,
15 which refer to as paren B, which has 1
16 through 5 criteria that are more specific to
17 the height of the structure.

18 Procedurally, what we have had to do is
19 kind of address briefly the deviation criteria
20 and then come back and address the height
21 criteria specific.

22 With that being said, in discussion with
23 legal, our report stands as substantial
24 competent evidence you have received that. And
25 the criteria for the deviation, Staff has a

1 summary support of the deviation. And that is
2 the -- actually the Section 656.361.22. That's
3 the A through E criteria. And Staff supports
4 the deviation. That being said, I'm going to
5 quickly move into the paren B, which deals with
6 the height-specific criteria. And when you
7 look at it, the criteria, one, speaks to
8 buildings or structures shall be compatible
9 with surrounding properties. Staff shared to
10 you their findings earlier on. The building or
11 structure should not have significant adverse
12 effects.

13 Three, the building or structure shall be
14 comparable and compatible in shape, style,
15 bulk, which we found to support. And the
16 increased height of building structure is
17 necessary for a successful function of the
18 building. The applicant has submitted, again,
19 supportive information. Staff supports their
20 information with our own additional findings.

21 And, five, the increased height shall not
22 adversely effect the functions of existing
23 transmission or receive any equipment within a
24 radius of five miles. And Staff supports the
25 findings that it does not interfere with that

1 aspect.

2 The summary recommendation for Staff for
3 the river view height, which, again, addresses
4 both the deviation criteria. And the paren B
5 criteria is a positive recommendation from
6 Staff.

7 Quickly moving through the adjacent and
8 additional criteria, the off-street parking is
9 addressed with the parking garage. The
10 interior storage and loading areas and
11 screening comply showing on their attached site
12 plans. Their transparency -- the transparency
13 aspect is adjacent to Palm Avenue. And they've
14 shown compliance with that aspect to it.

15 The grid pattern criteria is not
16 applicable, good patterns speaks to changing
17 and altering block configuration. We did pull
18 back on the streetscape design. As indicated
19 early on, the applicant is going to be working
20 with all of the adjacent property owners in the
21 area there.

22 And you'll see in one of the larger
23 exhibits that is in your possession kind of a
24 realignment and a readdressing of the design
25 that will be bringing that product back to

1 Public Works and through the design process to
2 confirm that all those with frontage and using
3 that circulation have compliance. That
4 concludes the ventures project, which is up and
5 around the new multifamily off of the
6 Prudential Drive side.

7 So with that, Staff has -- just reminds
8 the applicant and the board that that is going
9 to be looked at at a future date, and it will
10 address the parking garage.

11 The new parking garage actually did set
12 back so that they could accommodate any
13 modifications that had to take place on the
14 Palm Street improvements.

15 Quick summary: Staff has a
16 recommendation to approve the application for
17 both the conceptual and the final and the
18 deviations. And the deviation is to approve
19 the height of the building for an overall
20 height of 125 feet.

21 With that, I'll turn it back to the Chair
22 and/or invite the applicant to come up and make
23 any comments or pursue their report and
24 recommendations.

25 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Just one quick

1 thing before that. When I spoke with
2 Mr. Parola earlier this week, there were a
3 couple of items just from the board's
4 perspective that we're not trying to approve at
5 this juncture. I think we're specifically
6 focused on the building structure itself and
7 the height limitation or the height deviation,
8 but any modifications to the landscape. And
9 there was one other item that you referenced
10 that we would not be opined on at this
11 juncture.

12 MR. PAROLA: Through the Chair. So the
13 building has a courtyard area. And you can go
14 ahead and take a look at that. They're not
15 approving signage at this time, so signage will
16 come back.

17 And just to kind of expand upon Palm
18 Avenue, with MD Anderson with ventures, there's
19 a lot of work at the intersections at Gary
20 Street, Prudential. And they're also
21 realigning a drive to a garage that's near the
22 Weaver Tower to accommodate the courtyard area.
23 So there's a lot of moving parts that are, you
24 know, well beyond just this one, you know,
25 infill, so we'll be coming back with those

1 after engineering and everything else.

2 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Okay. So I think
3 my point is that in the interest of time, we
4 don't want to touch on those points for the
5 purpose of the application.

6 All right. State your name and address.

7 MR. HARDEN: Paul Harden, 501 Riverside
8 Avenue. Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the
9 administration and the board of directors and
10 the Baptist Medical Center, we are happy to
11 present for your review today the next historic
12 additions to Jacksonville skylines contained on
13 what Mr. Klement described as the Baptist
14 campus.

15 From the South Jax Campus to the Beach
16 Campus to the Downtown Campus, really on the
17 Southbank, Baptist has been very, very active
18 over the last decade. A couple of the projects
19 have already been mentioned, including the
20 garage. It seems like just yesterday, a few
21 weeks ago, that we were here with the MD
22 Anderson facility that you folks were kind
23 enough to work through. What a beautiful
24 facility that turned out to be as the front
25 door to the San Marco historic area.

1 Today, we're here to introduce our new
2 front door and what will be the neonatal
3 intensive care unit. The NICU, as we're
4 referring to it, is the -- is an infill
5 project. Basically it's in the middle of the
6 campus. It will greatly enhance the healthcare
7 in the City of Jacksonville, which is --
8 healthcare has become basically an economic
9 driver for the City along with our historic
10 drivers of the fort.

11 You have so many people come to
12 Jacksonville for healthcare. And this NICU
13 will be one of the draws. Sometimes when we're
14 reviewing, what I'm going to call, the skin of
15 these healthcare facilities, we lose sight of
16 the everyday miracles that take place inside
17 these buildings.

18 This facility will serve the most
19 wonderful of our population, newborns and the
20 pediatric or NICU facility activity. But
21 nonetheless, we are hoping it will be not
22 withstanding the wonderful things that go
23 inside the magnificent view to the eye as you
24 drive by, much like MD Anderson has come to be.

25 As Jacksonville's largest employer,

1 Baptist solicits your support of this project
2 as we move forward. We've gathered for this
3 today -- well, let me start with Frank Brooks,
4 our architect who's from Charlotte, was on his
5 way down, but President Trump grounded all the
6 737s. So he wasn't able to make it. I don't
7 think he focused on Frank individually.

8 But Keith Tickell, who is the
9 vice-president of operations and has been
10 intricately involved in all of the projects
11 that happened over the last several years is
12 going to present the overview of the project.
13 And then Zach, my partner here, who's worked on
14 the entire technical aspects of it. So the
15 three of us will be happy to answer any
16 questions after Keith's presentation.

17 Certainly as Jim -- I'm sorry. 1989 was
18 a long time ago since Trail Ridge Landfill
19 opened up. He had nothing to do with it. But
20 as Jim has indicated, we believe the staff
21 report meets all the competent substantial
22 evidence, requirements needed to approve this
23 site. And we'd like to put some icing on that
24 if we could.

25 So with that, I'll ask Keith to come up

1 and go forward.

2 MR. TICKELL: Thank you, Paul. Thank
3 you. My name is Keith Tickell. Address is 841
4 Prudential, Jacksonville, Florida. Again, I
5 want to extend my gratitude to the group who
6 are very dedicated citizens for their time in
7 allowing us to present this project. I
8 apologize. Will this work for me?

9 The project in question -- the whole
10 outline is just primarily where the old -- what
11 we call the old P2 garage, it's Palm Avenue
12 here. And if you've been down the street
13 recently, you'll notice that old garage that
14 was right on Palm Avenue. It is finally gone
15 away. What it's left us with is the Wolfson
16 Children's Hospital immediately to the west of
17 it, the Weaver Tower, as well as our Adult
18 Tower Heart Hospital this way. And then our
19 current NICU as well as labor and delivery is
20 in the Pavilion Building.

21 This new project will actually attach to
22 that building. The challenges, the floor
23 plates are on different levels, so that's
24 created a lot of gymnastics. But it's critical
25 that the building is attached directly to that

1 facility because we will still be performing
2 deliveries there and then transferring those
3 infants in need of this care directly into the
4 new building.

5 As Paul alluded to, it's really two
6 buildings here. It is going to be the new
7 front door for the campus. We're going to
8 reorient the campus away from Prudential Drive,
9 which quite frankly nobody can find our
10 entrance back there at the rotunda and really
11 create a new front door on this side of the
12 campus.

13 The second part is an intensive care unit
14 for Wolfson Children's Hospital. We are
15 experiencing rapid growth in that area.
16 Wolfson does not just serve Northeast Florida.
17 It serves -- it is the only children's hospital
18 between Orlando and Atlanta. And we get
19 transfers in from multiple states across the
20 country.

21 Wolfson was recently ranked in the top 15
22 children hospital in the U.S., and Michael
23 Alban, our president, has done a phenomenal job
24 in elevating this program. It is as an
25 intensive care tower. It is mission-critical.

1 Everything here is redundant to multiple times.

2 And the design, as you'll see, was
3 strongly influenced. In fact, the driver is
4 the room layouts. At the end of the day,
5 that's all that matters. Let's be blunt. The
6 clinicians working in these rooms having the
7 appropriate setup to take care of the neonatal
8 intensive care child is critical.

9 And we have spent a lot of time with them
10 and are in the middle of our mockups- to ensure
11 the room configurations work appropriately.

12 So that overview -- and as Paul noted,
13 this is the new cancer center here. The new
14 parking garage is up and in place. So we'll
15 show you some of our initial thoughts. This is
16 a view looking north on Palm Avenue.

17 One of the challenges with the site and
18 the project is the building is a very long
19 building. It's almost 300 feet in length.
20 And, again, that's driven by the clinical use
21 in there and how we staff, how we organize, and
22 how we support each one of those infants when
23 they're in our care.

24 So we've got a very long building height
25 while -- we're hitting for a height variance,

1 it's only 125 feet in height versus 300 feet in
2 length. What you're looking at from the
3 exterior, all of this volume on this side and
4 this side is patient care rooms. What you're
5 looking at here, this bump out is a family
6 waiting area and a control desk into the actual
7 NICU.

8 One of the challenges in this arena is
9 security is critical. And it's something we
10 take very seriously and has to be maintained in
11 terms of restricting access onto these floors.
12 But as you look north on Palm Avenue, this is
13 not what it will actually look like, but it
14 does give you the appropriate scale, the
15 widening of Palm Avenue.

16 As was mentioned earlier, we're in the
17 process of the architectural design of this and
18 will be coordinating with the City in that
19 project. And we'll be back later to talk about
20 this plaza area out front.

21 The building has a large southern
22 exposure. It is primarily a glass front on
23 this side. And you'll notice the difference.
24 There is a fair amount of fritted glass. And
25 that's a ceramic frit on that that will help us

1 with managing heat load in those rooms. And
2 then you'll see another large element of glass
3 over here. This structure here is wrapped in a
4 metal panel system.

5 And what you will also see is two other
6 predominant elements. You see this brown
7 element, that is a product that what we call
8 Longboard. It is a metal paneling system. We
9 used it on the cancer center as well.

10 And then we're using another product
11 called Tactile. And it a product that has been
12 developed that has the structural integrity we
13 need, but it is extremely lightweight and it is
14 a product we almost have to use because on the
15 back side of the building, we're going to be
16 lifting panels over the active NICU in labor
17 and delivery.

18 We will do a lot of work from a safety
19 standpoint, but part of achieving that is
20 making sure these panels are very lightweight
21 as we put them into play. So that was one of
22 the main drivers in the selection of that
23 material.

24 This is a view at night that has been
25 rendered and a little bit still going on and

1 evolving. What we want to do is, at night, be
2 able to recognize an element of color coming
3 through these levels. You also see a light
4 panel on that metal panel. That is again
5 trying to give a nod to the children's hospital
6 and trying to create a little bit of a
7 starlight pattern there recognizing that we are
8 caring for the most fragile life on earth, as
9 Paul referred to. And that's exactly what it
10 is.

11 It's a very open and transparent bottom
12 two levels. That's where our main lobby for
13 the campus will be. Again, five levels of NICU
14 and PICU about that. What you're also seeing
15 over here -- we're in the middle with the City
16 right now on the final elements to grant the
17 easement across Palm Avenue. And that will be
18 an elevated enclosed bridge from the parking
19 garage into the lobby on the second level in
20 the new tower.

21 And that's a critical element as well.
22 We need to get the pedestrians up off of Palm
23 Avenue. We've got real challenges there from a
24 safety standpoint, and this will allow us to
25 finally complete that element. It's very open.

1 It's also very reminiscent of the bridge we've
2 done over San Marco Avenue associated with the
3 Cancer Center.

4 In terms of the vertical elements, you
5 see the V's in there. That's really a nod to
6 the local bridges in the area is what our
7 architecture team was trying to capture.

8 This gives you a little higher
9 perspective. You get a sense of how we think
10 this will react during the day. There are also
11 vertical fins on this, again, trying to get an
12 element of verticality.

13 We did a number of architectural designs
14 with the horizontal louvers which, quite
15 frankly, provide a better sun control more cost
16 effectively, but it really did not -- didn't
17 achieve the look and feel of the signature
18 building that we were looking at in this
19 project.

20 So we've gone with a vertical sun louver
21 system, which has it's own challenges, and
22 hence the fritted glass that we're going to
23 have to incorporate into this to manage heat
24 load on that building. And I do have some
25 samples. My understanding is the group would

1 like to see some of the sample materials that
2 are going to use on the project.

3 Again, note this is Wolfson Children's
4 Hospital. It will connect on every floor
5 there. The Pavilion Building, we'll move the
6 NICU out of that, into this building, but labor
7 and delivery will remain. And they'll be
8 connected by an elevator shaft on the back side
9 of that building. It's incorporated within the
10 footprint, but that's a key connection point
11 for us. These buildings will touch each other
12 when completed.

13 Some of the architectural views, you get
14 a sense of the fritting. In order to achieve
15 the care that we need, the restrooms are
16 actually located outdoors. And that's where
17 you're seeing the -- excuse me, the spandrel
18 glass as well as the fritting to obviously
19 screen that.

20 We'll also utilize -- excuse me. We'll
21 utilize fritting on that panel to provide some
22 privacy to the parents. This is a critical
23 element for us. Our current NICU does not
24 allow the parents to stay overnight. And while
25 that's a very nice feature, clinically, it's

1 critical.

