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THE CHAIRMAN: Folks, thank you for your patience. There might have been some confusion on the location, so $I$ hung out upstairs, waiting for those that showed up there, and I think we've got most people here.

Let me do something real quickly here. We begin this meeting with a pledge. And apparently, we don't have a flag in here, so we're going to have a -- why do I have a picture of Marc on my phone?

And $I$ don't see that we can get an American flag on here, so we're going to -does anybody have a phone -- have a flag on their phone that they could do? For some reason, Marc's picture won't go away.

Okay. We're going to -- okay. We start this meeting with a pledge to the flag, so if everyone would please face the flag.
(Recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.)
THE CHAIRMAN: I want to thank everybody for their patience and coming today.

I'd like to make a few introductions.
Councilman Anderson, thank you for being
here today.
I think everybody knows Jason Teal, our General Counsel.

And then do we have any media in the room?
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (Indicating.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. David and Derrick.
Okay. Please let us know if there's anything you need.

I don't know, I think a couple of you have been through this appeal process in the past. This is -- okay. We'll get there.

This is the second appeal that the DIA has heard. And I'm going to go through those in just a second. Well, let me go ahead and do it.

At the end of this hearing -- and there is a schedule. You will follow the schedule. We're going to stay as close as we can to this schedule. We have to, actually, but what we're trying to do is, evaluating this appeal of the DIA, which was a decision by the DDRB.

And I think we have Mr. Jones here that's going to discuss the DDRB's findings for us, but is it consistent -- these are the things that we are to be looking for today:
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Is it consistent and compatible with all proposed development and redevelopment within the BID Plan.

Is it consistent with and provides mitigation as may be required by the Consolidated Downtown DRI Development Order and Transportation Concurrency Exception Area Implementation Plan.

And three, while considering the design-related issues of the application, whether the project is in compliance with the Downtown District Regulations, the Downtown Design Guidelines and all related approved design certificates, guidelines and standards, subject always to the ultimate authority of the DIA to interpret the BID Plan, the Downtown Overlay Zone and the Downtown Design Guidelines.

Now, remember, this is a quasi-judicial hearing. We need to go around for each member to disclose any ex-parte discussions they have had.

And I will start. I had a phone conversation with Mr. Harden on July 17. I had a meeting with Mr. Diebenow on $7 / 27$ concerning
this issue. And $I$ had a phone conversation with Mr. Harden on August 15th.

Mr. Meeks.

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: I don't have any of those discussions, calls or otherwise to disclose.

I would like to just say on the record, though -- and Mr. Teal or Mr. Sawyer, make sure this sounds appropriate to one or both of you.

Mr. Harden has recently represented me in a zoning matter, but $I$ don't think that's -that's not something that's going to affect my opinion today, and $I$ don't think $I$ should recuse myself unless you gentlemen have other opinions.

MR. TEAL: Through the Chair to Mr. Meeks, I guess a couple of clarification questions in terms of the representation by Mr. Harden.

First of all, $I$ don't think that

Mr. Harden or his client filed a Notice of Appeal in this matter. I believe that it was filed by Mr. Bean. And so in terms of

Mr. Harden's participation, I'm unclear in terms of whether he's just an interested party at this point or whether, you know, he's
actually representing a party.
But even if that was being the case, you know, the question for you, in terms of whether you would be conflicted out, there's mandatory conflicts, and then there's kind of the appearance of impropriety type of conflicts.

But whether or not the decision that is presented to this body today, and your participation in this meeting today, whether Mr. Harden's representation of you either, A, has influenced your opinion about this particular item, or, $B$, whether or not you have any direct financial interest or any -- I guess anyone related to you has a direct financial interest in the outcome of this case, you know, that -- I guess if you could just disclose that information and then we'll, I guess, decide from there on whether or not there's an issue. VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Well, A, Mr. Harden's representation is not going to affect my opinion today. And, B, I have no financial interest in this.

MR. TEAL: Okay. Then I think that resolves the issue. I don't see that there's an issue of a conflict there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Gibbs.
BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: I had meetings with Mr. Bean, Mr. Diebenow and Mr. Harden.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Barakat.
BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: I had a phone conversation with Mr. Keith Tickell, a phone conversation with Jason Isaacson, and meetings with Mr. Diebenow and Mr. Bean.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Moody.
BOARD MEMBER MOODY: I've had a phone conversation with Mr. Harden. I've had a meeting with Mr. Diebenow to discuss factual data.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Ms. Durden.
BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: On August the 1st, I met with Paul Harden. And on August the $2 n d$, $I$ met with Steve Diebenow and Mr. Siebert. And I will say for the record that neither -- neither of the meetings will influence my decision or opinion $I$ render today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Durden.
Mr. Padgett.

BOARD MEMBER PADGETT: I had a meeting
with Mr. Diebenow and Mr. Siebert.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. With that, we have a
quorum.
Now, in this hearing, keep in mind, you cannot go away, come back, participate partially. And I think you will explain all the rules of this, so we'll get to that. What we're going to start with is a staff report from DDRB.

Mr. Klement, you've got about five minutes, if you can do it in that period of time.

Thank you.
MR. KLEMENT: All right.
THE CHAIRMAN: And let me stress one thing, make sure everybody's phone is turned off. And I don't care how well-known you may be, we need you to give your name and address as you speak. Okay?

Thank you very much.
In a microphone. So no one will be addressing unless they have a microphone in front of them.

So, sorry, Mr. Klement. If you --
MR. KLEMENT: That's all right.
(Mr. Klement approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
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MR. KLEMENT: Jim Klement, staff to the D DRB.

I am presenting a brief summary of the staff report for June 1st, 2017, Ventures residential development request for final review, with deviations, for a project located on the Southbank. The property is referenced as the Hines property.

This summary addresses the report prepared for the final review outlining the code used by the DDRB to review the design of proposed projects located in the Downtown Overlay District. It is important to note, this review does not rezone property. The uses proposed presently are permitted uses by right.

As such, the charge of the DDRB final review, per code, is to review the proposed project in concert, in context with existing conditions; site constraints; development plans; public meetings for conceptual and final reviews; public workshops; compliance with the DIA Master Plan, including goals, downtown design criteria, the development overlay zone, and the downtown district regulations, which we reference as 656.361 .11 through 656.361 through
.21, including opportunities for deviations from the design guidelines per Section 656.361 .22 when requested.

The final development plans propose the following: A 300-unit multifamily project, 13-story development, with an overall height of approximately 190 feet, 359 parking spaces provided, which includes 10 Riverwalk parking spaces, 53,000 square feet of recreation, open space, and a request for deviations from the design guidelines, which we'll reference and address as we move forward in my report to you.

