



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



*Thursday, September 6, 2012 – 2 p.m.*

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Board Members Present:** Chairman T. Miller, A. Sikes, C. Flagg, R. Udenze, and J. Fischer

**Board Members Not Present:** M. Selim, J. Bailey, L. Rink, and J. Garza

**OED Staff Present:** Paul Crawford, Acting Executive Director; Jim Klement, Staff Liaison; Eric Lindstrom, Staff Liaison; and Michelle Stephens, Recording Secretary

**Representing Office of General Counsel:** Jason Gabriel

**Representing Office of City Council:** Scott Wilson, liaison for Council Member Don Redman, District 4

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Miller called the meeting to order at approximately 2:13 p.m.

**II. ACTION ITEMS**

**APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 2, 2012 DDRB MEETING MINUTES (INCLUDES NOTES FROM AUGUST 14, 2012 NOMINATING COMMITTEE MEETING)**

**THE August 2, 2012 DDRB MEETING MINUTES WERE APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.**

Paul Crawford noted that he had to depart the meeting early and the developer for the project also needed to depart the meeting early to make a flight out of JIA. He requested and the Board granted the request to revise the agenda and move DDRB 2012-006, Parador Parking Garage request for conceptual approval to the first action item on the agenda.

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

Mr. Crawford provided an overview of the project followed by Mr. Klement who reviewed the project report for DDRB 2012-006 dated September 6, 2012. He introduced John Norris and Christopher Holmes, Project Principal with Haskell, who were present to provide an overview of the project. It was noted that Mr. Ashish Bahl, owner and developer of the property was present.

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

**Public Comments related to DDRB 2012-006, Parador Parking Garage**

Mr. Doug Skiles (2002 San Marco Blvd., Suite 203, Jacksonville, FL) was present to oppose the design submitted for review for the proposed Parador Parking Garage project, as presented. He also read from a letter written by his friend, Bill Delaney.

Mr. Mike Field (4232 Palmer Ave., Jacksonville, FL) was present to oppose the design submitted for review for the proposed Parador Parking Garage project, as presented.

The following were relative comments from the Board:

- Related to the proposed canopy connector space between the garage and the SunTrust Building, would like to see what the design looks like, proposed programming for the space, and how it ties into the proposed garage. (Slide 6 - Conceptual Site Plan). Recommended more of a plaza versus an alley way.
- Would like to see the view from the Landing to the proposed garage (not sure how colors tie into SunTrust colors), (scale, color, and relationship or non-relationship would be key).

Mr. Holmes commented regarding the mature oak trees on Bay Street, the developer would like the flexibility to leave the trees in their current location, and then install the hardscape according to the new plans.

- Regarding the future retail and plaza area - would like any development on future retail for that space brought back to the DDRB prior to construction referencing that if the space is successful as an open space plaza there may not be a need to convert the space to a retail box. (slide 6 - Conceptual Site Plan - yellow "future retail" boxes)
- Asked about the timing of the Sister City Plaza and how that would tie into the festival plaza and future development. Asked if 65% occupancy of the garage had to be reached to trigger the development of the Sister City Plaza. (slide 6 - Conceptual Site Plan - green area "future retail & plaza")

Mr. Holmes commented that the Sister City Plaza property (proposed future retail and plaza) is under an option to the developer, but has not been purchased. It is conceived as a retail establishment of some type but there has been no concrete design work or development completed at this time. The 65% occupancy refers to the future retail. (Slide 6 - Conceptual Site Plan - 2 yellow "future retail" boxes)

Mr. Ashish Bahl (2030 North Serenata Drive, Ponte Vedra Beach, FL) developer for the property explained that the building currently has 20% occupancy. He added that in the four years he has been involved with the building; his hypothesis is that the local retail (whatever that might be) is going to be primarily fed from that building. The goal is to get bodies in the building. Based on the proposals that they have passed to the larger entities - parking is primary. Even though there is parking available in the vicinity, because of the weather in Jacksonville people want a covered walkway and nearby place to park. The building has very little amenities in terms of restaurants, health clubs, etc. but once the building gets populated they plan to open a Starbucks, convenient

place to eat, etc., in addition to what is provided at the Landing. He added that once you get foot traffic, pedestrian density, the retail spots will fill up.

He shared that his vision for the future retail plaza looks something like a hotel Mela – a very contemporary, trendy hotel. He added that the second part of the future retail could be a wraparound restaurant that is connected to the boutique-type hotel. The first piece looks like a cool coffee store that will have internet access, which will bring people to the plaza. For now, the density is not there and they are hoping that the parking lot very quickly gets larger corporates to come back downtown. It's hard to talk about the grid build right now because it is so far ahead and he does not know the composition of the types of companies that would ultimately move in (healthcare, high tech, waste management, etc.).