2 What we find is if parents can stay with
3 their infants, they're able to go home sooner.
4 They work with the clinicians in taking care of
5 those infants. So having our parents stay with
6 their children is an important clinical element
7 as well.

8 You'll also see a little differentiation
9 down here. There is a stone product that we're
10 going to use at the lower level just, again, to
11 provide a better sense, a higher level of
12 finish on that area. All of this area down
13 here, though, is a glass system as well as a
14 large covered canopy coming out to provide a
15 dropoff for our patients and visitors.

16 This is the east end and along Palm
17 Avenue that Jim referenced earlier. And we've
18 worked hard to provide more visual inference on
19 this side since it is streetscape. One of the
20 things that this really does not fully show is
21 that area through there is actually inset.

22 Again, we've got three main planes, this
23 end here, which is, again, patient rooms, an
24 inset that's actually a hallway through there,
25 and then patient rooms coming back through

1 here, but again on three different planes.

2 And what you see -- that dark space is
3 where the bridge will actually intercept the
4 building, and then they'll come into the lobby
5 on the second floor. And, again, that's the
6 view of that bridge, give you a sense of a very
7 similar design to what you see at the cancer
8 center today.

9 We do have to have a solid element on
10 that end, and that's a fire code issue. We
11 have to provide a rating and could not get
12 there with the glass that we wanted to use. So
13 it gives you a great sense along Palm Avenue.
14 Unfortunately, this does not show the widened
15 Palm, but you get a sense of the streetscape,
16 the feel through here, the transparency in the
17 glass, the metal panel system, and then some of
18 the little details with that wood paneling
19 reveal system.

20 What it doesn't pick up, it will run
21 along that top edge and down that area as well.
22 So we're fairly excited about the impact that
23 we're going to have on Palm while we're
24 providing the best service and probably our
25 highest calling in taking care of infants. We

1 think it's a stunning addition to the area.

2 And this, again, is just a little more
3 detail on that bridge connection. You'll see
4 that this end actually also has a little bit of
5 a widened area. That's the connection to P2.
6 And what we'll be doing, we'll be modifying the
7 elevators in there so when someone gets on the
8 level, they'll punch a button for hospital,
9 come off on that level, and then have a flat
10 walkway, which is very critical for our
11 patients. Many are mobility-challenged. So
12 we're solving that issue after a long time on
13 our campus.

14 The building is also slightly elevated.
15 We had more than enough fun when the hurricane
16 came through. Palm Avenue flooded. We were
17 fortunate. We were able to maintain services,
18 but we've got to get the ground level up. We
19 cannot be in the floodplain with this building
20 down at the street level, so that's a critical
21 element in this. And that allows us to get a
22 lot of the gear up off of street level here in
23 the project.

24 Do you have that video, by chance, you
25 could play? This would just give you another

1 sense just flying around a perspective. And
2 we'll be happy to show the material and answer
3 questions as well. Again, this is looking
4 north at the south elevation. And you get a
5 sense a little bit of this video of that inset
6 that we created, again, trying to break up the
7 plane as best we could.

8 And then you see that area in the back.
9 That's the Tactile product. And, again, we'll
10 be lifting panels over an operational unit and
11 why it's critical that we use that material
12 there.

13 I'm passing around -- they're not light,
14 but that's the Tactile product. I know some
15 folks had also asked about the glass. And what
16 we're showing you here is we'll have an element
17 of clear glass that we'll utilize, but then in
18 order to achieve the energy savings, this is a
19 ceramic frit that's actually baked onto the
20 glass as it's manufactured. And that allows us
21 to help the sun reflection. And some of the
22 metal panel systems that we'll be using as well
23 as the stone element down front.

24 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: All right. Thank
25 you, Mr. Tickell. Do we have any public

1 comments? Do we have any speaker cards that
2 were filled out for this application? Seeing
3 there was none, I'm going to go around the
4 board for comments. We'll start with
5 Mr. Loretta.

6 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: It's amazing. And
7 I appreciate everything that y'all are doing
8 for our community. And keep it up. And thank
9 you.

10 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Ms. Durden?

11 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Thank you. I'm
12 sorry. I think I've got allergies. So just
13 for clarity, Keith, where is this glass going
14 to be used?

15 MR. TICKELL: Sure. So that's -- when we
16 look at the elevations, you'll notice on the
17 architectural rendering, you see some of these
18 vertical elements. You see they're a little
19 different shade. That's what we're bringing in
20 that frit. We're not bringing it in on all the
21 glass. We didn't like that particular
22 appearance. We're bringing in enough to get
23 the heat --

24 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: And will the other
25 glass panel -- I think there was another one.

1 Right here.

2 MR. TICKELL: Yeah, it's coming around.

3 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: So it will be a mix
4 of these two on that south face?

5 MR. TICKELL: The majority of the glass
6 is the clear glass, but given the energy codes
7 we've got to reach, we can't get there without
8 a mix of that frit end of this.

9 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. And then I
10 think they're both very nice. What about on
11 the lower two -- the lower levels? Are one of
12 these going to be used there also?

13 MR. TICKELL: No. The frit will not be
14 used on the lower level. The bottom two
15 floors, because of the overhang we have in
16 front, that will be clearly pure glass --

17 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay.

18 MR. TICKELL: -- in those areas. We just
19 don't have those challenges at that lower
20 level.

21 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. And then the
22 only other question that I had was on the Palm
23 Avenue side. And if you could -- could we find
24 the -- well, I went over there the other day
25 after I talked to Guy and Jim and drove through

1 there. The only concern that I had was that
2 the sidewalk is a little narrow as you walk on
3 -- that would be the west side of Palm, and
4 you've got the --

5 MR. TICKELL: Right through there.

6 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Right. And then
7 you've got kind of a wall that I'm guessing,
8 because I couldn't quite tell, maybe about five
9 feet.

10 MR. TICKELL: Yeah. So the sidewalk
11 width is actually 12 feet through there, and
12 then that wall is going to be right at -- I
13 think that's 10 feet in height. Again, this is
14 because we've got to get out of the floodplain.
15 And that's the challenge. So --

16 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Let me just make
17 sure we're talking about the same one. Can I
18 borrow your --

19 MR. TICKELL: Certainly.

20 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: So what I'm talking
21 about is that wall.

22 MR. TICKELL: Yeah.

23 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: And that sidewalk
24 along there, 12 feet is great. I didn't --
25 when I looked at it, it looked like it was

1 about 5.

2 MR. TICKELL: Part of the project --
3 we're going to widen that.

4 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay.

5 MR. TICKELL: We're coming back. And
6 then I'll tell you the other thing. We share
7 the same concern when we looked at that wall.
8 We don't need all 10 feet of that for flood
9 barrier. What we do need because it's
10 elevated, we have to have a barrier or railing,
11 so we're in the process of working through a
12 railing system over top of that to open it up.
13 It felt heavy to us as well.

14 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Thank you. I think
15 it's a beautiful addition. And I know that we
16 need that increased service for a NICU. I
17 think you've done a great job.

18 MR. TICKELL: Thank you.

19 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Mr. Schilling?

20 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: No comments.

21 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Mr. Davisson?

22 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: The question is
23 for Jim. The only deviation here is height?

24 MR. KLEMENT: Correct.

25 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: That's it?

1 MR. KLEMENT: Correct. And really what's
2 unique about that it's a PBF zoning district,
3 which is probably antiquated for what we're
4 doing in our downtown area.

5 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: And I guess my
6 only comment -- critical comment kind of
7 follows up with the Palm Avenue. I understand
8 that's coming back streetscape?

9 MR. KLEMENT: Yes, sir.

10 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: I think it's a
11 great addition to the city. And the question
12 also is the glazing system, the color -- and,
13 you know, I think the frit's great. Is the
14 color in the same family as the Anderson and
15 Weaver building? Is this kind of the final --

16 MR. TICKELL: Good observation. You put
17 it well. And that was one of the challenges.
18 We needed something that was a little
19 different, but it was in the fabric of our
20 campus.

21 And this has a greenish tint. It's very
22 similar to the Weaver glass, but as you well
23 appreciated, glass today is radically different
24 than it was 10 years ago. Performance is off
25 the chart now compared to where we were, so the

1 color is slightly different. You can't match
2 it exactly now.

3 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: My question is
4 kind of irrelevant. The energy plan, I've
5 always -- as you can see, always fascinated by
6 it. Is the plan -- I mean, I think what's nice
7 that you've done is been able to have that
8 infill and still create that open space to that
9 entry which faces 95, which is going to be a
10 nice gateway, you know, into Jacksonville. I
11 was just curious if you had plans to ever
12 remove that? And I'm not suggesting that
13 that's something -- you know, I was just
14 curious.

15 MR. TICKELL: Personally, I'd love to.
16 We don't begin to have enough money to do
17 everything associated with our campus. All of
18 our generators, all of our cooling systems,
19 medical gases all come through there. The main
20 feed from JEA, everything comes through there.

21 We are working on some things. And you
22 would appreciate -- we debated, do we try to do
23 something to it, you know, color it, whatever.
24 I think we came away with -- let's track
25 attention to this, not enhance in any way or

1 distract with this, but there are some things
2 on the roof we're going back through to see
3 what could we perhaps make a little more
4 subtle. So it's -- you had the same reaction
5 we all did with it.

6 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: I think it's a
7 nice job.

8 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: I agree. Nice job,
9 well thought out, incorporates the campus well.
10 The only question I have is is this top portion
11 here -- I can probably show you easier on this,
12 is this just HVAC equipment in this portion in
13 the middle.

14 MR. TICKELL: So what we were doing here
15 -- when we did the design -- this building just
16 really fell short when you're 300 feet in
17 length. So what we did was we actually flew
18 the glass curtain wall up above patient core,
19 but this area up here is the penthouse and,
20 yeah, elevator shafts. A lot of the equipment
21 that runs off of the CEP is based up there, so
22 we were just, you know, knocking that down in
23 terms of visual impact. So there's actually --
24 that wall, you see that top layer of glass
25 actually flies by almost 14 feet to just,

1 again, help screen that area up there.

2 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Got you. Thank you.

3 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: All right.

4 Dr. Gaffney, any comments?

5 DR. GAFFNEY: Oh, I just love the whole
6 concept. Very impressive.

7 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: All right. Thank
8 you. I don't have any further comments.

9 At this point, do we have anybody that
10 wants to make a motion on this particular item?

11 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: We need to approve
12 conceptual --

13 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Let's focus on
14 conceptual first.

15 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: Motion.

16 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: I second the motion.

17 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: All right. Motion
18 by Mr. Davisson and seconded by Mr. Allen to
19 approve the conceptual approval of DDRB
20 2019-003, I believe. All in favor?

21 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

22 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Any opposed? The
23 motion carries.

24 MR. TEAL: Deviations.

25 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: The deviations for

1 the conceptual or the final?

2 MR. TEAL: Final.

3 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Okay. So let's
4 walk back through that. We have one deviation
5 which is now -- four on this particular
6 deviation; we've gone through each of the
7 individual requirements. Do we need to go
8 through those today?

9 MR. TEAL: That's what Mr. Klement spent
10 a lot of time doing during his introduction of
11 this, going through the two different sets of
12 criteria that apply to a height deviation. And
13 so the staff report stands on. It's competent,
14 substantial evidence that you can consider.
15 There's no need to rehash it unless there is a
16 question about a particular criteria.

17 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: So as far as the
18 deviation Section 656.361.1 height from the
19 allowed 35 feet to 125 feet, do we need to make
20 a motion?

21 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Make a motion for
22 approval.

23 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: All right. Motion
24 from Mr. Loretta.

25 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Second.

1 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Second from
2 Mr. Allen. All in favor say aye.

3 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

4 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Any opposed? The
5 motion carries on the deviation. So now we're
6 looking at final full approval of this
7 application.

8 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Make a motion for
9 final approval with deviations.

10 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Second.

11 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Motion from
12 Mr. Loretta, second from Mr. Allen. All in
13 favor say aye.

14 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

15 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Any opposed? All
16 right. It carries. Congratulations. I'm
17 going to hand the gavel back over to
18 Mr. Schilling.

19 MR. TEAL: And for the record, let the
20 record reflect that Mr. Schilling recused
21 himself on that particular item.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: We're going to go
23 ahead and move on to Item C, which is DDRB
24 2019-002, the dialysis clinic, Brooklyn
25 District for conceptual approval today. Any ex

1 parte -- I will declare that I believe that I
2 have received an e-mail from the applicant, but
3 I'm unaware of any e-mails for ex parte.

4 Mr. Klement, we'll let you get started.

5 MR. KLEMENT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We're
6 reviewing for the record DDRB-2019-002 dialysis
7 clinic. The location is Rosselle and Park
8 Street. It's in Brooklyn, Riverside District.
9 The agent is Lara Diettrich. And she has her
10 team here, and they're looking at a conceptual
11 review.

12 Ms. Diettrich has included a lot of
13 information to help remind the board of the
14 deviation. And she'll be looking at it as we
15 move through final. And that being said, I'll
16 move through briefly with respect to the
17 criteria that we use and will attempt to give
18 you a little information and set the stage for
19 Ms. Diettrich's presentation.

20 The first criteria that Staff really
21 feels is in compliance, but we just wanted to
22 direct the client -- or the applicant to bring
23 a little more detail to it, and that's with
24 respect to the setbacks. There the applicant
25 has the building setback from the Park Street

1 frontage.

2 What the guideline suggests is that you
3 certainly make a more urban and a
4 pedestrian-engaged setback. Right now it reads
5 a little more suburban and we can spend some
6 time after the meeting or when appropriate, but
7 that's what we were looking for in terms of
8 that compliance aspect.

9 In terms of encroachment and entrances
10 and rear views and height, that criteria of the
11 applicant complies.

12 The second area of identification of
13 Staff needing attention. And it appears they
14 will need the deviation. The criteria suggests
15 that in guide development to minimize parking
16 onsite. And they look for 50 percent of the
17 standard requirement of the park's 6th code for
18 areas outside of the core.

19 And in this particular instance, the
20 applicant as indicated that -- and provided
21 documentation with respect to the parking
22 requirement. Due to the medical nature of the
23 building, they're looking for an increase
24 parking. Again, this will be done at the final
25 presentation. Today we are doing the

1 conceptual, but the idea is to introduce to you
2 that they will be looking for that conceptual
3 and looking to allow an increase in parking.