There are 11 design guidelines that are referenced in the Downtown Overlay Zone and the downtown regulations of the Zoning Code applicable to reviews. The intent of the review is to assure development that is in context so as to promote and encourage the revitalization and growth of downtown as a desirable, high-density, mixed-use area that is in keeping with the traditional downtown urban fabric.

In this review process, the applicant submitted revisions as recommended and offered by the DDRB. The following is a summary of the
applicant's request for final DDRB approval that included mitigated requests for deviations from the following design guidelines:

I am going to address just the -- very briefly, the design guidelines that the applicant looked to mitigate and looked relief from.

The first one dealt with setbacks, which was to allow an increase to the building setback requirement. The project received a deviation to allow the setback building from the Prudential Drive setback.

The second item that the applicant looked for was to -- relief from the river view and height of buildings. The project received a deviation to allow a building height for a 190-foot structure.

The third deviation dealt with off-street parking. The project received a deviation to allow a reduction of the parking requirement to provide 349 parking spaces for its project.

The fourth deviation dealt with streetscape design standards. The project received a deviation to allow an alternate streetscape design along the Prudential Street

## frontage.

The fifth and last deviation dealt with waterfront design regulations. The project received a deviation to allow a reduction to allow a 25-foot setback for portions of the building fronting the St. Johns River.

Staff reviewed each of the requests, along with revised site plans, alternative designs, supplemental information supporting the requests provided by the applicant and mitigating alternative design solutions.

Staff notes, the development guidelines are not meant to be totally prescriptive but qualitative and reflective of a design-oriented approach to review and approval of projects.

As such, staff reviewed the request for the deviations, in support of the deviations, using the criteria for deviations, and being reminded that the $D D R B$ can deviate from established development guidelines when projects cannot meet the design criteria but do mitigate and/or provide an acceptable alternative design as well as addressing the criteria for granting a deviation.

Staff recommended approval of the five
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deviations. And there were some additional conditions, A through $F$, that dealt with some specific design of the waterfront Riverwalk and aspects of that part of the project.

With that, I'll conclude my report, sir. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Klement. Before we go on to the DDRB process -and, Mr. Jones, I'd like to ask Mr. Teal to explain this process a little more detailed, please.

MR. TEAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Through the Chair to the Board, I know that some of you have been here for appeals in the past, but to kind of set the stage, the purpose of this appeal is -- this is a standard appeal that is allowed -- or is authorized in the Zoning Code for the Downtown Overlay. Specifically, 356.361 .17 that authorizes appeals from DDRB decisions to the DIA. And those are what are called de novo hearings. What that means is, in essence, you're starting over. You do have available to you the record that was submitted and presented to the DDRB, but the parties are not going to be limited to only that information. So it's
not just a review of the items that were presented to DDRB. It could include additional materials or different -- additional arguments or additional evidence that's provided to you.

This is a quasi-judicial hearing. What that means is that your decision must be based only on information that you receive -competent substantial evidence is the legal standard -- that you receive at this hearing today. So the parties will be providing you with evidence that you can consider to make your decision.

One thing $I$ want to make clear is that the staff's report is considered competent substantial evidence. So the staff's report to you -- and I believe that Mr. Klement has already provided that. And you've already seen the staff report where they do make a finding that this particular project, with the conditions that were assigned to this particular project, do meet all of the requirements in the Zoning Code for this particular project.

That's only a recommendation and is one bit of evidence that you can receive.

Obviously, the parties have a difference of opinion, some of them as to whether or not that evidence should be followed. They will have to provide additional evidence to you to overcome what the staff report does tell you.

Just so you know, in terms of where you fit into all of this is that your decision today is subject also to appeal to the Jacksonville City Council. And so you're kind of the intermediate step in terms of the appellate process. And so $I$ just wanted to make you aware that the next step from you is not to go to court, but the next step is -- is to go to the City Council.

And I also say that for the benefit of Council Member Anderson who is in attendance today.

The Downtown Zoning Overlay does provide criteria for you to review, I believe, in your packet. And if you don't have it, I've got extra copies of 656.361.22, which is the criteria that you need to consider in terms of whether or not to grant a deviation request from the Downtown Overlay.

I will tell you for background purposes
that the Downtown Zoning Overlay, the intent was that deviations were to be the norm. In other words, it's a restrictive code, but the intent of the Council, when it did it, was to authorize deviations because they wanted more projects to come before the Downtown Development Review Board for review as opposed to, you know, somebody just automatically getting approval and, therefore, DDRB wouldn't have the ability to weigh in, you know, through DDRB to you guys as well.

So don't feel like there's something wrong or improper about somebody making a request for a deviation. That is something that they are legally authorized to do.

You do have the criteria. I believe it's A through E. So five criteria that you have to consider and that each of the deviation requests must meet.

Mr. Klement went through the five requests for deviations. Those are separate requests. So you'll consider them separately. So each one of those separate requests must meet the five criteria. And so you will take them up kind of individually and looking at them

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., P.O. Box 2375. lacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
individually in order to determine whether or not they meet those.

I am here, obviously. If anybody has any questions at any point procedurally or otherwise, feel free to request. And we will be advising you, you know, through this process.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Teal.
Mr. Meeks.
VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Since you said you have extra copies -- I've got about 3 pounds of information behind me -- rather than going back into that, if you can provide those, that would be most helpful.

MR. TEAL: Absolutely.
BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Mr. Chairman, while he's doing that, $I$ need to declare a conflict of interest due to relationships $I$ have with both parties. I checked this with the City's ethics officer last week, and she confirmed, and I will be signing the appropriate paperwork accordingly.

THE CHAIRMAN: And with that, Mr. Teal, Mr. Barakat can participate in the discussion.

He can opine, but he can't vote?
MR. TEAL: Correct. He can participate fully, as if he was voting, just when it comes time to vote he will recuse himself at that time. And then $I$ will remind you when you're announcing -- whatever ultimately the vote is, I'll remind you to announce that Mr. Barakat recused himself.

THE CHAIRMAN: And he also counts for the quorum.

MR. TEAL: He does count for the quorum.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Very good.
Now, before we open this public hearing, I'd like to ask Mr. Jones, who is chairman of the DDRB, to give us about a ten-minute -well, you aren't right now, are you?

MR. JONES: Not right now --
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
MR. JONES: -- I'm not -- technically not
the chair. Mr. Joe Loretta --
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
MR. JONES: -- has assumed that role, but during --

THE CHAIRMAN: If you will --
MR. JONES: -- this process $I$ was the
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chair.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. You've got a mic. If you will state your name and address. And you've got a few minutes to tell us the process and how you got to this point.

MR. JONES: Thank you, sir.
Frederick Jones, 1300 Kings Road, Neptune Beach Elem- -- Neptune Beach, Florida 32266. Neptune Beach Elementary, I'm sorry about that. My kid goes there.