- Since retail is a hot issue, suggested that better articulation of the future retail development (slide 18 - Conceptual NW View) would be beneficial.

Regarding the future retail development (slide 18 - Conceptual NW View), Mr. Holmes commented that since they have currently not been asked to design it at this point, it is shown today as a place holder only and whatever is proposed in the future will have to come back to the DDRB at that time.

- Referring to the August workshop - commented that the purpose of the workshop was to stress innovation, the multi-dimensional aspects of a multi-functional building that just happens to have the ability to park in. Found the quote made by Mr. Holmes “downtown needs people not cars” to be an interesting paradox considering a parking garage for more cars downtown is being considered.
- Does not favor a parking garage on a prime piece of property downtown. However, is hopeful given the latitude of creativity and innovations available, opportunities may still exist.
- Has issue with the retail as a second phase because of the public money issue.
- Is disappointed that some of the ideas expressed at the August workshop were not integrated into the new design (plaza and how it connected to the Landing, instead of just a parking garage in and of itself talked about the plaza connecting to other components of downtown, retail at that plaza as well as along Hogan Street).
- Acknowledged that it is difficult given they are designing in an urban core with a small piece of the puzzle with other things going on around it that the developer does not have control over, which makes it hard to design without knowing what is going on over there.
- Referring to the corner element (slide 18 - Conceptual NW View) suggested they look at transparency.
- The previous designs handled the repetitiveness of the balance of the garage better than what is presented today.
- Opportunity to do something different in regards to retail.

- Suggested a horizontal band of darker burgundy on each floor level below the windows all the way around may help tie it into the SunTrust Building more and pull the dark brownish burgundy color in a little bit more.
- The first floor needs to separate itself from the appearance of the rest of the garage.
- Suggested innovative art in the windows/openings. Look at the building as background for art work.
- Articulate the top of the building, or corners to set the structure off.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER FISCHER AND SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER SIKES GRANTING CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL FOR DDRB 2012-006, PARADOR PARTNERS PARKING GARAGE WITH THE FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF REPORT DATED SEPTEMBER 6, 2012 AND CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE BOARD AS LISTED BELOW. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 3-1-1 (BOARD MEMBER FLAGG VOTED IN OPPOSITION OF THE MOTION AND BOARD MEMBER UDENZE ABSTAINED FROM VOTING)**

- 1. Applicant to clarify/show compliance with the entrances requirements or receive a deviation to *Section 656.361.13 Entrances* to not provide entrances to the building façade facing Bay Street prior to final DDRB approval.**
- 2. Applicant to receive a deviation to *Section 656.361.20* to allow for alternative streetscape and landscape requirements for Hogan Street frontage prior to final DDRB approval.**
- 3. Deviation from *Section 656.361.16 Off-Street Overlay* to not provide required 50% retail for frontage on Bay Street provided DDRB agrees to the proposed Applicant's Commercial/Retail Mitigation Strategy for Hogan Street, as further detailed under Recommendation No. 4 below.**
- 4. In lieu of seeking a deviation to *Section 656.361.16 Off-Street Overlay* requirements to reduce the commercial/retail requirement of 50% of street frontage on Hogan Street, the applicant shall agree to provide building tenant occupancy monitoring reports for the SunTrust Tower to the DIA Board staff on a semi-annual basis with reports delivered in June and December of each year after DDRB approval of Phase 1 of the project until the 65% tenant occupancy rate of the SunTrust Tower located at 76 South Laura Street is achieved. Within one year after a 65% occupancy rate is achieved, the applicant shall commence construction of the DDRB approved plan for the commercial/retail space and complete the space with active tenants in place within 12 months of commencement (Applicant's Commercial/Retail Mitigation Strategy).**

- **OPTIONS FOR ARTICULATION OF THE RETAIL SPACE**
- **ELEVATIONS FOR TOP OF THE BUILDING, AND COLOR INTEGRATION (BURGENDY COLOR ONTO THE PRIMARY ELEVATION OF THE BUILDING)**
- **ADDITIONAL PERSPECTIVES BETWEEN THE PARKING GARAGE AND THE SUNTRUST BUILDING**

- **DESIGN ELEMENT FOR THE ENTRANCE CORNERS**

Board Member Flagg voted in opposition of the motion commenting that he felt there was too much on the table to proceed and did not feel comfortable moving forward with conceptual approval with the project as presented.