4 The second item dealt with the
5 transparency. They do have transparency on
6 their street frontages. That's the criteria of
7 and the guidelines; however, they are less than
8 required. And Staff will be looking for them
9 to provide, again, specific mitigating criteria
10 and the answers to the guidelines with respect
11 to that deviation request.

12 The grid pattern is not applicable. One
13 interesting situation here, which is the last
14 item Staff spoke to which was the streetscape
15 design. They are pursuing and indicating
16 compliance on the Park Street frontage.

17 The challenge is more of an existing
18 condition in order to bring compliance and meet
19 our standard. The Rosselle Street has
20 perpendicular parking to the curb line, which
21 is out of ordinary with our general circulation
22 and streetscape standards.

23 They anticipate that everyone will have a
24 parallel traffic flow to it. Actually, we have
25 encouraged where we have seen this in the past

1 on similar designs. We encourage the
2 perpendicular parking. It gives us a little
3 nuance, and it does actually help bring a
4 little more pedestrian engagement to the street
5 frontage.

6 That being said, the applicant is going
7 to be looking for a deviation from the
8 streetscape standard along the Rosselle Street
9 frontage and will be bringing it back to this
10 board in their final presentation how they will
11 address and mitigate their street frontage
12 requirements.

13 It usually also involves a little more
14 traffic engineering to make sure there's any
15 setbacks needed or if we're going to landscape
16 items where we address with traffic engineering
17 to confirm that they are nonissues.

18 That being said, Staff has a
19 recommendation to approve conceptually and we
20 have asked the applicant to address the
21 following items of the off-street parking prior
22 to their final to address the transparency
23 prior to their final, and to address the
24 streetscape design prior to final. And the
25 fourth is more of a general comment that the

1 applicant will address and give off a more
2 pedestrian and urban theme on the Park Street
3 setback -- building set back.

4 With that being said, let's turn it back
5 to you, Mr. Chairman. And the applicant is
6 here to make that report.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right.
8 Ms. Diettrich.

9 MS. DIETRICH: Good afternoon. First, I
10 must say congratulations to Mr. Jim Klement as
11 my former boss. I called him Clementine. So
12 I'm glad he won't be going away, but he'll be
13 keeping going. And he deserves it. He's been
14 a joy to work with. And I've learned a lot
15 from him. So way to go, Jim.

16 MR. KLEMENT: Thank you.

17 MS. DIETRICH: Okay. So to briefly
18 touch upon just a few things I'll get right
19 into those deviations. It's a \$4.6 million
20 investment on this southeast quadrant of
21 Rosselle and Park. You've got .77 acres of two
22 parcels that are both owned by a Dialysis
23 Clinic, Inc. They have a current facility and
24 clinic on Union Street. And because of the
25 need and the service level, they need to add an

1 additional facility.

2 Due actually the predecessor before
3 that's on the agenda proves that we're not only
4 a hub for the southeastern United States for
5 medical services, but for the country, and
6 actually the world. So it's increased their
7 need as well.

8 So when you look at this site, there used
9 to be a dialysis clinic on this site. So this
10 use is just coming back to their own property.
11 The overlay does not allow that use. It allows
12 much more dense and intense use for the
13 hospital. This is a much less intense and
14 dense use.

15 So conjoining these two parcels as one
16 and having two access points, one on Park and
17 one on Oak Street, which is on the eastern side
18 of the slot allows for very good access, not
19 only for the clients and the patients, but
20 loading as well as ambulatory services which
21 will be accessing this as well.

22 Speaking to parking first and foremost,
23 because we're in the downtown overlay which
24 we're also in the Riverside Brooklyn District,
25 you have the kind of push and pull of the

1 minimum maximums, so the minimum requirement by
2 standard regulations would be 37 parking
3 spaces. The maximum requirement for parking
4 spaces would be 74, but because of the
5 50 percent reduction or requirement in the
6 urban area, that leaves us with 19 spaces that
7 are required; however, we have 35 regular
8 spaces and two AA spaces. And that's based on
9 the following: We have 15 to 20 staff members,
10 and we have approximately 30 clients or
11 patients that will circulate in. They're
12 through the eight to nine-hour day. It's a
13 four to four and half hour treatment that
14 occurs twice. So it's a very long process.
15 This is not a high turnover rate. And a lot of
16 patients are actually either coming through
17 public transit or being dropped off.

18 So in order to accommodate not only the
19 safety of the staff that arrives very early and
20 works through the day until 6:00, 7:00 at night
21 and the patients, because there's an overlap
22 within like a half an hour to an hour, we need
23 to have sufficient parking that not only allows
24 them for easy access because these are not, you
25 know, extremely mobile people in their

1 condition. And we need safety for them to have
2 easy access as well as the staff that's going
3 to be coming here.

4 So with that, we are asking for an
5 increase and allow the parking to accommodate
6 those. There's a couple other ancillary
7 reasons why this is good and benefits the area
8 as well. We've got Florida Blue which you can
9 see -- and I'll go ahead and move along these
10 slides here, the land use of the CBD of course
11 and the zoning is CCG-2. That's the quadrant
12 -- actually across the street, that's vacant.
13 This is our site. There's a mural on our
14 adjacent building.

15 Actually, Bert Brown who's in the
16 audience is the owner of that property. And
17 we've been including him in the loop on all
18 things. And he's been in the public hearing.
19 So we are keeping the mural and using that as a
20 separator so that will still be visual to the
21 public.

22 This is looking south at the property.
23 You'll see that the on-street parking that
24 currently exists is along the property line
25 there. Right along the public access sidewalk

1 and our development is where that fence is,
2 which is right on the property line. So there
3 is no give and take there.

4 This is across the street to the north,
5 Tire Kingdom. This is the northwest quadrant,
6 which is Jax Federal Credit Union. This is the
7 -- again, the southwest quadrant which is
8 vacant. Again, that's looking across the
9 street to the west.

10 This is the print shop, the adjacent
11 build with the mural. There are several
12 tenants in there. And they have to use
13 on-street parking because they don't have any
14 on-street -- or off-street parking. So not
15 only are they in great need for their staff and
16 their customers and possibly loading, but
17 Florida Blue interestingly enough -- sorry.
18 Let me go back a little bit. Florida Blue is
19 right there. You can see to the left, they
20 make their employees pay for parking. Their
21 employees don't want to all collectively pay to
22 park in their garage. So they use the
23 on-street parking that's in this three-block
24 radius.

25 Because of the high use of that and the

1 fact that there's more competition for it,
2 they've actually put two-hour collection
3 parking citations on Oak Street, which is
4 unusual in that area. So given that there's a
5 great need for Florida Blue and their overflow
6 as well as our adjacent users -- and we do
7 operate on Saturday. And the Riverside Arts
8 Market operates on Saturday. And this is an
9 area where people park and then walk to go to
10 RAM Festival.

11 So on-street parking is critical,
12 therefore we are benefiting the greater area by
13 having our folks park onsite and not competing
14 for those spaces. This is, again, looking
15 north on the sidewalk across the street. Okay.
16 This is our Park Street edge. That's a BRT
17 sign. And there are -- there's one large city
18 light pole you can see there by the palm. And
19 then we have numerous lights that are on the
20 property line on our property.

21 This is -- stepping back just a little
22 bit, there is a bench there. And you'll see
23 over here in this area, pavers are required
24 because we're a gateway. In the overlay, we're
25 in the gateway design guideline section. So

1 that's a massive paver connection that just
2 happens to also be in the middle bifurcating
3 our parcel. It used to be the entrance to the
4 previous dialysis clinic.

5 So the fact that we've got the lights in
6 and we've got this paver in, we'll be
7 interested to hear what your comments are with
8 regards to the streetscaping.

9 Then you'll notice that the trash
10 receptacle is already placed here as well as
11 the bench. With that, the 19 park spaces we
12 are actually for the deviation to have 37
13 instead.

14 Let's move on to some of the last
15 comments you've got in your packet.
16 Over-parking -- Riverside and Brooklyn -- as a
17 resident of Avondale and Riverside, I can tell
18 you over-parking has always been a problem. So
19 by relieving that over parking competition, it
20 makes this deviation actually a positive for
21 you.

22 And then the second one being
23 transparency, we'll get into some elevations
24 here. So there's the first elevation. That's
25 the Park Street perspective. Due to a couple

1 things is why the transparency -- we're asking
2 for from Park Street, a 10 percent reduction,
3 so we are providing 40 percent of the glazing
4 that is required. And that's for a couple of
5 reasons: And the architects are here. Doug
6 McNab, Joe Delary (phonetic) is here, Eric
7 Lycke is here, and Doug Skiles the civil
8 engineer. So they're all here to answer your
9 questions, but the safety of the clients and
10 the privacy of the clients, because those
11 services are being provided, and the way to
12 layout the system has to be, they will be in
13 some of those areas, so those windows are
14 designed to protect them and their privacy. A
15 10 percent reduction is all we're asking there.

16 Along Rosselle, we're only asking for 9
17 percent. This is the Rosselle. That's looking
18 at the corner. So Rosselle's to your left. So
19 collectively that's 10 percent and 9 percent.

20 Again, there's also been previous clinics
21 -- they have experienced in the past some theft
22 or some damage and vandalism because some
23 people may think that there might be some
24 prescription drugs being held onsite, which
25 there are none. So I'm not sure if there's a

1 posting of that or not. You'll have to ask
2 Mr. McNab. And Dwight is here also. He can
3 answer some questions. He actually runs the
4 clinic on Union Street.

5 So there's one other thing that I need to
6 make mention of that I don't think Mr. Klement
7 talked about. In addition to this application,
8 there's a rezoning application that has been
9 submitted as a companion. And it's a little
10 complicated, but to simplify it -- and Mr. Teal
11 and Mr. Klement and I have worked together on
12 this along with Bruce Lewis with the planning
13 department.

14 Because this use is not currently allowed
15 in this overlay district, but hospitals are, we
16 submitted a rezoning application. However,
17 Counsel Member Boyer is currently in the middle
18 of drafting legislation, which I believe might
19 have been submitted finally, that's asking to
20 do a companion overlay zoning to be a partner
21 with the overlay of Central Business District.
22 So you would have CBD along with a CCBD zoning
23 to basically remove these, you know, patchworks
24 of zoning requests that we've got going on and
25 to basically keep the uses that the code

1 originally intended for the ten districts that
2 exist.

3 So in working with Council Member Boyer
4 on that, I asked her -- and she agreed
5 100 percent. She said, keep your rezoning in
6 and let's see how the time travel goes because
7 you're on a clock. And if her zoning
8 legislation gets in the hopper and goes through
9 the process before we need to finish here with
10 our final review, then we'll withdraw our
11 rezoning application. However, she said if we
12 somehow get hung up, then continue on with your
13 rezoning. I understand your time frame and the
14 cost of the project.

15 So just note that you have that. I think
16 I provided a copy of that. If not, I can do
17 so. There are signs posted at the site. And
18 we did heed, Mr. Loretta, comments with regards
19 to the site triangle. And I sent a note to
20 Council Member Boyer in her design guidelines
21 she's looking at. And I asked that while the
22 back end may request that to remove that from
23 the urban districts because I know that DDRB
24 would rather not see that, and so I've made her
25 aware of that kind of conflict that goes on in

1 the front end versus the back end. So we
2 heeded your guidance. And Mr. Skiles moved the
3 building up. So it's 15 feet, Mr. Skiles?

4 MR. SKILES: Yes.

5 MS. DIETRICH: Recessed from the public.
6 So with that, we've got our team members. If
7 you'd like to ask questions or make comments or
8 suggestions, we're here to answer all of those.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: We will go ahead and
10 do public comment next. And I know that I have
11 one speaker card. Ms. Powell, if you would
12 please come up to the podium. And you'll have
13 three minutes.

14 MS. POWELL: Nancy Powell. Do I need to
15 put my address or anything?

16 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Name and address,
17 yes, ma'am.

18 MS. POWELL: 1848 Challen Avenue,
19 Jacksonville, Florida 32205. So I'm a resident
20 of Riverside Avondale, so this property is
21 just, you know, kind of real close to that.
22 And I'm kind of a broken record at these
23 meetings. I really would like the DDRB to
24 oppose their own standards. I understand the
25 context to this. It's very suburban designed.

1 And, you know, the design standards are much
2 more urban.

3 If you are going to bend and waive
4 certain requirements, I think the community
5 should benefit. I think there should be some
6 kind of something in return that gives back.

7 One example might be the architectural
8 visual interest. The distinctiveness of the
9 building would be of benefit. What a treat to
10 listen to the Baptist presentation. I mean,
11 they are elevating the standards of Downtown
12 Jacksonville. And that is the -- I mean, we're
13 not going there in this one, but it's such a
14 nice thing to see. I think Jacksonville has
15 been waiting for that kind of design standards
16 in the Downtown area.

17 So I think there could be more visual
18 interest. I'm not a architect. Something
19 feels really off about that second story to me
20 in relation to the first story.

21 I think when you add parking like this,
22 you know -- there's a lot of things you can do
23 to a parking lot to make it better. You could
24 have some islands with some shade trees. You
25 could have shade trees in different locations.

1 You can have islands in the right-of-way. You
2 know, there's a lot to be done there. And,
3 again, I think that if you're going to give up
4 some things, you should get something back.

5 I do have some concerns about the
6 driveway widths. I think they can be lower,
7 you know, from a walkability standpoint. And
8 I'm not sure if the design standards say that
9 parallel parking is. Usually in urban areas,
10 parallel parking is kind of the standard. So I
11 think 90 degree parking is -- number one, it's
12 awkward to pull out of these places.

13 And also a lot of times the fronts of the
14 cars go over the sidewalks. So there needs to
15 be something related to making sure that those
16 things don't happen. And also you could have,
17 you know, some more landscape islands.

18 So you know, these are 30 to 50-year
19 decisions that you guys are making. Those
20 properties are going to be here for a long
21 time. And so I urge you to consider those
22 factors. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Thank you. Are
24 there any other members of the public that
25 would like to speak to this item? We'll go

1 ahead and go back -- move back into the board
2 for discussion.

3 MS. DIETRICH: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman,
4 am I allowed to rebut?

5 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Let us discuss it
6 first, because I think based on some comments,
7 you're probably going to get some questions
8 here in a couple of minutes, which I think
9 you'll have an opportunity.