Again, $I$ think it would be helpful to -just to discuss, really, kind of the function and the role of the Downtown Overlay and the DDRB.

We never really see ourselves as a yes/no. We see ourselves as a value-added agency to help projects move through the process and, really, to ensure that we're getting high-quality, mixed-use development downtown.

And again, our role specifically is to assist the DIA in its review of development and redevelopment within this overlay zone, which was specifically established to promote and encourage the revitalization and growth of downtown as a desirable, high-density,
mixed-use area. So that's codified. And so that really becomes kind of our -- our charge.

The other -- as another backdrop to -- to our role with the City is that in 2014, the DIA adopted a new Community Redevelopment Area plan and a business investment strategy. And in this plan, there were seven primary goals in supporting objectives and benchmarks, designed each to measure the progress on downtown development.

So the first one here is one -- you may have read this. This is to reinforce downtown as the city's unique epicenter for business, history, culture, education and entertainment.

B, to increase rental and owner-occupied housing downtown, targeting key demographic groups that are seeking a more urban lifestyle.

C, to simplify the approval process for downtown development and improve developmental and agency coordination.

D, to improve walkability, bikeability and connectivity to adjacent neighborhoods and the St. Johns River while creating highly walkable nodes.

E, establish a waterfront design framework


#### Abstract

to ensure a unique experience and sense of place.


F, maintain a clean and safe $24 / 7$ downtown for residents, workers and visitors.

And the last goal, to use planning and economic development policies to promote design for healthy living.

So really, with that, that really becomes kind of the backdrop for every decision that we make; are we ultimately achieving those goals, recognizing that there are a lot of challenges.

And $I$ think this whole process, from the beginning, was very -- highly iterative. I know when we first received this application it came in as a conceptual. And we ended up making a recommendation to go through a workshop so that we could improve the design outcomes of this particular site.

I know we had some issues with what we felt was an obtrusive garage that was fronting the river, and we just continued to go back to the drawing board. So I think through this whole process, it was always about, not a yes or no, but how can we make this a really unique project for this site and recognizing that this
particular parcel has some unique constraints to it. And we needed to figure out a best way to work through that.

One of the things that came out of that process during -- $I$ think this was the period between -- we had an October hearing, and I think in January, we had another -- the workshop, we had townhomes that were added to the front row which were facing the Riverwalk. And really, this was to help embellish the architectural character and to minimize that sort of obtrusive feel along the river.

One of the most important things that came out of this, which ties right back into Item D, about improving walkability and bikeability, that we're getting a new Riverwalk access. Initially, as you know, as you're going through there, right now it's very difficult. I didn't even think you could walk back there. And so now, we're getting a 20 -foot Riverwalk extension through this process and through this project, which, $I$ think, is really much a value add.

In addition, one of the concerns that we had when we saw this -- there's a very long,
linear strip that connects to Prudential Drive. We saw that as an opportunity to really enhance the opportunity for a multiuse-trail along that. And again, if you also look at some of the bigger initiatives that the City's been undertaking, particularly its Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, it cites the ability to connect to Prudential Drive and to really look at ways that would connect folks better to San Marco. And the develop- -- the project included a new 12-foot multiuse trail. This provides connection directly to Prudential Drive, again, building upon the other efforts that we have going on.

And particularly, Councilwoman Boyer had some public access improvements on the Southbank envisioned as part of a multiuse loop. So we saw this as an opportunity to connect directly to that. So we're getting a project that's building upon the public interest in terms of projects that we'd like to see happen.

Some of the other issues that we had encountered during this process were parking. And I think, again, it's important to note --
and $I$ know Mr. Klement had brought this up, and Mr. Teal -- that it's not about minimizing the standards, but it's about providing a range of acceptable mitigation within this dynamic urban context that we have in downtown, consistent with the guidelines.

Again, ultimately, we want to have a good project for downtown. We want to see cranes happening in downtown Jacksonville. And to the extent that we avoid getting hung up in low -lowest common denominator issues related to off-street parking and setbacks, we felt that there are ways around that.

So again -- and when it comes to parking, you know, we ended up with -- the developer ends up with about 1.2 spaces per unit, which really exceeds the amount of parking that we've -- that we've approved for many other projects over the past 18 months. I think, in particular, the Vestcor project, the Lofts at Monroe, has almost less than one space per unit.

Our thought process in that -- and at least mine, as the chair, is that, you know, parking in downtown is a different animal than
parking in a suburban location. And if anybody's ever read The High Cost of Free Parking, by Donald Shoup -- I would suggest you read it. It's a big -- but it comes down to -it boils down to three things.

You know, one, charge the off-street parking so that you have at least whatever amount that is -- so that you have enough spaces for people to at least find -- use the amount that you're generating from parking back into the public area; and two, to not have any off-street parking requirements.

And I think it's important to note that we want the market to decide what's enough. And I think, in this particular case, you know, the developer is not going to come and say we don't need any parking at all. They're going to look at their market, they're going to look at their comps, and they're going to say, this works for this site, this works for what we think is going to -- our tenants here.

I think that it would be premature to assume that they would underpark their site. So I think, again, it's -- it's really allowing the market to decide what's an appropriate amount.

In the case of Intuition, we didn't even require any off-street parking, just -- just as a -- as a note there.

And again, $I$ think we just felt that there's a lot of flexibility here in terms of the parking requirements and the setbacks; that we're ending up with a product $--\quad$ I mean, from what came to us in August and to what we ended up getting in June, we ended up getting a much improved project on a site that is very challenging.

And keep in mind, in 2005 , if I'm not mistaken, Hines -- the Hines project that was proposed here, $I$ think that was for almost two towers. It probably would have been the tallest in the city. And I think there were riparian rights for 125 boat slips. So I think that the impacts are certainly much less and much more consistent with what the market here locally would bear.

So with that, I think that's -- that really becomes -- that was really our rationale and process through this. Again, we -- we wanted to work with the owner to ensure that we
could have a high-quality product, as the number one goal, to meet, really, the seven primary goals of the Downtown Investment Authority CRA.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Jones.
And you will be here during this entire hearing for any questions later because, at this point, we're going to open this public hearing.

During this public hearing, there will be no questions from the DIA board. We have to refrain from our questions until the end of this meeting.

So, Mr. Teal, is that correct; after this open hearing -- after this public hearing, we will close the public hearing, and then we can engage in dialogue with the parties?

MR. TEAL: Through the Chair to the Board, if there's something that a party says that's unclear --

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. TEAL: -- you can ask for clarification, those types of interactions, but the purpose of this next process is for them to convey information to you. That's not to mean
that you can't then call them up later if you have questions that you want to explore further with them, but your questions at this point should be limited to, hey, I didn't hear what you said, or $I$ didn't understand, you know, something like that, you know, those kinds of clarification-type questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
Now, we're going to go through this
process. And the appellant will have
15 minutes. The appellee will have 20 minutes.
We're going to have a public hearing. And it looks like, at this point, we have about seven of them. We will hear those at three minutes apiece. We will have a five-minute rebuttal period, then we'll close this public hearing and open up for questions.