DDRB 2012-009, JTA BRT REQUEST FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF COLOR AND MATERIALS

Mr. Klement reviewed the project report dated September 6, 2012. He introduced Ms. Suraya Teeple who provided the Board with the information and materials, as requested at the August 2, 2012 DDRB Meeting, where the DDRB granted conditional approval for the free-standing informational sign associated with the locations, not to exceed 12 feet in height and 3 feet in width, subject to final DDRB approval of the color, material and lighting of the sign prior to installation.

There were no adverse comments from the Board.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER SIKES AND SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER FISCHER GRANTING APPROVAL OF THE BRT SHELTER DESIGN COLOR AND MATERIAL SAMPLES AS PRESENTED. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.**

DDRB 2012-010, AETNA BUILDING IDENTIFICATION SIGNS AND DEVIATIONS

Mr. Klement reviewed the project report dated September 6, 2012.

Board Member Sikes noted that he works for Baptist Health and they lease space in the subject Aetna Building and asked if he needed to refrain from voting.

Mr. Gabriel replied that he did not have to recuse himself unless he had anything monetary to gain. Board Member Sikes commented that he did not.

Mr. Klement introduced Mr. Randall Ginzig, President of General Sign Service Corporation in Jacksonville, representing Lauretano Sign Group, which is the national company that handles the Aetna account nationwide. He advised that the change that Aetna is requesting is due to an international rebranding and is in line with what they are doing at all of their other 30 locations, including their corporate headquarters in CT.

The following were relative comments from the Board:

- While understanding that purple is Aetna's new branding, it is foreign and very large and next to the blue Baptist Health sign adjacent to it, it is not compatible to be used in the same setting (reference slide 12).

- Although the math is correct, it is deceiving that the sign on the left (new) is 200 square feet less than the current sign on the right (slide 12).
- Proposed sign is overpowering and the purple color not in concert with the rest of the aesthetics of the building.
- Suggested reducing the size of the height of the lower case letters of the new sign to be the same height as the lower case letters of the old Aetna sign.
- Does not have an objection to the sign glowing purple at night.
- Change the color during the day so that it appears dark (gray or black/white) and let it glow purple at night.
- There are already too many signs on the top of the subject building.
- Suggested the visual impact may not be as severe if the height of the letters were lessened and if during the day the outline of the letters were purple while the field of the letters were a lighter color and at night let the LED lighting take the purple cast.

The general consensus of the Board was to defer approval suggesting that the font of the letters as proposed be more in proportion to the scale of the façade of the building where the signs are to be placed, and suggested the color be screened during the day to minimize the purple color, while at the same time allowing the purple color to be seen in the evening.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER FISCHER AND SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER SIKES DEFERRING APPROVAL OF THE AETNA BUILDING SIGN DEVIATION REQUEST RECOMMENDING THAT THE FONT OF THE PROPOSED AETNA SIGNAGE BE REDUCED TO BE MORE IN PROPORTION TO THE SCALE OF THE FAÇADE AND THE COLOR SCREENED DURING THE DAY TO MINIMIZE THE PURPLE, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME ALLOWING THE PURPLE TO BE SEEN AT NIGHT. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.**

#### SELECTION OF VICE CHAIR AND SECRETARY

Per Section 4.0 of the DDRB Bylaws, the Nominating Committee met on August 14, 2012. The Nominating Committee advised that they nominated Board Member Fischer as Vice Chair and Board Member Rink as Secretary. The floor was open for additional nominations. There were no nominations from the Board Members present.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER SIKES AND SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER FLAGG NOMINATING BOARD MEMBER FISCHER AS VICE CHAIR OF THE DDRB. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER SIKES AND SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER FLAGG NOMINATING BOARD MEMBER RINK AS SECRETARY OF THE DDRB. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.**

### **III. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

DDRB 2010-001, Pedestrian Bridge connecting the Duval County Unified Courthouse Facility was pulled from the agenda by the applicant prior to the meeting date.

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

No old business was discussed.

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

Paul Crawford provided the Board with a brief overview of the new Downtown Investment Authority Board and the DDRB's role, which will be the same as it is today.

**VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments from the public.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

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

The next DDRB meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 4, 2012, at 2:00 p.m.

Witness

Downtown Development Review Board

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy Miller, Chairman

Print Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Vote: In Favor: \_\_\_\_\_ Opposed: \_\_\_\_\_ Abstained: \_\_\_\_\_