10 And we'll start on the other direction
11 and work our way back around. Dr. Gaffney, any
12 comments, thoughts, and/or questions for the
13 applicant?

14 DR. GAFFNEY: No. I just want to listen
15 to some of the dialogue. And I think I have
16 another opinion. So I would like to listen to
17 some healthy debate. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Great. If we get
19 around the table and from the debate you have a
20 question or item, please jump in.

21 DR. GAFFNEY: Thank you so much.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right.

23 Mr. Allen?

24 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Thank you, Mr.
25 Chairman. A couple questions regarding the

1 parking. The area coming off Oak there, if
2 you're driving to the building on the
3 right-hand side, are those parking slots there?

4 MS. DIETRICH: I'm sorry?

5 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: If you're coming in off
6 of Oak going towards the building on the
7 right-hand side there --

8 MS. DIETRICH: This is a loading zone.
9 It's a 90-foot linear loading zone.

10 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Okay.

11 MS. DIETRICH: And these are parallel --
12 four parallel spaces.

13 CHAIRMAN ALLEN: Okay. So how many spots
14 -- number of spots are there actually going to
15 be?

16 MS. DIETRICH: 37. Two ADA (phonetic),
17 and 35 regular.

18 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Okay.

19 MS. DIETRICH: And it was asked by one
20 of the fellow board members that he is very
21 much against dead-end parking, and so these are
22 posted as employee/staff only since they will
23 only be leaving possibly once during the day.

24 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: And then how about
25 the corner of Rosselle and Oak? Is that

1 you-all's property right there?

2 MS. DIETRICH: Right here?

3 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: To the right, is
4 that --

5 MS. DIETRICH: This is not. This is an
6 adjacent property. The mural is right here.

7 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Okay. I see it.

8 MS. DIETRICH: So our plan was to do
9 open space and/or storm water right here, that
10 way it allows a nice transitional buffer and
11 allows people to still enjoy the mural right
12 here.

13 And also to note, the parking items was
14 mentioned. We are provided parking items that
15 don't exist.

16 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: In reviewing it and
17 just looking down at the aerial image right
18 here, to me at first blush it does appear to be
19 way too much parking. It looks like it's just,
20 you know, gobbled up with a big parking lot and
21 the building happens to be stuck on it. Would
22 this project be able to go forward without the
23 extra parking that you're seeking?

24 MS. DIETRICH: No.

25 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Why is that?

1 MS. DIETRICH: Because of -- first of
2 all, the patients are of a sensitive nature.
3 These are dialysis patients. These aren't
4 patients that can walk many blocks like a
5 pedestrian would if they were enjoying
6 downtown.

7 Also due to the fact that Staff is in
8 very, very early and leaving late, there's a
9 safety factor there, but predominance for the
10 patient as well as ambulatory access. There is
11 perimeter parking, again, as you saw on
12 Rosselle and paid parking -- or timed parking,
13 which is not only very minimal which would not
14 only grossly under serve our site, but it would
15 be public space that we'd be competing with,
16 which is already being viewed as -- by folks
17 who aren't using their own garage and then our
18 neighbor who doesn't have any parking spaces.

19 And it was used for that prior, too. So
20 this is a use that's going back in. If they
21 hadn't have demolished it, it would be a
22 nonconformity.

23 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: The brick images
24 that we see on the building, are those
25 individual bricks or is that some sort of tile

1 work?

2 MS. DIETRICH: This is Doug McNab, the
3 architect.

4 MR. McNAB: It's brick veneers.

5 MS. DIETRICH: Did you want to speak to
6 the second level?

7 MR. McNAB: No, unless they have some
8 questions.

9 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Yeah, what is the
10 material on that --

11 MR. McNAB: That is at the very end where
12 we have some materials. It's not corrugated
13 metal, but it's similar to that. It's a
14 colored metal. And what we were trying to do
15 -- we're kind of between two neighborhoods, the
16 Brooklyn neighborhood to the north, and then
17 the older community to the south, Five Points
18 to the south.

19 And so we were trying to take materials
20 that you could see in both of these areas.
21 You've got the new apartments that were built
22 in Brooklyn that have some brick. They've got
23 some of the metal. They've got some EIFS
24 instead of EIFS or stucco. We're using, like,
25 a metal composite panel. So we were trying to

1 do this as a transition between the two.

2 You know, everything seemingly in this
3 area to the north has become a little more
4 contemporary rather than traditional, so we
5 were leaning a little more to that. And then
6 the other thing we're having to look at is
7 budget. Right now, the cost of construction is
8 extremely high.

9 The building that we just saw before this
10 was absolutely beautiful. I've got to agree
11 with the lady in the back there. It's a
12 beautiful building. The budget of that thing
13 if we were to do something in that style --
14 there's no way we could build this.

15 So we're budgeting or we're working with
16 the budget. We're working with transformation
17 between two communities, and then we're trying
18 to work with the locale that we're going in.

19 We want it to be, I guess, complementary
20 to the corner and surrounding area, but we've
21 also got to get this thing built for the
22 clients and take that into consideration as
23 well.

24 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: And I guess one of
25 the things that I picked up on, you mentioned

1 between two neighborhoods. I actually see it a
2 little bit different. I don't see it
3 necessarily between two neighborhoods. I see
4 it between Five Points, which is a
5 neighborhood, and then our core of Downtown
6 Jacksonville, which is highly urban.

7 And I'm just getting hung up on the fact
8 that I do feel that this is more suited for a
9 suburban setting than an urban setting. And
10 with those comments, I'll pass it along to my
11 colleagues.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Thank you.
13 Mr. Davisson.

14 MS. DIETRICH: Actually, if I could
15 respond quickly to that.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Sure.

17 MS. DIETRICH: When I was a city
18 planner, we actually reviewed Brooklyn. There
19 was nothing there or there was existing homes
20 or there was just empty space. And that
21 finally came out of the ground in the last
22 three years, 220, Fresh Market.

23 There's a lot of people that think that's
24 suburban, too, but yet it's been wildly
25 successful. And it was planned to the edge and

1 it has parking. And it's actually grossly
2 under parked. So maybe keep that in mind given
3 the fact that this isn't keeping with the new
4 construction.

5 MR. McNAB: If I could talk a bit about
6 parking. For a building this size where we'd
7 construct these, we're somewhat short on
8 parking here. So, you know, we're going to be
9 working with a tight parking constraint as it
10 is. To go down to less parking would really
11 put a hurt on what we're trying to construct
12 here as well.

13 So we've got a fence, a decorative fence
14 that comes along that's part of the
15 requirement, the landscaping within that fence
16 to somewhat conceal that parking behind there
17 and soften it up. But parking is fairly vital
18 for this facility.

19 Again, these patients aren't very healthy
20 for the most part. They can't go very far
21 walking. So as close as we can get them to
22 entering this facility is pretty vital.

23 MS. DIETRICH: And please take note that
24 these renderings were constructed prior to us
25 moving the building up, so it's going to be

1 urbanscaped instead of that depth of
2 landscaping. Mr. Klement and I walked through
3 urbanscaping and what that meant in landscape
4 architect, so subsequently incorporated that.
5 So the final review and our third meeting will
6 show that edge much closer with the urban
7 scape.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Davisson?

9 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: Yeah, I concur
10 the sense of this project is suburban, and you
11 can't get around it. And I don't quite know
12 what suggestions they have. I understand your
13 issue with parking. I don't really -- it's not
14 my concern how you park on the site when you've
15 got a dead end or loop around. That's your own
16 issue.

17 I do, however, have an issue with that
18 big plat of asphalt. And, again, I see your
19 need for parking, but I'd suggest taking two
20 spaces out and get some trees in that as you
21 would -- as you would by the landscape code.

22 MR. McNAB: Let me address that. The
23 suburban landscape code would require tree
24 items. The downtown overlay, if you have over
25 50 parking spaces, you're not required to put

1 any landscaping in the internal area of your
2 parking lot. You put it around the perimeter.
3 So when you see a lot of these small parking
4 lots throughout downtown, there is no -- there
5 are no interior islands. All of the
6 landscaping is around the perimeter.

7 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: Yeah, those are
8 pretty much lots that have been there,
9 grandfathered in for years. And I think if
10 you're going to do this, if you're going to
11 bring a suburban-type parking in, I'd suggest
12 adding some beauty and shade to it rather than
13 blacktop. That's my personal opinion.

14 MR. KLEMENT: And just to clarify that,
15 the intent of the code speaks to minimizing
16 the landscape items. There is a higher and
17 better use other than parking surfaces for your
18 associated facility.

19 So there's certainly probably maybe --
20 when it gets to Mr. Loretta, that there are
21 ways to even urbanize a parking lot so it takes
22 on a little better presentation.

23 But I wanted to clarify that, that the
24 reason we don't have it is because we encourage
25 other than parking surface. So there may be a

1 mitigation need to come in and do a little more
2 landscaping or shade tree, whatever might be
3 appropriate. That's all.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Harden?

5 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: I would tend to
6 agree with the comments that have been made so
7 far and the comments from our speaker that it
8 seems like -- and I don't have specific -- I've
9 searched myself for what comments I would give
10 that would address the issues, but like
11 Mr. Davis -- and I don't really have the
12 suggestions.

13 I mean, it seems like a square peg and a
14 round hole. And, you know, I don't think that
15 -- most of the deviations we've asked have
16 asked to lower the parking even further than
17 what it is today. We're talking about
18 increasing it. The goal is not to provide more
19 parking. It's to encourage, you know, using
20 other transportation methodology.

21 So I don't know if we're really moving in
22 the right direction on that. So, I mean, I'm
23 having a hard time finding that this can be
24 compatible, period. So, you know -- but I wish
25 I had comments, but I think it's at the point

1 where I don't have comments that would address
2 that -- would fix that. That's it.

3 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Ms. Durden?

4 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Thank you. So I
5 have some questions about the parking. Could
6 you tell us a little more about your hours of
7 operation, how many patients can be served at
8 any given time, and how many employees you're
9 going to have because I need to hear that kind
10 of information to justify the increase in
11 parking.

12 My experience with dialysis patients is
13 that they get dropped off, period. And
14 somebody doesn't stay there and wait four and a
15 half hours to pick them up -- I mean the whole
16 time. So I'm a little confused how they get
17 dropped off, and yet at the same time, we need
18 all these parking spaces.

19 MR. MORGAN: My name is Dwight Morgan.
20 I'm the administrator for the local facility on
21 Union Street. Let me try to explain. This
22 facility has 24 stations, so there will be 24
23 patients running at one time.

24 You have approximately 15 to 17 staff
25 members that will be here to take care of those

1 patients. So what happens is with dialysis
2 patients, you're correct on four hours. The
3 problem is is there's an overlap where the
4 patients -- before the morning shift gets off,
5 the afternoon shift arrives.

6 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: The employees?

7 MR. MORGAN: No, patients. About half --

8 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: But they're being
9 dropped off.

10 MR. MORGAN: Half get dropped off, half
11 drive would be rough. You know, we try to have
12 patients be as independent as they possibly can
13 be.

14 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Right.

15 MR. MORGAN: So what happens is you have
16 the 24 patients in the morning getting ready to
17 come off. And they may have issues and be a
18 little bit longer, but the other patients are
19 in the waiting room so that when the patient
20 comes off, the new patient can go on.

21 So we would have approximately 24
22 patients on the parking, 12 from one shift, 12
23 from the other. They overlap. That's the
24 problem. If we ran one shift and shut down and
25 then run another shift, we could get by with

1 less parking.

2 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: And what are your
3 hours of operation?

4 MR. MORGAN: Our hours of operations are
5 about -- we open the doors at 5:30 and try to
6 be done by about 4:30 or 5:00, depending on
7 transportation and patients and patient needs.
8 We presently have, I believe, somewhere between
9 65 and 70 spots on Union Street.

10 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: And how many
11 patient stations do you have at that facility?

12 MR. MORGAN: We have 32.

13 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Then you have
14 plenty of space.

15 MR. MORGAN: No. We actually -- we're
16 the overflow apparently for the Ritz. So
17 sometimes if they have something, I don't have
18 enough room. We're trying to work through that
19 so that they -- you know, everybody can park
20 because there's not much parking back there.
21 It is our parking -- ours pretty much covers
22 both of us. We're the overflow for them.

23 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. So if I
24 heard it right, you have 15 employees and 24
25 patients at a time of which that's about 12,

1 you're saying, would need parking. So that's
2 about 27 spaces; is that right?

3 MR. McNAB: There's an overlap.

4 MS. DIETRICH: That's if it was isolated
5 and static. You got to double it at maximum
6 capacity between an hour, hour and a half in
7 the middle of the day with the treatments
8 ending and starting.

9 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: I don't mean to
10 interrupt, but the question is if you're saying
11 half are getting dropped off and half are
12 parked, that's 24 spots overlapped.

13 MS. DIETRICH: Plus 50 to 20 staff,
14 which is 44.

15 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: So you're at 40.
16 We're telling you to take a few off.

17 MS. DIETRICH: We're eight short if you
18 do the math.

19 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: And we're
20 downtown. I mean, we're trying to be in a
21 downtown area and you've got street parking.

22 MS. DIETRICH: Which is already being
23 utilized by our neighbors.

24 MR. KLEMENT: If I could -- I apologize.
25 Our court reporter is going to need one at a

1 time.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Good point. If we
3 could go one at a time.

4 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: I didn't mean to
5 interrupt.

6 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Back to me?

7 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Yes.

8 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. So I think I
9 understand it a little bit better. You know,
10 even with the overlap, it sounds like because
11 of the overlap, that's the 24. And then the
12 15, so 39 spaces. That sounds pretty close to
13 what you're actually asking for, 37; right?

14 MR. MORGAN: Correct.

15 MR. TEAL: And, Mr. Chairman, I want to
16 make sure I point out for the board that the
17 deviation for parking is not at today's
18 meeting. I think that they appreciate the
19 feedback for this, but --

20 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: That's a good
21 point. Thank you.

22 MR. TEAL: But right now you're looking
23 at conceptual approval --

24 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay.

25 MR. TEAL: And so how the need for

1 parking may factor into some suggestions that
2 you have for them in terms of improving, you
3 know, the parking lot landscaping, you know,
4 those kinds of things. But as far as
5 justification for whether 37 is the right
6 number or not, that's technically not --

7 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Before us today?