So everyone must be here and must stay with this process the entire time, understanding -- and I guess I can -- there's four directions we can go when we're concluding this. It's to grant the appeal, which overturns the DDRB decision; grant the appeal with conditions, which is modifying the DDRB decision; we can deny the appeal and uphold the

DDRB decision; or we can remand the application to DDRB for further proceedings.

Whichever way we go, the -- well, we'll go from there. At this point --

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Mr. Chairman, can you clarify that? Since we have five items, I think -- is each item, then, taken individually, that we could have the actions you just described for each of the items?

THE CHAIRMAN: No. It will be done as one.

MR. TEAL: Mr. Chairman, let me clarify.
When I mentioned that you take the
deviation requests separately, you will take them and vote on them separately, but then you will vote on the project as a whole, depending on, you know, how you voted on -- you know, which will include the deviation requests.

And then when you vote on the project as a whole; i.e., the appeal as a whole, then you will have the choices that the chairman just read off as -- as to this -- appeal of this project, which contains these sub-items, the deviation requests.

What do you want to do with it? Do you
want to approve it, do you want to approve it with modifications, do you want to deny it, or do you want to send it back to DDRB for additional discussion?

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: If I might ask this, please.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Just to make sure I understand that, if, theoretically, then, $I$ or we were satisfied with one particular item as it's presented to us but not with another, you're telling me that we take it all as a group?

MR. TEAL: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. With that, this
public hearing is now open. We'd like to
ask -- and just for clarification, the GV-IP Jacksonville Owner, LLC, filed the appeal for DDRB 2017-15 [sic] application.

So, at this time, the appellant will make their presentation of 15 minutes.
(Mr. Diebenow approaches the podium.)

MR. DIEBENOW: Mr. Chairman --

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know. Something's mixed up.
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MR. DIEBENOW: -- Steve Diebenow, 1 Independent Drive, Suite 1200 , here on behalf of the applicant, the appellee in this case.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me get Mr. Teal's --

MR. DIEBENOW: I just want to let you know that, because we have relaxes Rules of Evidence and all that, I'm not going to -- if Mr. Harden says something that $I$ object to, which I can't imagine that he will, but if he does, I'm not going to object while he's speaking. I'm going to wait until after he's done. Again, I just want to make that clear --

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good.

MR. DIEBENOW: -- so that it's a more
seamless presentation for the board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Appreciate that. Thank you very much, Mr. Diebenow.

Okay. Mr. Harden.
(Mr. Harden approaches the podium.)

MR. HARDEN: Let me ask a couple of questions too --

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. HARDEN: -- before I get started.

The way it's been explained is that

Aetna -- by the way, $I$ represent the Aetna
building owners, but $I$ also represent Baptist Medical Center, which also appeared below.

While I'm deemed the appellant here, as Mr. Teal has noted, this is a de novo hearing. Mr. Diebenow still has the burden of proof, even though -- even though I'm -- I'm the appellant. And I'm going to focus in more on legal issues and some of the things that Jason has talked about.

So I want to make it clear that you're not -- you still have to judge each of the deviations by each of the criteria. And if $I$ say nothing, and he doesn't make his case, you still should not grant the deviation.

Just so -- because I'm going first, it makes it -- it makes it a little bit awkward, unless you want to go first, Steve.

MR. DIEBENOW: I'm good.
MR. HARDEN: Okay.
All right. With that said, I'm Paul

Harden. I represent the owners of the Aetna building and the Baptist Medical Center folks who appeared at the hearing below.

Both the Aetna building and Baptist Medical are located on a peninsula, on the

Southbank of Jacksonville, which has very limited infrastructure. That peninsula is blocked off four or five times a day by train traffic, and all of the traffic inside that train is captured there.

Baptist Medical Center is committed to its location on the Jacksonville Southbank, with Wolfson Children's Hospital, The Women's Pavilion, Anderson, and the original hospital. The Aetna building, of course, is an existing building that's been there for many, many years. Neither Baptist nor Aetna were built with substantial or similar deviations as are requested today by the Ventures project.

And while I'm saying that, let me make it clear that we're not opposed to the Hines property being developed, but respectfully request it not be given deviations to which it is not entitled.

I guess you noticed that the former chairman of the DDRB never mentioned any of the five criteria is what they talked about, it was their goal to try to get a project going. And I understand that goal, but that doesn't take away from the legal requirements that you're
required to follow and, quite frankly, they were required to follow, but none of those five criteria were mentioned in their consideration.

So we're -- we're not opposed to development on the site. What we're opposed to is the deviations to which they are neither entitled nor, respectfully, need to develop the site.

The site currently allows them to build a 60-foot-tall building with $50-f o o t ~ s e t b a c k s ~ a n d ~$ requires that they meet the parking requirements. And it's not a multitude of requirements, a top and a bottom, as Mr. Jones indicated. There is a requirement in the code. There's a requirement on height. There's a requirement on parking. There's a requirement on setbacks. So they are not entitled to change the rules that are in the code unless the five criteria are met.

The document that Jason gave you I have blown up in front of you because I'm going to be referencing it.

I guess you probably have a copy of this, Steve? I'll favor you with an extra copy I have.
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Ventures is seeking to force -- and let me make sure you understand this -- a 100-unit-per-acre project on this site. It's not a very large piece of property. It's 3 acres. It's slightly less than 3 acres. It's slightly more than a hundred units per acre on the proposed site.

In order to build this hundred-unit-per-acre project, they are asking for multiple deviations, the five that you've heard about. The three that $I$ am going to focus on today are:

First, the height limit request from 60 feet to 190 feet, greater than a 300 percent increase in height.

Second, they're asking you to allow them to build their project with half of the required parking. And again, it's not a guess about what we think the market will -- will need on the site. There is a requirement in the code. And to deviate from that code, they have to meet each of the criteria on that document that Jason handed out to you that I have in front of you.

Third, they're asking for lower of
setbacks, from 50 to 25 feet, to cut the setbacks in half. And let me -- let me talk about this briefly before $I$ get going.

On the height requirement in the CCG-1 category, you can do that by right. You can go from 60 feet to 190 feet, 130 feet extra on the top, but to do that you have to move your setbacks in. So there is a methodology to do this; not increase your setbacks, but for every 3 feet you go up, you have to move your setback in. So they'd have to move starting at 50 feet.

Now, they're asking you to not make it go back, but make it go further out. They have a way to do that, to go up in the height, but in order to meet the other goals of the Zoning Code, you have to move that setback out 1 for every 3 feet. So there's a methodology to do it, but they're ignoring that. They're asking you not just to not have to do the 1 for 3 but to give us 25 feet back.