8 MR. TEAL: Before you today. It will be.

9 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: I appreciate that
10 because I'm a little bit confused about -- and
11 it's because this is like my third meeting --
12 about when we go forth with conceptual, are the
13 things that are listed on the last page, page 7
14 of your staff report? There are four things
15 that the developers shall receive a deviation
16 for parking, transparency, streetscape and to
17 clarify urban theme to set back areas along
18 Park Street frontage.

19 So the truth is those are all the
20 issues -- those are my concerns, actually. And
21 so maybe my -- maybe it's just a comment. I
22 can provide comments on those or no?

23 MR. KLEMENT: If I may, Mr. Chairman, and
24 to Ms. Durden, part of what is important about
25 the conceptual presentation and even workshops

1 and things of that nature is for them -- the
2 applicant to receive --

3 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Some feedback.

4 MR. KLEMENT: Some feedback or comment to
5 give them a flavor of is this an acceptable
6 deviation or is it something that rises to a
7 higher level of concern or certainly needs to
8 be addressed.

9 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. So I want to
10 go to the second item, which was I wanted to
11 talk about the streetscape. And a comment -- I
12 can provide comment; right? Can you go to the
13 -- no, you flew by.

14 MS. DIETRICH: Rendering or photo?

15 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Rendering. So I do
16 have some concerns about the setback off the
17 right-of-way and the streetscape. I like to
18 see -- I'd like to see you think about wider --
19 widening the sidewalk through here.

20 And I'd like to -- let me clarify
21 something. You said, Laura, that the building
22 is set closer to the street than this shows.
23 Could you tell us how much much -- what is the
24 setback right here?

25 MR. McNAB: So when we did this

1 originally, we had it at 25 feet primarily
2 because I was concerned about the City's
3 requirement for visibility at an intersection,
4 which is a 25-foot triangle.

5 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: That triangle --

6 MR. McNAB: When we were here --

7 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Site triangle?

8 MR. McNAB: Site triangle, yes, ma'am.

9 When we were here the last time, we talked
10 about that. And we were encouraged to reduce
11 that.

12 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: 25 feet.

13 MR. McNAB: If we could reduce that down.

14 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: To what?

15 MR. McNAB: 15 feet is what we're showing
16 right now, which seems to work well for the
17 site plan. I mean, I've got my storm water in
18 the back. And I would love to see that get
19 bigger and push the building up to the street,
20 but we do have to be concerned with this
21 pedestrian area that, you know, as cars make
22 those right turns that they can see around the
23 corner. So there is a visibility issue.

24 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. I
25 understand. Is 15 feet the minimum because of

1 the site triangle?

2 MR. McNAB: Well, 25 is really the
3 minimum, but we're going to reduce that down to
4 15.

5 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. And then the
6 only other thing that I mentioned just now was
7 the sidewalk. And, you know, I'm a big
8 proponent of walkability. This is a chance to
9 -- on both the Rosselle and the Park Street, if
10 there's anything that can be done to widen the
11 sidewalks. You may not be able to do it on
12 Rosselle because of the perpendicular parking,
13 right, but it does seem like you might -- with
14 the 15 feet that your building is set back, is
15 there a possibility for widening the sidewalk
16 along that area, and along that same idea is
17 the -- the width, yeah, thank you, that whole
18 area coming up right, if there's something that
19 you could do to kind of improve the walkability
20 through there and also address -- somebody said
21 the width of the driveway. I don't know if
22 it's already at minimum. Maybe it is. If it
23 is, then I understand. And also what that's
24 going to look like in the southern -- I'm just
25 going to call it southern. It's actually

1 northern.

2 MS. DIETRICH: That's south.

3 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Go around the
4 corner. The other way.

5 MS. DIETRICH: West?

6 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Thank you. West.
7 That area right there, it's hard for me to
8 envision what that's going to actually look
9 like with the sidewalk and then the parking
10 spaces and what you're proposing to be in
11 between those two.

12 So -- and then I had one other -- the
13 transparency. This is a question for Staff.
14 What is the normal transparency on Park Street
15 facade? 50 percent?

16 MR. KLEMENT: 50 percent of the building
17 frontage.

18 MS. DIETRICH: 10 to 2 feet.

19 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: So they're offering
20 40 -- well, I guess you can see it, 40 percent
21 there?

22 MS. DIETRICH: 40 here. The requirement
23 is between the 10th foot from the ground and
24 the second foot of the ground, the space in
25 between foot 2 and foot 10, 50 percent of that

1 should be some form of transparency. And we're
2 meeting 40 percent on Park and 41 percent on
3 Rosselle.

4 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: And is the only
5 reason you've got the building set back 15 feet
6 there because of your concern about it being a
7 corner?

8 MR. McNAB: It's not on the Rossell. The
9 Rosselle, we were right to the --

10 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: I know. I'm
11 talking about the Park Street.

12 MR. McNAB: Yes.

13 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Just because of
14 visibility? You know, I'm not in love with the
15 architecture, you know. I hear what you say
16 about the budget issues. I think it could
17 be -- I mean, they even convinced Gate to make
18 their gas station look a little more, you know
19 -- I don't know, interesting. But I don't
20 think, you know -- those are just comments, but
21 I do think that the four deviations if you
22 could take into account the comments and try to
23 just make it a little more interesting.

24 I mean, the fact is that there's
25 something -- I don't really care for the

1 exterior on the second floor at all. I think
2 it's very -- we are going to have this building
3 for 30 to 50 years. And it could be a lot more
4 interesting. And it is on an important corner.

5 Park Street is really important to this
6 area of town. So I do understand about the
7 parking. I'd like you to be thinking about
8 some other things that we might be able to do.

9 MR. MORGAN: Pardon me. May I?

10 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Please. Go ahead.

11 MR. MORGAN: One of the issues of parking
12 that I forgot to tell you, on the second floor,
13 we have five home training rooms to train
14 patients to be able to dialyze at home so they
15 don't have to come to a center. So those
16 patients will also be coming, too.

17 We have cut this parking to where -- you
18 need to know, it's not only 24. There are five
19 rooms upstairs. Now, some of those will be
20 dropped off. Some will come with two cars
21 because they're coming with family members.
22 We'll make it work, but you need know that,
23 too. It's not only the downstairs 24 stations,
24 it's the five training rooms we have upstairs.
25 Thank you.

1 MS. DIETRICH: I wanted to point out one
2 other thing because I think I heard a comment
3 or two about something about it not just being
4 suburban, but why here. This is the medical
5 area. I live here. I drive by it at least
6 three to four times a day. You've got
7 St. Vincent's. You've got Baptist. You've got
8 clinics. And you have almost at least
9 40 percent of the doctors' offices and clinics
10 are all within a mile radius.

11 So this is exactly one of the locations
12 where it needs to go, and that's why it already
13 was where the clinic was. Unfortunately, they
14 demolished it. You could have done an exterior
15 improvement and upgrade and had your use, but
16 you did clear the site. And we do want to do
17 something new.

18 And they have been made aware that this
19 is a very prominent corner. And all of your
20 comments have been expected, I think, because
21 we've talked in depth about that.

22 What we need to know today and what we
23 would greatly ask from you because we would
24 like to find a way to make this work, they own
25 the land. This is something that is very

1 important to them. And we would like to know
2 what we could possibly do to help mitigate some
3 of your concerns so that way we could come back
4 with our final review and be able to seek your
5 approval and make you feel a little bit better
6 about this project.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. Hold
8 that thought. We still have a couple more
9 comments. Ms. Durden?

10 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: I'm done.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Loretta?

12 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I'm trying to see
13 on -- historical aerials on Google Earth
14 because when you shut that -- closed down. So,
15 I mean, how long ago was it there?

16 MR. MORGAN: It moved eight or nine years
17 ago to its present spot on Union Street.

18 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: So is the parking
19 lot that's there right now just on the prior
20 slab?

21 MR. McNAB: No. That's the asphalt. The
22 parking that's there now is the parking that
23 served the building.

24 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Okay. So you're
25 saying it was where the grass is?

1 MR. McNAB: Yes. The building was here.
2 The parking was there. If they hadn't torn the
3 building down --

4 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: That's fine.
5 Thank you. I'm like, you know, the parking
6 looks pretty dated right now. So it's tough to
7 believe that was only 10 years ago, but now,
8 with what you're saying, that makes a little
9 better sense. Thank you.

10 I'm going to ask a bunch of questions to
11 help gauge a little bit. Eric, you're up
12 there? Which one of these -- I mean, your
13 sketch shows the six-foot fence, but then you
14 show two options here. So is there a -- what
15 do you-all --

16 MR. LYCKE: So we have two different
17 conditions. We have a condition along --

18 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: If you would please
19 introduce yourself.

20 MR. LYCKE: Eric Lycke.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Spell that, please.

22 MR. LYCKE: L-y-c-k-e, landscape
23 architect with the project. Do you need an
24 address?

25 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: If you would,

1 please.

2 MR. LYCKE: 5122 Otter Creek Drive, Ponte
3 Vedra Beach, Florida. We have a metal fence
4 along Park that's shown in the bottom sketch
5 that is separating the parking lot from the
6 sidewalk and the right-of-way. We have a knee
7 wall along the -- this comes in along Rosselle
8 that separates that open space down near the
9 mural.

10 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Okay. So the knee
11 wall is on Rosselle?

12 MR. LYCKE: That's correct.

13 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Okay. So then
14 that answers a question because, you know, I
15 know your engineer wants to put the storm water
16 there. And it sure, like, really -- initially
17 when we talk about discussion, you know, we're
18 trying to keep the buildings apart because this
19 wonderful mural that Bert owns -- I get a nod
20 from the audience. Bert, do you care for this
21 mural?

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I didn't own the
23 building when the mural was put up. I don't
24 have a preference one way or the other. I
25 don't know what DDRB's preference is.

1 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Okay. So no from
2 the audience; there is no preference. My
3 question -- you know, it just seems like that
4 area should become activated. It shouldn't be
5 a storm water pond. It's crazy to even
6 contemplate putting a storm water pond there.
7 It should become more of a courtyard that the
8 employees could start utilizing. There should
9 be landscape there. And it's the place that
10 all the dialysis folks are going to go out and
11 smoke at.

12 And so -- I mean, it just seems that
13 needs to be activated and not a retention pond.
14 It almost seems like that's a nonstarter as a
15 retention pond for the whole project. It just
16 needs to be accepted that the retention is
17 going to go underground on this project, not in
18 a tiny little place that's going to create a
19 lot of mosquitos for the area.

20 So I just -- I feel like that really
21 needs to be something that needs to be brought
22 out. Eric, again bottom left right there.
23 What's the B juniper -- what juniper is that?

24 MR. LYCKE: Those are --

25 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: What's the tree?

1 So that's a tree?

2 MR. LYCKE: That's a tree.

3 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Okay. I've just
4 never -- I mean, we've got the drive out to the
5 south. Why not make that a live oak so that
6 way it's giving a little more shade to the
7 area? Now, you've got a driver (phonetic) out
8 to the south off property.

9 MR. LYCKE: I'll tell you a quick comment
10 on that, Joe, is that this parking lot, the
11 interior, call it parking quarter. And we
12 wrestle with the idea of an urban condition and
13 where we evaluate this under an urban condition
14 for compliance within landscape codes. And
15 then we have, as Doug said, a suburban
16 condition or any of the way the land
17 development codes review landscape in a parking
18 lot. This plant is compliant with both 55-foot
19 ruling and also the interior landscapes based
20 that one would consider applicable to any
21 project.

22 The way that I did it is I'm extremely
23 familiar with this area. And I chose to place
24 those live oaks where we had the planters so
25 that we could create shade. And the Brodie

1 cedar is a variety of a shade tree. It's
2 considered a shade tree within the Jacksonville
3 code. So it is -- to ask for a live oak there,
4 is to be considered -- and I appreciate your
5 thoughts on the design of the landscape and
6 those sorts of things, but in my mind what
7 we've done is we've put four shade trees around
8 the flanks and the corners of this parking
9 court and have achieved all but one material
10 terminal island on the interior base and
11 parking that would be generally considered what
12 the only exception --

13 MR. McNAB: It's not an exception.

14 MR. LYCKE: It's not an exception,
15 because it wouldn't be here. So just to
16 qualify the thoughts on the landscape that they
17 are sincerely interested in the urbanization or
18 the urban nature of the landscape presentation
19 here, and that the shade is the primary driver
20 of where --

21 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Okay. I just want
22 to make sure you're talking about this tree
23 right here?

24 MR. LYCKE: That could be a live oak.

25 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Again, there is

1 the driver right here.

2 MR. LYCKE: Right.

3 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: There is a
4 building right here in scale. I mean, I'm
5 trying to help you out -- figure out a way --
6 somehow people can get around to get approval.

7 MR. LYCKE: Help me out.

8 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Let's just make
9 that live oak and then we're not -- creating a
10 little bit of shade onto the southern side
11 here. You know, right now everybody else is
12 saying you need to make this a landscape
13 island, and quite frankly I think we do, too,
14 but again I'm just trying to get this -- this
15 is a eastern red cedar, basically.

16 MR. LYCKE: Right.

17 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: You know, I'm not
18 going to -- I don't really -- I think we just
19 need to make it -- if you want to make these
20 high rise live oaks, that's fine, but let's
21 just try to get it at a shade tree. That's
22 what I'm trying to get to.

23 I'm not going to accept the eastern red
24 cedar as a shade tree in the interim time
25 frame. So -- okay. I think from the

1 architectural perspective --

2 MR. LYCKE: Is that it on the landscape?
3 You just want a live oak tree in the corner?

4 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Well, and I think
5 we've got to get rid of -- I think we've got to
6 create -- I'll get a little bit more on the
7 Park Street portion. I think we've really got
8 to make that a courtyard space on the rear of
9 the property, not a retention pond.

10 I think one of the issues that probably a
11 lot of people are having with the architecture
12 is the fact that there's the hip, which is kind
13 of a little goofy looking on Park. And, you
14 know, you can almost -- if that building came
15 out and there was no hip on that side and then
16 your tower element became a little more of a
17 tower element, maybe it's now starting to
18 become a little more industrial and modern and
19 people aren't so frustrated with it. So
20 there's some thoughts. But even if you weren't
21 to get rid of the hip, if we were to make that
22 tower element --

23 MR. McNAB: Excuse me, just to clarify,
24 you mean the sloped roof?

25 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Yeah. I mean, I'm

1 talking about the sloped roof on the Park side.
2 If it were to be flushed like you have on the
3 Rosselle side and then we take the tower
4 element and move it up six more feet, you know,
5 now maybe it's looking a little bit more -- and
6 I'm not the architect here, but it's starting
7 to look a little bit more industrial modern
8 versus the suburban nature that a lot of people
9 are taking issue with.

10 So when we talked last month, I mean, I
11 still completely concur that there is no site
12 triangle in this issue of 25 feet or whatnot.
13 And I think you guys got that resolved, but we
14 move it up to 15 feet. I don't know that I
15 have, you know -- I mean, it just needs to --
16 when we talk about 25 feet, then it needs to
17 become a courtyard and some sort of space. So
18 even if we got it at the 15 feet, we just,
19 again, need to again make that become a bit of
20 an urban environment, a little bit more of an
21 urban environment versus the current way we
22 landscape with the two trees there.

23 And I don't know that it's that -- I
24 mean, this is -- I think everybody else on the
25 board needs to realize, this is, you know, a

1 block from the outskirts of the downtown area.
2 So it is starting to get theoretically a little
3 more suburban. But, you know, maybe there is
4 something that can be done.

5 So my last couple of questions are why is
6 it like on Rosselle that we're not at
7 50 percent? It really seems that we are. Is
8 it just because your windows aren't up to 10
9 feet tall that we're not at the 50 feet?

10 MR. McNAB: The windows are 10 feet tall,
11 but they're three feet off the ground because
12 of the function behind those windows. We have
13 what they call an RO chase (phonetic) where all
14 the water purifications, bicarb, and acid mixes
15 flow along the wall of each station.

16 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Okay. So that's
17 not what it shows in your plan in your
18 elevation. Your elevation shows that it's 2
19 feet and then 9 feet.

20 MR. McNAB: That's 2 feet.

21 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: According to this
22 plan right here, it shows at 2 feet.

23 MR. McNAB: It's still 41 percent.

24 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I guess. It just
25 seems like it's a lot higher than 41 percent.

1 I mean, I'm looking at it and I think -- I feel
2 like you need to go back and recalculate
3 because I feel like you're more than 51
4 percent.

5 MR. McNAB: That's glazing. That's the
6 translucent. That's not the frames. In the
7 code it says translucent parts, but the
8 translucency of the window. So I took the
9 frames out. And that's just the glass panels
10 in there.

11 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I mean --

12 MR. McNAB: So I count the whole cutout.

13 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I'm just -- from
14 my standpoint, especially on Rosselle, it seems
15 like you're kind of there. And even if you
16 were to -- this little brick piece on the end,
17 if you had to make that a faux glass panel to
18 get your final -- on the other end right there
19 behind that tree -- if you had to make that
20 faux glass, I feel like that's getting you to
21 the 50 percent.

22 MR. McNAB: But the other part with that
23 is because that's a stairway, I can't have my
24 glass closer than 10 feet to the glass next to
25 it.

1 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I'm just saying
2 faux.

3 MR. McNAB: It still becomes integral
4 with that wall system there.

5 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Is that true for
6 upstairs, too?

7 MR. McNAB: No, ma'am. The translucency
8 has nothing to do with the second floor.

9 MS. DURDEN: I know that part. I was
10 just asking about from a design --

11 MR. KLEMENT: The transparency addresses
12 the first floor.

13 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: I know. I'm just
14 asking about the second floor. I understand
15 it's only 10 feet and below.

16 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: So then the only
17 other thing is, like, at this point like this
18 sketch -- okay. So the underside right here,
19 it's just that things aren't aligning between
20 the two plans, so the entry right here is
21 showing kind of a door and some other panel of
22 something. And you just don't really -- I
23 mean, maybe that's what it is there. It just
24 doesn't seem like the two things are scaling
25 similarly. Do you understand what I'm saying?

1 I mean, maybe it's just the fact that there's a
2 brick inlay there and/or I guess on this
3 elevation you can see the dash door, but then
4 there's a panel that goes all the way to the
5 first level that I don't see in the sketch.

6 MR. McNAB: The panel on the right side
7 is the column on the port --

8 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Okay. So that's
9 in front of --

10 MR. McNAB: -- of the dashed lines is the
11 door beyond.

12 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Okay. I mean,
13 this is kind of internal of the site. I don't
14 know if it would make anybody happy or not, but
15 just the decoration to the main entry is pretty
16 minimal.

17 MR. McNAB: What we were trying to do
18 there, part of the function -- if you look at
19 the floor plan, part of the function of this
20 building has a large story and water tributary.
21 In that, we can't have any glazing. I suppose
22 we could come and put some fade glazing on it.
23 All this area right here is back of house.

24 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Where is the entry
25 from the parking lot?

1 MR. McNAB: Right there.

2 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: So you enter
3 into --

4 MR. McNAB: You come into the lobby.

5 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Well, that's not a
6 lobby. It's just like a dead zone. So you're
7 not entering into the lobby because there's a
8 wall there. You're entering into like a
9 little --

10 MS. DIETRICH: It's a secure entry.

11 MR. McNAB: It's a vestibule.

12 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Yeah. And then
13 you got to go through another -- you've got an
14 elevator there.

15 MR. McNAB: And that's a waiting room.
16 We can -- we're still in the preliminary stages
17 here as far as design, so adding more
18 fenestration to this portion in the waiting
19 room, we can do that.

20 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I guess I just was
21 trying to -- it seems like some of the things
22 weren't adding up, but what you're saying is
23 that was the panel in the outside, so that's
24 where I was having some issues.

25 MR McNAB: What you don't see right here,

1 there's a column which we're creating out front
2 of the door that's beyond the stairwell. That
3 door is what -- you see the dashed lines and
4 that panel?

5 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: So I guess in the
6 end -- I mean if maybe we either make the
7 landscape area to the east of the building, if
8 we truly need that to be a retention pond, then
9 we almost put a six-foot wall and brick wall
10 that all the way to the existing building, and
11 then the mural is just gone -- goes away, or,
12 you know, that's option 1. You know, that's
13 one maybe option. Or the other option is we
14 really try to figure out how to activate that
15 and create that as an urban space for your
16 employees.

17 MR. McNAB: I'm sorry. I hear what
18 you're saying, and I think I know what you're
19 looking for. I know, come back right? Do we
20 come back for one more? Eric and I are going
21 to work on this. We're going to work on the
22 front. We know we can't have grass there and
23 stuff. We're going to work on the back. It's
24 not going to be a wet pond. I assure you that.
25 It may be an area where we handle storm water,

1 but the average person wouldn't know it when
2 they walk by. It will look like an urban
3 space. We've done projects like this all over
4 Jacksonville, making storm water areas look
5 good. So we'll handle the back and we'll
6 handle the front. And we also are aware that
7 the sidewalk needs to be wider. There's a city
8 standard downtown. We're not asking for any
9 deviations on that. Quite frankly, we missed
10 that.

11 We should have shown them a wider
12 sidewalk there and we should have matched the
13 city's standard to not have a drastic road
14 strip. I regret that. We'll take care of
15 those issues. I also have some ideas on how we
16 can make the interior parking lot look more
17 like a courtyard where we can achieve parking
18 if we want. We can use some variations in the
19 materials.

20 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Well, that's where
21 like in another project, you know --

22 MR. McNAB: I think the Cummer, the
23 parking lot, there is a good example that we
24 can by where they have some pretty good pavers
25 and some asphalt and they can mix things up.

1 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I mean, that's
2 just costing -- if you can make the whole
3 parking lot, you know, out of concrete pavers
4 or brick pavers, then obviously it's nicer and
5 looking more urban, but that's costing a lot
6 more money. Part of us -- you know, to offset
7 that, that may be better to put that in a
8 little bit more pizzazz in the elevation or the
9 tower element or something like that in the
10 building.

11 So, I mean, there's just -- there's a
12 whole bunch of different ways. I mean, I'm not
13 trying to resign this thing despite the fact I
14 keep saying stuff. I'm just trying to help
15 because I feel like the rest of the group is,
16 you know, struggling to come close to approving
17 this. And I'm trying to help you guys figure
18 out a way to success. That's all I'm trying to
19 do.

20 MS. DIETRICH: Thank you.

21 MR. McNAB: We appreciate that.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Parola, I know
23 you may have wanted to add something.

24 MR. PAROLA: Yeah. And this is very
25 specific to the storm water. I'm assuming for

1 y'all it's a treatment issue, it's not a
2 prepost?

3 MR. McNAB: Well, it's both.

4 MR. PAROLA: Okay. We have some storm
5 water credits that I'm sure in the long run
6 would work for you guys, so why don't we talk
7 about that for the treatment and dial back this
8 conversation about putting the pond dry, wet or
9 otherwise. So why don't we talk after this,
10 and we'll go from there. And I think it could
11 help you out.

12 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: Mr. Loretta said
13 something that maybe sparked something because
14 I was trying to find what is suburban about
15 this other than the site plan. And I think
16 what he hit on -- and it's your building. You
17 do what you want. It's just a suggestion. The
18 shed roof off the front is what really gives
19 that suburban look. You've got a building that
20 has this corrugated metal around the top, which
21 I don't have an issue with. Perhaps that shed
22 roof is -- it's just a parapet, it's a flat
23 room. And you run that around the building and
24 it's going to have more of that appearance that
25 it belongs on the street rather than setback.

1 And, again, it's your building. It's just a
2 suggestion.

3 MR. McNAB: I will tell you, that's the
4 elevation I had originally. There was a
5 comment that our clients did not like internal
6 roof drains because it had issues with it.
7 Would it be an issue if we went back to that
8 and had a couple of scuppers on the front with
9 some leaders carrying the water down?

10 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: Yeah, or you can
11 run -- you know, just slope the roof behind it.
12 I don't mean -- I'm not trying to say there's
13 any plan change.

14 MR. McNAB: I think that's great. I'll
15 enjoy that. Going back to my original
16 elevation, that's what I had carrying all the
17 way around. I appreciate that.

18 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: That's all our
19 questions. I'll just share some thoughts.
20 Actually, Mr. Klement, I do have a question for
21 you which has been mentioned a couple times. I
22 just want to clarify. I know there's been
23 mention of a potential rezoning. Just to
24 clarify, that is nothing that is at all before
25 this body today, that is separate and all we're

1 talking about is what we've seen?

2 MR. KLEMENT: Procedurally they were kind
3 of a bifurcated path. One path deals with
4 amending the downtown overlay district to make
5 this a permanent use and to change the overall
6 zoning within that overlay district, and the
7 second item is to take the CCG-2 zoning, which
8 is our most intense city zoning, and go through
9 a less intense zoning that allows this type of
10 use as a permanent use.

11 And the applicant has indicated in their
12 discussions that they should take both paths
13 and then whichever path is appropriate. Now,
14 the rezoning will come back to this board for a
15 recommendation before going to the full
16 counsel. And presumably the overlay will also
17 come back to this board with respect to the
18 rezoning for the downtown overlay district.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Those are all things
20 that we will see in the future -- could see in
21 the future, but certainly not today.

22 MR. KLEMENT: They will not be able to
23 see or pull the permit until those are resolved
24 with respect to their permitted use.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. So then

1 just sharing some thoughts -- and I know I've
2 had a chance to hear a lot of things. So just
3 sharing, I guess, my thinking is I know there
4 was some comment about the 90 degree pull-in
5 parking on Rosselle. I don't know that I have
6 any issue with that. I know that that's out
7 there today that exists. You guys are taking
8 an existing condition, I think, making that
9 better by putting some landscape islands in it.

10 I will agree with my board members that
11 knowing that you're asking for a deviation on
12 the parking, I understand why you're getting to
13 the parking count. And I think I can support
14 that deviation. But, again, the question is
15 what is the mitigation? I think Mr. Davisson's
16 idea of some additional landscaping by putting
17 in another landscape island, I think that may
18 be a reasonable mitigation. And I think it's a
19 very good suggestion that I'd recommend y'all
20 consider.

21 The other thing I was going to point out
22 is, you know, because the way you have the
23 loading zone, you've got quite -- for lack of
24 better terms and not technical terms, quite a
25 kink in your drive as you come through. And I

1 could see that if you had a truck sitting in
2 that loading zone, if you had two opposing
3 cars, they would have a tough time getting by
4 each other. So I was just going to suggest you
5 may want to consider pulling the front -- I'm
6 not sure which way is north, but the edge right
7 at the kink back a little bit just to make it
8 easier for cars to get in through there, if
9 that makes sense.

10 MS. DIETRICH: I'm sorry. Just so we're
11 clear, are you talking about right here?
12 There's 24 feet between the loading and the
13 parallel parking, so between here and here,
14 that's 24 feet. You're talking about this
15 right?

16 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: If you have two cars
17 passing each other here and you have a truck
18 that's parked all the way on that corner, that
19 could be a little bit of an issue. So you may
20 want to pull it back a little bit.

21 MS. DIETRICH: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: And try to get it --

23 MS. DIETRICH: Because we are 68 feet in
24 excess of your requirement.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: If you've got extra

1 space there, you may want to just --

2 MR. McNAB: It's a full-sized semi, so
3 he'll pull in, back all the way up and should
4 be able to --

5 MS. DIETRICH: Or pull in here on Park,
6 park here, and then pull out.

7 MR. McNAB: I get what you're saying.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: I just threw that
9 out as an idea. So that's everything related
10 to parking. Transparency, I agree with
11 Mr. Loretta that it sure looks to me like y'all
12 are meeting on Rosselle. I mean, it's awfully
13 close.

14 And, again, I think that I can support
15 the waiver for Park Street, assuming it's done
16 right with the streetscape and some things out
17 in front.

18 So as far as the build to on Park -- and
19 this is one where I'm still struggling a little
20 bit, because with Park and Rosselle being a
21 signalized intersection, I just don't think it
22 has the same site triangle requirement because
23 it's not a stop sign where a driver has to look
24 left and right and meet the 25 feet because the
25 intersection and otherwise signal, so they just

1 have to see the signal in front of them and if
2 it's a yield on left, the cars in front of
3 them.