The granting of waivers, or deviations as they're called in the Downtown Overlay, is unlike any task that you undertake in your role and quite unlike any task the DDRB typically
takes. Most of the time, you're trying to pitch projects. You're trying to get activity downtown or, as the gentleman said, bring cranes to the site.

The deviation consideration, however, is a quasi-judicial function. It's a much different function than you normally have. The deviation in a quasi-judicial function requires that you only grant the deviation if each and every one of the code provision criteria are met. And it's in front of you, because you have it on the piece of paper Jason handed out.

You may grant a deviation from any of the requirements -- and this is important -- if a positive finding, based upon substantial, competent evidence to each of the following criteria is met.

So there's five criteria. You can't meet 14 of the 15 and grant the three. You have to meet all 15 of the 15 . And in all due respect, there is no competent substantial evidence that they met any of the criteria. And I'm going to walk through those in a second.

So I urge you to take seriously -- I know you take seriously your role as a DIA member,
but seriously your role as a quasi-judicial officer because, as you move up the chain to the City Council, they deal with it all the time, but next to a circuit judge and next to the Court of Appeals, then -- they look at this as a quasi-judicial proceeding.

And, as $I$ say, the criteria are intended to be met, but they're also intended to be strict. So if you say, boy, that's hard to do; sure, it's hard to do because the code sets forth certain standards. And to deviate from those, then you -- you have to meet each of the criteria.

The criteria as Jason pointed out or set forth -- or Mr. Teal, sorry -- set forth in Section 656.361.22, again, the ordinance provision $I$ have in front of me, I think each of you have it in front of you, $I$ want to walk through, briefly, each of those criteria and make sure you understand that they are strict and they are difficult.

And when you're trying to compare whether or not they've got competent substantial evidence to meet them, what the document says -- the first is that there are practical
or economic difficulties in carrying out the strict letter of the requirement.

So what they have to say is, there's a practical difficulty or economic difficulty with us building a 60-foot building on that site. I don't know how you prove that.

There's an economic difficulty in us meeting the parking requirements. Well, the economic difficulty is, we don't want to build it. That's not an economic difficulty. That's just, we want to make more money on the project.

The second one is, the request is not based exclusively upon the desire to meet -- to reduce the cost of developing the site but accomplish some result that's in the public interest. So you have to prove something that they're doing to go -- that they need to do. They need to go to 190 feet instead of 60 feet to meet the public interest. So they can't meet the public interest at 60 feet.

We can't meet the public interest by meeting the parking requirements. We want you to give us a deviation. We can't meet the public interest by building at the 50-foot
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setback that you require. These are hard burdens to meet. And I think the fact of the matter is, the record doesn't show any competent substantial evidence on that matter.

The third one is that the proposed reduction or deviation will not substantially diminish property values in the area surrounding the site and will not substantially interfere or injure the rights of others whose property would be affected by the deviation.

Now, this is important: They have to prove that this deviation doesn't injure the Aetna building. They're allowed to have a 60-foot-high building. They want to go another 130 feet in the air. That's another nine floors up in the air. And what that does is block the view of the river, of the Aetna building for those additional nine -- nine stories.

How does that not, as a matter of fact, a matter of law, injure the rights of the Aetna building? We'll go through each of those in a second.

The fourth one is that the proposed reduction will not be detrimental to the public
health, safety and welfare and result in the creation of nuisances. So that's a little more difficult one to explain away.

The fifth one is that the effect of the proposed reduction furthers the objectives and goals of the BID Plan.

Now, this gentleman went through all seven of those goals. What they have to prove under the fifth one is that the goals are furthered, that you're doing better under those goals. The goals are enhanced or furthered. Instead of building a 60-foot building, I build a 190-foot building, I'm furthering the goals. That not having enough parking furthers the goals.

So it's not that the goals are -- are met by building at 190, but they do better by going from 60 to 190 feet. Again, it's a very difficult burden. And $I$ suggest to you, there's no competent substantial evidence on that matter in the record.

I'm going to go quickly through the -- as Mr. Klement indicated, they wrote a report, but it was based on the report that the applicant provided on each of the criteria. And I'm
going to kind of -- Jim, I don't know where we are on time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to say, 8 minutes, at this point, of 15. A little better -- more than halfway.

MR. HARDEN: Okay.
MR. KLEMENT: Are you timing it?
THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. I'm sorry. I started. So ...

MR. HARDEN: Okay.
MR. KLEMENT: We're going with your clock, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
MR. HARDEN: Okay. Steve, I'm going to have to ask for an extension of time. And I'll give you a little -- Mr. Diebenow and I are colleagues. We'll both -- I think we'll get along fine.

MR. DIEBENOW: I think 30 seconds will be fine, not including --

MR. HARDEN: Are you enjoying my presentation?

MR. DIEBENOW: We're including this time in it, too, right?

MR. HARDEN: Yes, we are.

MR. DIEBENOW: Okay.
MR. HARDEN: I will need a few more minutes, quite frankly, I'm sorry, because there are so many deviations they are asking for.

What I'm going to do is talk about a memo that the applicant filed to try to explain how they meet these criteria because $I$ think it sheds light on the fact that they don't meet them.

The first one is, as to the setbacks, whether there are practical or economic difficulties, they say, The proposed deviation from the setbacks is in response to constraints and the density and parking requirements that make the proposed development viable.

So what they're saying is, we don't make quite as much money if we don't get the deviation. If you'll note, that's not one of the five criteria. And -- and, frankly, you see that a lot. And I know that some of the folks who are on the other side of me on this project have told you, we can't do this project, it's not viable if -- if we don't get the deviations.

Well, I'm sorry to say, because I'm normally on the other side of the table, I'm not -- that's not one of the criteria that you're entitled to consider.

The second one, on the setbacks, they said, The request is not based upon the desire to reduce the cost but accomplishes some public interest.

Here it says, "It will accomplish a public interest, including the widening and extension of the Southbank Riverwalk for dedicated public use."

So what they're saying is, the public interest that is -- is pitched by the deviation -- and they use this same answer on each of the five deviation requests. So I'll just kind of lump them all together. We're not going to build a Riverwalk unless you give us the deviation.

Well, that's not the public -- you can have the Riverwalk built and be in the public interest by building a 60-foot building with 50 -foot setbacks that meets the parking requirements.

So the fact that they're saying, we'll
build the Riverwalk for you -- which, by the way, Baptist and the Aetna building folks are having to give land for the Riverwalk, too, as you go on down. We're the next two pieces down. We're not asking for deviations to our buildings to do that. So $I$ respectfully don't think saying it's in the public interest to get the Riverwalk built -- that doesn't have anything to do with wanting to go 190 feet or getting the setbacks into the 25 feet.

The third one is, "The setbacks will not substantially interfere or injure the property rights of others." So I'm going to, again, lump all of these together, all three of the ones that I'm focused on.

And I'm not trying -- you have a lot of discretionary activities in this approval on the design and that sort of stuff. I'm not focusing -- I'm focusing strictly on the legal requirements of the -- of the deviations.

I know you have discretion on the others, but anyway, it is not possible to say that building with not enough parking on the site doesn't affect the rights of the other folks in the area.

At the same time that they're asking for a deviation to go to half the parking, Baptist, about a driver and a 9 -iron away -- or for Mr. Moody, a 3-wood and another 3-wood-- is building a 2, 200-space parking garage. Now, I want you to think about it. We're building a 2,200 -space parking garage while they're trying to cut their parking in half. You don't think that impinges on Baptist's property rights?

And again, you've got 190 feet, which takes out the view of another nine stories of the view of the Aetna building. That impinges upon their property rights. I just don't see how you present competent substantial evidence to the contrary.

The fifth one of the criteria below is that it develops -- that it furthers the objectives and policies. And the gentleman from the DDRB went through those policies and objectives, but here is the question:

Maybe the building does promote the objectives, but what you have to prove is that, I need this deviation because it will further promote. So what they're saying is, if I build a 190-foot building as opposed to a 60-foot
building, or $I$ build a parking garage with half the parking I need, I will reinforce downtown as a unique epicenter better than $I$ have if it's a 60-foot building. Well, that's just not true.

The second one is, increase the rental-occupied housing downtown. You can build a hundred units at 60 feet, and you'll increase the -- the rental and owner-occupied housing downtown. So the 60-foot building -or, you know, come in for a 70 -foot, you know, or 75 feet.

There's a project on Lomax, just down the river from these folks, that they're building. They went to 70 feet in the CCG-1 and built 120 units on the site. And it's a -- it's even a larger piece of property. And that -- that provides additional housing, and you don't need -- so you don't further it by adding the additional 130 feet.

Simplify the approval process for downtown development. Well, I don't know that asking for five deviations simplifies the downtown -or furthers, simplifies the downtown approval process.

The fourth one, improve walkability, bikeability. How in the world does building an extra nines stories or coming in off -- and making it closer to the river increase the walkability over the 50 feet setback and the 60-foot-high building?

Establish a waterfront design frame to ensure a unique experience and sense of place. What the waterfront area in the code says is, you don't want tall buildings crammed up close to the river. So instead of building 60 feet, 50 feet off, they're going to build 190 feet 25 feet off. That does not, by anyone's imagination, establish a waterfront design frame for -- yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me interrupt you just a second to confirm with Mr. Diebenow that he is willing to extend some time equally for his presentation or, Mr. Harden, your choice would be to take it off your rebuttal at the end.

So, Mr. Diebenow, are you good?

MR. DIEBENOW: That's fine. How much time are we talking about?

THE CHAIRMAN: How much time you need?

MR. HARDEN: I don't -- I didn't time my
speech.
MR. DIEBENOW: Well, are we up to time now?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, this is 15 minutes.
You'd like five more -- or three minutes?
MR. DIEBENOW: Three minutes is fine.
Whatever you want.
MR. HARDEN: Give me five more minutes.
THE CHAIRMAN: Five more minutes.
Okay. Thank you, Mr. Harden. Thank you, Mr. Diebenow.

MR. HARDEN: So I won't go through all seven of them because I'm getting short on time here, but the fact of the matter is that going up to 190 feet, while it may promote the goals, it doesn't further promote the goals, which is what you have to prove to go from 60 to 190 feet.

I was going to go through each criteria on all three of them, but, obviously, I'm running out of time. So I ask you to judge the deviation request as the ordinance requires. It's your obligation as a quasi-judicial officer to enforce the strict criteria of the Zoning Code.
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Surrounding property owners, such as mine, my clients, are entitled to rely on the code and entitled to rely on the requirements to deviate from that code, which are very difficult.

After $I$ reviewed the Ventures application, I asked Michael Herzberg, who has worked in the area of planning with the City for 25 years, to analyze the requests of the deviation. And I have provided you with a copy of his report.

Mr. Herzberg's report is also competent substantial evidence in the form of expert opinion, as Mr. Teal indicated. The staff report -- and $I$ want -- Mr. Teal $--I$ mean, Mr. Herzberg goes through each of the criteria in his report. I'm not going to go through those because I'm short on time, but I do want to talk about some of his comments with regard to the three -- the intent of the three areas where they're seeking setbacks.

Section 656.361.11, Setbacks, this section promotes open spaces for public congregation and recreation. So now you're coming 25 feet closer into that area where they are supposed to congregate. It prohibits severe elevation
changes or walls adjoining public corridors, which is what you're going to get at 190 feet, 25 feet off the setback.

Entryways and steps are to be wide and welcoming. After reviewing the DDRB application package, Mr. Herzberg opined, "It's evident that the proposed development does not meet this criteria." So the goal of the setbacks is not met. So it's not just the strict letter of the law, but the intent and the spirit.

Height, 656.361.14, this section is one of the most important components of the entire Downtown Overlay. It specifically intends to promote building forms and massing that is respectful to the content. It intends buildings to step up from the river in defined height zones. So -- which is what you would get -- at the 60 feet, you'd get -- 50 feet off, you'd get 60 feet, then you'd go to the higher buildings as you come back.

The section states that the preservation of the river shall -- now, this is not permissive. The preservation of the river shall be maintained by adherence to 656.361.14.
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That's the height requirement. Heights of buildings and structures shall adhere to 656.361 .14.

So, respectfully, I'm not sure you can even get a height variance or a height deviation if you follow what the BID says, but it does allow for it if you go up higher and move the setbacks back further.

And then he explains the CCG-1 limitation.
And then, finally, the off-street parking.
The Downtown Overlay does permit districts to be exempt from off-street parking, as the DDRB gentleman said. The subject property, however, is not included in those areas, but even in the -- where the overlay permits the remaining downtown districts to reduce their required parking 50 percent, to otherwise minimum required, except -- this is a big except -except for all new residential uses constructed.

So the code itself says you've got places where we're going to give you exemptions and we're going to let you go lower. The one place they don't let you is in a residential code area. It is mandatory that you not have --
that you not limit the parking in -- or lower the parking in a residential area.

The parties involved in creating the Downtown Overlay -- this is Mr. Herzberg's words -- understood the residential uses in parking are intensive, especially in the city of Jacksonville.

We are asking you to require that they meet the provisions of the code. And if they don't, they meet each and every one of the criteria of 656.361 .11 -- . 22 that you have in front of you. We ask you to hold them to that standard. We don't want to stop them from developing their property. We want them to develop it in coordination with what the ordinance code provides.