4 And I hear you somewhat saying that maybe
5 you've worked with the City and you've gotten
6 beyond the 25 feet, but if we've gotten beyond
7 the 25 feet, I don't see why we aren't getting
8 all the way there.

9 MR. McNAB: We actually do have one other
10 issue with that. If we pull the building all
11 the way up, we would need a 36-foot wide
12 driveway because how are we going to get people
13 out of drop off area? And so I've heard the
14 comment by several. They think the driveways
15 are too wide. They do meet the city standard,
16 two 12-foot lanes. If we pull the building
17 forward, we're going to need a 36-foot wide --
18 which the City does allow. And so, I mean, I
19 don't know that anybody would want that, but it
20 is a permissible width on the driveway.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Ms. Durden?

22 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: One thing about the
23 driveway -- I had two last comments about the
24 parking. I don't want to interrupt you.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: You're good.

1 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: So one of the
2 things that is kind of throwing me off, too,
3 about the streetscape is the width of that
4 driveway on Park Street. And so I clearly
5 wouldn't want us to increase it to 32.

6 MR. McNAB: 36.

7 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Have you thought
8 about making both of these one way so that
9 instead of having so much width there in and
10 out, have you thought about, you know, that you
11 would have in maybe off Park and out off Oak as
12 opposed to making both of them two ways?

13 MR. McNAB: We thought of a bunch of
14 things. We thought about a driveway on
15 Rosselle. We thought about making some of them
16 one way. I feel like for the uses of the
17 facilities, it's really important to maintain
18 two-way traffic particularly with the traffic
19 patterns that exist in the neighborhood of
20 where people would be coming to the site from.

21 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: That's Oak; right?

22 MR. McNAB: Oak. Just for example, if we
23 were to make it, the entrance would probably be
24 on Park Street, but now you have all of these
25 people who would not normally then go through

1 the traffic signal are going to have to go
2 through the traffic signal to come around and
3 it could cause some congestion at the
4 intersection. So for the sake of the
5 neighborhood, I think it's better to keep it as
6 two-way traffic.

7 MS. DIETRICH: Ms. Durden, you'd be
8 adding trips to a road that is already designed
9 -- they're trying to take trips off of. There
10 is a road scape that isn't being implemented,
11 but it has been designed.

12 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Well, that might be
13 good if that were --

14 MS. DIETRICH: Well, that's the point.

15 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: No, what I'm saying
16 is, you know, if you had less parking then
17 people would actually get an Uber or Lyft.

18 MS. DIETRICH: After they've circled the
19 block longer adding more congestion.

20 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: That's possible.

21 MS. DIETRICH: The second reason why
22 this is very vital other than good traffic flow
23 and good access, which is good planning is
24 principal, is the fact that this is also going
25 to be accessed by ambulatory services. So it

1 has to have access for pickup, drop off. There
2 is not enough room to do a big suburban truck
3 circle. So this is critical, not only for the
4 aesthetic, for planning principles, for access,
5 but also for the trucks and the ambulances.

6 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: And one last
7 comment, Doug, about the -- I see up in the
8 Park Street side that you're going to have
9 pervious pavers, but is that -- yeah, in there.

10 MR. McNAB: That would be the parking
11 spaces themselves. So see those five parking
12 spaces?

13 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: No, I'm talking
14 about interior parking. So was there a reason
15 that those are pervious? I mean, it's kind of
16 -- could you just tell us what you were
17 thinking in that regard?

18 MR. McNAB: So it might be good if we got
19 into details when we come back, because -- just
20 to give you an example, I made reference to the
21 Cummer parking lot, which is one that I happen
22 to like, I didn't design. Whoever did it did a
23 good job. And it uses pervious parking -- a
24 pervious accompanying paver in the parking
25 spaces around the perimeter, but then it's an

1 asphalt drive.

2 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: More as a design?

3 MR. McNAB: Just to add some design and
4 break up the parking lot. I've heard several
5 times people don't like the sea of asphalt.
6 Nobody likes that.

7 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Thinking that
8 through, based upon the comments that I've
9 heard, that might be something else that you
10 could do to the parking.

11 MR. McNAB: We would look to do maybe
12 some of that in here or create an island here
13 with it, create some over here. We'll bring
14 something back that looks a lot nicer.

15 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Why -- with the
16 City, we can still do an urban flair; it's just
17 DOT's kind of requiring the large radii. Why
18 not go to the urban flair?

19 MR. McNAB: Well, this is -- this is a --

20 MS. DIETRICH: This is a city
21 right-of-way. It's not DOT.

22 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: That's what I'm
23 saying. So the City should allow urban flair
24 where DOT's requiring radii.

25 MR. McNAB: I don't think that's what we

1 would want to do with the delivery trucks.

2 They're going to tear up those flairs.

3 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: So it just seems
4 -- yeah, just kind of intriguing that there's a
5 lot of comments and answers that you-all are
6 saying that would make an argument of, again,
7 going back to is this really an appropriate
8 site. So it's just something you guys should
9 think about before you truly continue forward.
10 But, I mean, a lot of the answers really are
11 leaning that way, but...

12 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: So close to the end
13 -- so to finish the thought, if the answer is
14 having 15 feet back is the correct answer, I
15 know y'all are speaking with Mr. Klement, and I
16 think heading in the right direction that if
17 that is the case, if that is the best solution,
18 which it may be, then I think out front, like
19 we've talked, needs to be something more than
20 just the 5-foot concrete sidewalk with some
21 turf. It needs to be something that is much
22 more urban feel.

23 And I would encourage you -- I would say
24 you're heading down the right path and
25 encourage you to continue with Mr. Klement.

1 MS. DIETRICH: And actually,
2 Mr. Schilling, to that point Mr. Klement and I
3 -- when I turned these in a couple weeks ago,
4 we actually sat down and went through some of
5 his urban scape design books. And Eric, of
6 course, is an expert in understanding that. So
7 we've talked about that, so that would heavily
8 be reflected in the next final.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: And then the only
10 last thing I have is I will agree with many of
11 the board members that the second story of
12 this, it just feels like there's something
13 missing. And if I start talking about
14 architecture, we're all in trouble. But it
15 feels like it needs something, some doodads or
16 something to jazz it up. And I'm sure the
17 architects on the board can speak to that
18 better than I, but I'm not there on the second
19 story.

20 And I actually think Mr. Davisson's idea
21 of the parapet wall, I agree with him that that
22 front roof, that pitch-slope roof, to me almost
23 looks like a metal barn, so -- I think he's
24 given a great idea. If there's anything else
25 you can look at on that upper metal section in

1 making it look better and adding something to
2 it -- what it is, I don't know -- would be
3 good. So those are my thoughts and would
4 recommend.

5 The other couple things I've been asked
6 is if everyone that's spoken, if y'all would
7 please fill out a speaker card to help the
8 court reporter with names and everything.
9 Before y'all leave, if you'd please do that.

10 So bringing it back to the board as to
11 let's figure out where everybody's mind's at.
12 And I assume for them to get to the next level,
13 we have got to at least have a majority approve
14 them conceptually today with, I think, all the
15 recommendations we've made and Staff's
16 recommendations.

17 I know that there is always the
18 possibility that if we don't feel like we're
19 there yet, we could ask the applicant to do a
20 workshop, another workshop with us. I'll put
21 that on the table. I don't know if we think
22 that's necessary or if we feel like we've given
23 them enough feedback and input that they can
24 get there for their next visit here.

25 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: My suggestion would

1 be, you know, this is the second time we've now
2 had this project in front of us. I don't think
3 we need to spend more time with the workshop.
4 I'd prefer to address what's in front of us
5 today, and then have them come back one last
6 time and see what their changes are.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: I'm seeing head
8 nodding. So then based on that, would anybody
9 would like a motion and a second?

10 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: What exactly are we
11 voting on? I'm sorry. Are we approving the
12 conceptual design of this and saying it's good
13 enough to go to the next phase or --

14 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Yes, with the
15 recommendations of Staff. And I think I would
16 work into the motion the other recommendations
17 and discussions that have been provided by the
18 board members today, or Mr. Klement, if you
19 have a better idea.

20 MR. KLEMENT: I've been trying to take
21 some notes just to help the board understand
22 where we're trying to direct the applicant,
23 either bring additional information or get some
24 additional guidance. And just very quickly, we
25 talked about, again, urban design was not only

1 a repetitive but a mandate out of the design
2 guidelines. There was a reference to the
3 parking area with respect to the sea of
4 parking, shade tree islands, and things of that
5 nature.

6 The -- brick veneer and the materials,
7 make sure that their materials are urban in
8 character and design. We talked about the
9 second floor setback and delineation with
10 respect to bringing it a facade treatment. And
11 there might be some language in the code itself
12 that speaks to facade treatment. I'm just
13 trying to look in here.

14 Again, the parking lot seemed to carry a
15 lot of the transparency. Definitely bring in
16 your calculations and double check your
17 calculations on transparency.

18 The Cummer parking lot evidently was the
19 one referenced, the pond credits and water
20 credits or storm water credits as discussed.
21 And I would take any other comments -- loading
22 zone comments with the circulation interior.

23 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: I have a question
24 for our general counsel. We've talked about so
25 many things I feel that it just goes to the

1 overall concept of the project. What if we
2 don't think that the concept of the project is
3 anywhere where it needs to be? How do we vote
4 on this piece of motion that's in front of us?

5 MR. TEAL: Through the chair to Board
6 Member Allen. Basically you have three
7 choices: You've got a motion for approval
8 right now. That's in front of you. And so if
9 you don't feel like conceptually there's enough
10 there, that you want them basically to go back
11 to the drawing board and, I guess, incorporate
12 all of the comments that you've received to the
13 point where you don't feel like you can support
14 even a conceptual approval at this point, then
15 you would vote against that.

16 Basically, the board has three options:
17 You can approve it. You can approve it with
18 conditions, or you can deny it, or you can
19 defer it. If you think that you want them to
20 come back doesn't necessarily mean that they
21 have to have a workshop, it's just that you
22 feel like there's not enough information there
23 for you to be able to say, I don't know if can
24 support this or not, you know, because I want
25 to see these changes to it and I want to see

1 how you react to that. So that's an option as
2 well would be to do a deferral.

3 And sometimes how we've handled that in
4 the past has been with a workshop so that
5 there's more of a dialogue component that can
6 kind of happen. If you feel like you've given
7 them enough direction or if you feel like
8 there's some consideration, then you could
9 defer it. You could have them come back with
10 something, but that also can happen at final.

11 So even if you approve it conceptually
12 and you don't like what they come back with,
13 then you still have the same option.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Harden?

15 CHAIRMAN HARDEN: And I would say to the
16 board as far as this project is concerned, I
17 think that as somebody who has property in
18 Brooklyn and has developed property in Brooklyn
19 and sits on this board because the purpose of
20 this board is that we create a vibrant,
21 thriving urban core. And the downtown overlay
22 exists to provide guidelines for that purpose.

23 And if this project met those guidelines,
24 then I don't think that we have obviously any
25 say to it, but the project does not meet a lot

1 of these guidelines and the deviations that
2 we're asking for don't do anything to benefit
3 the community at large. And if we had a
4 community of Brooklyn full of this project,
5 then it wouldn't be a transitional zone that's
6 so important to the urban core and to Riverside
7 and the rest of the neighborhoods.

8 And so I don't want to condemn the
9 designers because I think they did a great job
10 of trying to find a way to make it work, but
11 the reality is for some of the requirements
12 they have, it's very difficult to meet those
13 guidelines.

14 So I just think that the concept and the
15 use and the requirements that they have to meet
16 the needs of the tenant of the building aren't
17 compatible with the neighborhood. And I have a
18 really hard time finding any kind of approval
19 for that.

20 And I don't know if a deferral -- I mean,
21 a deferral is an option, I guess. That's
22 probably what I would support, but I couldn't
23 see it in conscience knowing what our role is
24 on the board to approve something like this
25 right now. I only say that because I don't

1 want that to come back after we vote and we
2 have people not share that opinion that might
3 negatively impact the applicant. If we didn't
4 have the votes, it wouldn't have the option of
5 being deferred. It would be denied.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: I think we have a
7 motion. Mr. Davisson, did you --

8 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: Motion to approve
9 conceptual.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. We have
11 motion to approve conceptual. Ms. Durden, were
12 you going to second that? Is there a second?
13 Let me ask.

14 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: I was going to
15 second it to allow them to keep going. I would
16 be concerned about denying the conceptual at
17 this stage because then they don't really --
18 you know, there's no opportunity. If we're not
19 happy with where they are at this point, I
20 think deferral would be better than denial
21 because that would give them another chance to
22 come back for conceptual.

23 I would be very concerned about denying
24 them because I think they are working really
25 hard to try to make it work. And I have trust

1 in their -- all of their consultants that they
2 could come back with something that would be
3 more acceptable.

4 So I'm willing to second it, but I would
5 also be supportive if the board preferred to
6 defer it to allow them to come back. I think
7 that the reason I can support approval is
8 because I do think that they've heard a lot
9 more today than maybe we were focused on during
10 the workshop last month.

11 I do think that if we were to move
12 forward with approval that it would definitely
13 have to be subject to zoning -- to the
14 rezoning. I mean, I don't see how we can give
15 them conceptual approval without making it at
16 least subject to the rezoning because -- and I
17 gather that the idea was that they'd come back
18 for final after the rezoning was done; correct?

19 MS. DIETRICH: Yes.

20 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: So I could go
21 either way depending upon what the board wants
22 to do.

23 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: We need a second.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Ms. Durden --

25 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: That's what I said.

1 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: We have a second.
2 So we have a motion, so we're discussing. We
3 have a motion and a second. And I think,
4 Ms. Durden, to build on your thoughts and I
5 guess where I'm at right now is -- and
6 Mr. Harden is, I don't think what we're doing
7 necessarily today is saying whether the use is
8 correct. I think that's a zoning question that
9 will be answered separately. And, I mean, I
10 have a sense that there is a need for this use.
11 And part of the question is where does it go?

12 I don't know that -- I don't know that
13 there's a better place for the use than here.
14 And I think that the applicant is doing their
15 level best to try to make it fit. But with
16 that -- again, going back to what's being said,
17 it's not in our purview today to decide whether
18 this use is in the right place. That will be
19 zoning.