There's no practical or economic difficulty in building a 60-foot-tall building. The people on Lomax did it and put a hundred -120 units there. It's right on the river. They built, also, the Riverwalk at that location.

There's no practical or economic difficulty other than we don't want to build enough parking spaces. And, really, if you
think about it, the parking requirement comes because they're going 190 feet and adding 300 units. Otherwise, they would only need 200 parking spaces on the site.

The only public interest at the Ventures' site will be the construction of the Riverwalk. They can construct the Riverwalk and do that in the public interest and still build a building that meets the Zoning Code's requirements.

More importantly, there is no competent substantial evidence. It can only be based on competent substantial evidence.
(Timer notification.)

MR. HARDEN: You know, we think it's better to do it this way. So we respectfully request you deny the deviations. And if you want to allow them to go forward with the project without the deviations, we have no objection.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Harden.
MR. HARDEN: I'm sorry I took so long, Steve.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate that.

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., P .O. B ox 2375. Iacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300

We're not taking questions or comments at this point, but -- Mr. Diebenow, are you prepared? You'll have 25 minutes to present.
(Mr. Diebenow approaches the podium.)

MR. HARDEN: Do you want us to take that back?

MR. DIEBENOW: No. I've just never seen it.

MR. HARDEN: I handed it to you.

MR. DIEBENOW: Oh, yeah. I just wanted to see what else was on it. I didn't see what this was. You have all sorts of fancy highlighting and writing.

MR. HARDEN: Well, I said that when I said every one of the specific criteria.

MR. DIEBENOW: All right. My name is Steve Diebenow, 1 Independent Drive, Suite 1200. I'm here on behalf of the applicant, who is the appellee.

With me today is Sean Siebert, who is the developer, as well as a number of other folks whose affidavits were submitted to you along with our materials regarding this appeal.

Right off the bat, $I$ want to touch on a few things that Mr. Harden talked about. First
of all, he said that the DDRB didn't look at the criteria based on the comments that Mr. Jones made. That's not correct. They looked at all the criteria. And that's reflected in the record below.

Mr. Jones' summary of that is not the end-all/be-all of what happened at the DDRB. What happened at the DDRB meeting speaks for itself. They went through all the criteria, a meticulous effort, and they voted on each individual criteria individually before the DDRB.

Secondly, he said that these things are really strict and it's meant to be hard. Mr. Herzberg's report says that these code provisions are meant to be prescriptive. You have to follow them to the word.

Let me read you what it says in the code. 656.361.1, which is the introduction to the overlay, says, "The development guidelines are not meant to be totally prescriptive." It's the very first phrase in the entire code.

It goes on to say, "Therefore, the intent of the DDRB guidelines is to provide an initial framework to review projects from and allow
consideration of alternative designs needed to accommodate unique site and design limitations of a site, building or structure when appropriate."

That's not me making it up. That's exactly what it says in the code. So the notion that that $D D R B$ didn't apply the rules and that the rules are prescriptive and you can't deviate from them is completely false.

Secondly, I think that Mr. Harden may have conveniently ignored all the record -- all the information we put in the record. And if you go through -- we definitely do have the burden of proof. The staff report is competent substantial evidence. That's already been stated by your -- by your lawyer.

And if you go through the individual criteria line by line and you look at the memorandum that $I$ attached as Exhibit 1 to our material, it's the very first exhibit in that big binder of material, I go through each criteria and point out in the affidavits of the various experts where they testified that we meet the criteria.

So, for example, under the build-to and
setback lines, there are six affidavits submitted in support of Criteria A. There's six affidavits supported for B. There's seven supported for C. There's six for D. And there's two for E.

In other words, every one of the experts that we have, that we've introduced to you, that we've shared their CVs and materials, have all testified independently, based on their own expertise within their individual disciplines, that we meet each criteria. And that's not just for the first deviation request, the build-to and setback lines, but it's also for all five of the deviations that we're seeking.

What is not at issue today, what is not at issue today are several things. First of all, the BID policies $1,2,3,6$ and 7 are not at issue. BID policies 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7 haven't been talked about at all. They're not talked about in Mr. Herzberg's testimony. They're not talked -- Mr. Harden didn't speak about them at all.

Similarly, Mr. Harden said that he was going to focus on three issues, height, parking, waterfront design. Now, his testimony
kind of went back and forth and all over the place, which is fine, but if you look at the memo that $I$ have introduced as my very first memorandum, it summarizes exactly where the testimony is that rebuts each one of those statements that Mr. Harden made.

Let's talk about setbacks. And he read an excerpt from our original application. Look, if you don't grant a deviation on this site for setback from Prudential Drive, this site isn't ever going to be developed, I don't care what it is. A Jollibee can't go on this site, you know, a Chili's, a medical office building. There isn't anything that can go on this site unless you give a setback -- or a deviation, rather, from the setback from Prudential Drive. The fact that they are even arguing it is remarkable because, if you don't grant it, nothing else can happen on the site.

They also talked about -- you know, saying that there was no evidence -- they said that there was going to be a diminution in property value. First of all, they didn't present any evidence to that effect. Those are just conclusory statements that Mr. Harden made,
just conclusory statements that Mr. Herzberg made. You know that neither one of them are appraisers.

I'm going to take just a moment and ask Courtland Eyrick to come up and just ask him a couple of quick questions.
(Mr. Eyrick approaches the podium.)
MR. DIEBENOW: While Courtland's coming up, he's an MIA appraiser. All of his -- all of his credentials are in the record.

Courtland, were you engaged to do a study on this project?

MR. EYRICK: First off, Courtland Eyrick, 806 Riverside Avenue.

Yes, I was.
MR. DIEBENOW: And all the materials that you provided, you prepared, they're the ones that were submitted on the record, correct?

MR. EYRICK: That's correct.

MR. DIEBENOW: Was there any evidence of property diminution in any way from any of the five criteria?

MR. EYRICK: No, there wasn't.
MR. DIEBENOW: Is the complete analysis
that you provided included in your affidavit --
affidavit and the materials that you provided that we submitted on the record?

MR. EYRICK: Yes, it is.
MR. DIEBENOW: Okay. Thank you.
So what you've got on the property valuation issues, you've got an MAI appraiser against nothing, just for example.

Similarly, they said there was no public benefit, no public interest. And they ignored the fact that the DDRB found that building a 20-foot multiuse path in a 25 -foot Riverwalk, a 20-foot Riverwalk with a 5 -foot setback would be deemed in the public interest.

We can talk a lot more about the iterative process, but let me pause there for a second and talk about the 50-foot setback. That's another one of the criteria that they talked about. And I'm kind of going in the order that, at least, I took notes that Mr. Harden spoke on.