20 But I would -- my thought is, and so we
21 have a motion and a second, would be to -- I
22 would like to see this applicant move forward
23 with the conceptual approval to allow them to
24 try to address the comments we've raised and
25 keep in mind that if the applicant -- y'all

1 come back for final and you don't address these
2 comments, I'm feeling that's when we need to go
3 to the deferral and defer them. And at that
4 point, hopefully we'll have a better idea of
5 where things are going with zoning.

6 Mr. Parola?

7 MR. PAROLA: Thank you. This is Mr.
8 Jim's last meeting and there doesn't seem to be
9 a replacement in the line of sight unless
10 they're just sitting in this chair right now,
11 which they may very well be.

12 I guess my question is how much effort
13 and money do they have to spend to get to
14 final? And the reason I'm asking that question
15 is if there are so many questions about
16 conceptual and there's no guarantee that it's
17 going to get approved in the long run, even on
18 the conceptual level in terms of the site plan
19 and everything, then let's get in the know at a
20 less expensive way or have them come back
21 before they spend a lot more money to bring in
22 what's sufficient for final and get them to
23 where they need to be.

24 I mean, I just don't want someone moving
25 forward with a yes now spending a lot of money

1 with uncertainty. I think although it may take
2 a little longer, I feel that in this instance,
3 we're time-rich because we have a rezoning to
4 go through. And I would suggest getting the
5 conceptual right before they -- a lot of money
6 is spent on getting the final right. That's a
7 business decision, and I think the applicants
8 should weigh on and you should weigh on.
9 That's an unsolicited two cents.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Harden?

11 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Yeah. My point of
12 clarification is that I'm not opining on the
13 use. My point was that the requirements of the
14 use are -- require certain specifications that
15 are incompatible with the use -- with the code
16 in that we're having a really hard time -- we
17 spent a lot of time providing feedback. And I
18 think that I've heard more professional
19 opinions about what might be able to do to move
20 it closer to what it needs to be than opinions
21 on whether or not the deviations would meet the
22 tests that are required of the process.

23 So that's why I have a really hard time
24 doing this because, again, there's sometimes on
25 this board where there's an appropriated time

1 for us to make some -- give some feedback that
2 might adjust it to meet the deviations as far
3 as the tests go. This is not one of them. You
4 know, we're just trying to approve the
5 projects. And I don't know if that's
6 necessarily our responsibility to get there.

7 So that's why I have a hard time with it.
8 And that's why I was probably more leaning on
9 the side of no. And I was being clear with
10 that at this point instead of waiting until a
11 vote had come on.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Davisson?

13 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: As a property
14 owner as you talk about money, sitting 30 days
15 costs money, too. So if you give somebody a
16 conceptual approval with the idea that in the
17 spirit of it that they will get to that point
18 or make a major effort, which they appear they
19 will, then that becomes up to the applicant
20 that they can either open the door or close the
21 door. They could come back in a month or they
22 could decide not to, but it's their risk. And
23 they can make that decision.

24 If we shut the door on them, that's the
25 decision we've made for them, which can take

1 now 60 days. So it's a decision that the owner
2 can make.

3 MR. PAROLA: Absolutely. And if the
4 zoning were in place, I'd be with you.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Ms. Diettrich?

6 MS. DIETRICH: I actually wanted to
7 speak to a very thoughtful and interesting
8 comment that Mr. Parola made. And I just
9 wanted to clarify for the record that the money
10 has been spent. I love what he said because
11 that is the business savvy way of thinking;
12 however, they own this land. They've already
13 had a business on the land. They want to put a
14 new business on this land to keep the use that
15 was historically there. They want to go
16 through to full review. And we have taken
17 apart every comment you've made. And we would
18 like the opportunity to revise our plans
19 holistically to address all of those.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: So let me make sure
21 I follow what you said. Is your proposal to
22 ask for deferral to have time to do that, or
23 would you like to have a vote on this?

24 MS. DIETRICH: And, Mr. Chairman, to
25 clarify for the record, April 11th would be the

1 final DDRB hearing for this because I think
2 that's when the next one is scheduled; is that
3 correct?

4 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Yes.

5 MR. PAROLA: If everything is in by the
6 19th.

7 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Of March?

8 MS. DIETRICH: If I may have a moment,
9 sir?

10 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: What would be the
11 April date?

12 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: April 11th.

13 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: For what?

14 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: For our next
15 meeting.

16 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: For our next
17 meeting.

18 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: But they would have
19 to have all of their feedback in five days from
20 today's time to make that work.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: While they're
22 discussing, let me ask a technical question,
23 not knowing what the outcome of this vote would
24 be but if it were not successful, would we
25 require the applicant to pay another

1 application fee and start a new application?

2 MR. PAROLA: I've never seen that happen.

3 MR. KLEMENT: I'm shaking my head.

4 MR. TEAL: I did want to talk about the
5 ramifications, if you will, of the denial is
6 that that would conclude this application. And
7 so they would have to file a new application.
8 And the limitations on that new application is
9 a legal concept.

10 And I'm going to throw some Latin at you,
11 called administrative res judicata. What that
12 means is that an application that's denied is,
13 in essence, barred from being re-presented to
14 the same body, not the same seats, not the same
15 individuals, but the same board unless it is
16 determined to be that there's been a
17 substantial change in circumstances such that
18 its essence a new application.

19 So what that prevents is an applicant
20 from getting a denial, waiting until some of
21 the seats change, and then coming back and
22 re-presenting again and hopefully trying to get
23 a different result. So in essence, what a
24 denial would be, would be that they couldn't
25 bring back this particular application to you.

1 First thing they would have to demonstrate to
2 the board is how is their new application
3 substantially different from the previous
4 application.

5 And so whether or not they're capable of
6 doing that, whether or not the board would
7 agree that they've done that, I can't speculate
8 on, but that would be the effect of a denial
9 would be to prevent them, in essence, from
10 coming back and bringing back an application to
11 you unless they can show that it's
12 substantially changed from the previous one.

13 I do also believe that there is a time
14 limit in the zoning code since you can't bring
15 back another application for a year, you know,
16 and that -- so that would complicate things as
17 well. Regardless of whether it's substantially
18 changed as well, they wouldn't be able to bring
19 something back for a year.

20 So I wanted to make sure that you
21 understood that piece of it. One thing, too, I
22 wanted to kind of throw out there, too, is it
23 seems like there's a lot of issues with regard
24 to whether there's a need for the parking or
25 not, whether there's, you know, modifications

1 made so that they can justify the parking
2 deviation or mitigate for it. They wouldn't be
3 able to present that to you unless it was at
4 final because you need to kind of know with the
5 deviations requests, you know, what have they
6 done in order to accommodate, you know, and
7 evaluate it from the need for the deviation.
8 Have they sufficiently changed the parking lot
9 to your satisfaction to justify the need for
10 the deviation? So that would be something that
11 would be able to be considered at conceptual
12 or, I'm sorry, final.

13 As I mentioned before, you do have the
14 same options you have now at final, which is to
15 deny, which is to defer, which is to approve
16 with conditions, or which is to approve out
17 right. And so simply by passing them to final
18 approval doesn't limit you in any way, I guess,
19 from being able to take the action that you
20 want to take on the application.

21 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: And vice versa. If
22 a vote is made today by a particular board
23 member, that would be a denial, but it does go
24 forward and they do completely change their
25 project to satisfy all of the concerns, then

1 that person that voted the denial could vote
2 different the next time.

3 MR. TEAL: Absolutely. You're not locked
4 in by your vote. I mean, an approval could
5 turn into a denial. So your vote on conceptual
6 does not predestine you to a particular vote on
7 the final approval.

8 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I just -- I'll
9 quickly -- I think that I can get around
10 approval with conditions based on the fact that
11 they recognize there are some modifications
12 we're all looking for with the expectation that
13 maybe not having good things occur, there may
14 be a denial and potentially my first denial in
15 the final.

16 And so, I guess, to Mr. Parola's question
17 and comment, being from the consulting side,
18 really at this point for them to take it to a
19 new conceptual design versus a new final, it's
20 probably less than a couple thousand dollars.
21 So it's almost the same amount of effort. The
22 only real difference, quite frankly, is maybe
23 showing up with materials. And that's about
24 it.

25 So I think in essence of, you know, as

1 we've all said, they've got to take the risk --
2 the financial risk to move forward. But, you
3 know, if at that point in a month or two
4 months, whenever, if we're not satisfied, then
5 they themselves can request a deferral and come
6 back again.

7 So at this point I, you know, generally
8 agree with Mr. Harden because a lot of their
9 answers kind of go to the result of this is a
10 tough parcel to accomplish all that they were
11 looking to accomplish. I'll go with the
12 conceptual approval based on conditions with
13 what we currently have on the table here.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: So do we --
15 Mr. Klement and Mr. Teal, do you feel the way
16 the motion has been made by Mr. Davisson
17 encompasses the items -- the recommendations of
18 Staff and what we've discussed here today that
19 you're comfortable you've got that?

20 MR. TEAL: I think that his motion was
21 for a straight up approval. Obviously, he
22 could do a friendly amendment to incorporate
23 whatever conditions he wanted to include in
24 that. And then Board Member Durden would have
25 to decide whether she wanted to continue with

1 her second of that motion. But right now, I
2 think the motion before you is a straight up
3 approval.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Davisson, do you
5 want to reconsider your motion to include the
6 recommendations of Staff and those items
7 discussed today?

8 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: Recommendations
9 of Staff. And they had, I think, clearly what
10 our comments were.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: And, Ms. Durden?

12 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: And I would agree.
13 I do have a question about No. 1. It says that
14 it's a reduction of the required parking. I
15 understood that it was an increase.

16 MR. KLEMENT: You're correct.

17 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: So with that one
18 change. And I still think it still needs to be
19 subject to rezoning.

20 MR. TEAL: That would be a condition at
21 final is it's contingent on the -- yes, it's
22 definitely a contingency.

23 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Then, yes, I would
24 accept a friendly amendment with a change from
25 reduction to increase.

1 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Okay. Then I think
2 we have a motion and a second. And --

3 MS. DIETRICH: May I actually respond to
4 your question that you had ask me a moment ago?

5 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Sure.

6 MS. DIETRICH: Just for clarification
7 for the record to make sure we all understand
8 the time line, March 19th, which I believe is
9 Monday, is when all of the revisions are due to
10 be submitted in order to be on the agenda for
11 the April 11th DDRB meeting.

12 BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: That's if it was
13 deferred.

14 MS. DIETRICH: In the posture that
15 you're in -- and, Mr. Teal, if I'm not correct
16 -- or if I am correct, we would have to make
17 all these revisions, turn it in to Mr. Parola
18 on Monday for it to get on the agenda for April
19 11th. So that's definitely not possible.

20 So we would like to be able to continue,
21 if the board sees fit, to make -- to continue
22 with the vote of approval with conditions based
23 on staff requirements and recommendations that
24 we be on the May -- May agenda so we'll have
25 time to accommodate all of the changes.

1 I want to make sure my client -- the May
2 DDRB so we have April to make these changes.
3 Very good. And through whatever -- Council
4 Member Boyer and/or our zoning, whichever one
5 comes first, I think Mr. Teal and Mr. Klement
6 and I spoke previously about the fact that
7 whether it could be an approval with
8 contingency on the approval whether it's
9 through the administrative or ours, so we
10 couldn't go through with all the civil until
11 that happened.

12 If none of that happens, then this will
13 remain as it is as a parking lot, which would
14 be unfortunate. Thank you very much for all of
15 your input and consideration. And we hope to
16 have the opportunity to please you. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. So we
18 have a motion and a second. Let's go ahead and
19 call the vote. All those in favor of the
20 motion -- the amended motion with the
21 recommendations of Staff and the other items
22 we've discussed, all those in favor say aye.

23 COLLECTIVELY: Aye.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Any opposed?

25 BOARD MEMBER ALLEN: Denied.

1 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Denied.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. That
3 passes the majority. Members Harden and Allen
4 descented or opposed, whatever the right term
5 is. All right. So the conceptual passes.
6 Thank you-all very much. We look forward to
7 some exciting revisions and changes for the
8 final. That covers all of our action items.

9 MR. PAROLA: Mr. Chairman, we do have to
10 be out of here at a quater of. They have an
11 ethics training.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: I am hopeful we will
13 be out of here -- the only other item we have
14 on the agenda is the April 11th meeting and --
15 we're almost done. Any other items that any of
16 the board members would like to raise before we
17 adjourn?

18 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: I'll ask a quick
19 question. Where did the billboard come from in
20 front of Daily's Place. I mean, there's a
21 brand new digital billboard in the southwest of
22 Daily's Place that just popped up, it seems
23 like, in the last three or four months.

24 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: We approved that.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: I think we approved

1 that.

2 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Digital billboard?
3 I must not have been here. Interesting. So
4 then we approved that. So that must have come
5 in for conceptual final?

6 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: I think so.

7 BOARD MEMBER LORETTA: Because there was
8 one last year that the Jaguars here, and I
9 wasn't here that day, but didn't realize there
10 was an action item on it. Interesting.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Mr. Klement, any
12 final words of wisdom?

13 MR. KLEMENT: No. I've enjoyed working
14 with the board and each generation of
15 participants. I certainly respect you-all and
16 your opportunity to come in and participate.

17 And it's always -- providing service to a
18 board is I think certainly a complement to
19 you-all, especially this board because it does
20 give a chance to invite a lot of the individual
21 expertise that many boards, I don't think, get
22 to address. But working within that specific
23 core, I think should be a complement to
24 you-all, especially on what has been
25 accomplished recently.

1 So hopefully it will continue in that
2 right with some direction from Mr. Parola and
3 team and see where it goes.

4 BOARD MEMBER HARDEN: Thank you for
5 making it easy on us.

6 BOARD MEMBER DAVISSON: If we would have
7 known you were retiring, we would have gotten
8 you a metal detector for your time on the
9 bench.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: Well, we all wish
11 you the best.

12 MR. KLEMENT: Thank you. The pleasure
13 has been mine.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHILLING: All right. With
15 that, I think we're adjourned.

16 (Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF DUVAL

I, Stephanie Shear, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did report the foregoing testimony and proceedings; and that the transcript, pages 1 through 136, is a true record of my stenographic notes.

DATED this 21st day of March, 2019.

STEPHANIE SHEAR, Court Reporter