The 50 -foot setback we always knew was an issue. Our first project showed a tower -Hines first project showed a tower, 12 feet, set back from the river. That was what was approved in the early 2000 s. Our original
submittal to DDRB showed a 15-foot setback. We thought we were doing better than the 12 feet Hines did.

When we showed that, the DDRB and various DIA members, members of the public, elected officials, appointed officials that we spoke with, said you really need to move it back. We moved it back 25 feet from the river.

When we showed that to DDRB, they said, Well, that's still not good enough because we don't want a screen blocking headlights going into the river. We want you to activate the Riverwalk. So, as a result, we developed a plan that put units fronting on the Riverwalk and further pushed the building back.

Now, if we took those units off -- and we had this conversation at DDRB. If we took those units off, that structure would be set back about 43 feet, 8 inches from the river, almost the full 50 feet, but the DDRB decided, as they have the discretion to do, that they would rather us activate that space with units that have folks that actually walk out and go on to the Riverwalk.

They also required us to do a park, which
is right in the middle of the plan. You guys have all seen the renderings, but again, adding park space, adding Riverwalk, adding the multiuse path is all a public benefit that is throughout our presentation.

Mr. Harden says you have to prove that each of these deviations furthers the BID. That's very simple.

Brad, if you will come up for just a second.
(Mr. Wester approaches the podium.)
MR. DIEBENOW: Brad Wester's a planner -while he's coming up -- for 20 years. His credentials are in the record.

And Brad, after you introduce yourself, I'm going to ask you one question.

MR. WESTER: Brad Wester, 1 Independent Drive, Suite 1200, Jax, Florida.

MR. DIEBENOW: So Brad, with regard to whether or not these deviations furthered the BID, could you just give a couple of talking points or a couple of points that are included in your testimony but maybe emphasizing today on how we further the BID.

MR. WESTER: Yes. I'll go into a couple
of topics generalized for the BID. One is a diverse mix of land uses. This is the residential project that will provide a diverse mix of land uses and further the residential initiatives by the BID, the BID Plan.

They have specific goals, benchmarks to provide up to 350 dwelling units per year for the residential aspects. They also talk about it being a viable and vital residential area, acceptable land uses anywhere in the downtown.

And, furthermore, the marketplace, not regulations, shall be the primary force and the driving for the mixture of land uses. I think we further that.

MR. DIEBENOW: So again, remember -- and he was reading straight from the code -straight from the BID, rather. The marketplace determines.

Thank you, Brad.

MR. WESTER: Okay.

MR. DIEBENOW: The marketplace determines, not regulations.

So, Sean, if you could come up for a moment. Sean Siebert. Sean is the developer.
(Mr. Siebert approaches the podium.)

MR. DIEBENOW: If you will introduce yourself and tell them where you live.

MR. SIEBERT: Sure. Sean Siebert, 101 Arnau Court, St. Augustine, Florida.

MR. DIEBENOW: All right. So Sean is the developer.

Sean, you've examined this project many different ways as a multifamily project, correct?

MR. SIEBERT: That's correct, yes.
MR. DIEBENOW: Could you just briefly talk about the different ways that you examined this as, you know, 5-over-1, 5-over-2, and why you ended up where you are?

MR. SIEBERT: Sure.

Early on, the first thing we did was take a look at the Florida Building Code that's applicable to the city of Jacksonville and discovered that the only applicable height structure that was permissible would be a 5-over-1 structure.

The challenge with that is, we can only basically generate about 123 units of density and have a parking issue. Couple that with issues with construction costs and operating
inefficiencies makes the deal economically infeasible relative to what prototypical equity investors would look for in a secondary market like Jacksonville.

MR. DIEBENOW: And you looked at not only that version, but you looked at multiple iterations of different types of development from the multifamily world that could go on this site, correct?

MR. SIEBERT: Absolutely we did, yes.
MR. DIEBENOW: Is this project the smallest possible multifamily development that can fit on this site that makes -- that meets the criteria and that is -- again, in the words of the code, in the words of the BID, would be accepted by the market?

MR. SIEBERT: Yes, that's correct. What we've presented within the DDRB package that was approved on June 1 st is the lowest possible structure that we could go with.

MR. DIEBENOW: Okay. Thank you, Sean.
So again, $I$ think that, again, from our perspective, the code says you have to show that there are economic difficulties or practical difficulties.

The setback one's really easy. If you don't grant a setback, nothing can be built on the site. That's a practical difficulty.

The economic difficulties are a little -they require a little bit more examination. And so if you look at the materials submitted -- again, seven affidavits from seven experts in different disciplines -- we outline how there are economic difficulties in meeting each of these five deviations.

Mr. Harden goes on to talk about height. He says that in CCG-1, you're allowed to go up 1 feet for every 3 feet you're set back. Again, that just completely ignores the fact that this property is downtown, that it's subject to the overlay, that it's subject to the BID.

He's applying the suburban parking regulations downtown, which is great. And yes, it does say that you don't -- you know, you have to meet Part 6 if you're a new apartment or you're a new hotel, but it also says you can get deviations if you meet the criteria.

For parking -- and, again, throughout our materials, there are multiple statements,
again, from multiple locations that -- or multiple experts, that we're not providing any parking that's any less than what's already been approved locally, but more than that, that in their experience, there won't be any people parking off site.

In other words, if you go through the analysis of parking in Mr. Wester's affidavit, he shows you that out of the seven multifamily projects we examined on a dwelling-unit basis -- that is, how many parking spots do we provide per dwelling unit -- that we're right in the middle. There's three of them that are lower than us. There are three of them that are higher than us.

He goes on and analyzes them by a bedroom analysis. In other words, how many parking spaces do we provide per bedroom. And you'll find out that three of the developments that have that information readily available park at a ratio lower than us. They park at fewer cars, fewer parking spaces per bedroom than we do, and one is higher.

Now, that's all really interesting, but the other thing is, is that all of our experts
have testified that, in their experience, based on all of their projects, nobody is going to park off site. And we also know that because all the parking in the area is controlled, and it's opposite of ours.

If you look at Mr. Petrone's testimony, for example, with regard to traffic, our traffic is opposite from what happens throughout the peninsula. And that's why that mix of uses that Brad talked about is so important. This is another reason why this project is in the public interest.

In the morning, most traffic comes to the peninsula to go to work. Our traffic will be leaving. In the evening, most traffic will be leaving, and our traffic will be arriving. And, as a result, our traffic, because it's opposite, actually will benefit the overall system that's working there. And I'm not testifying to that, that's all in the affidavit. You can just look at Mr. Petrone's affidavit and find that out yourself.

Mr. Petrone, if you'd come up for just a second. I have a couple quick questions for you.
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(Mr. Petrone approaches the podium.)

MR. DIEBENOW: How am I doing on time,

Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: You're about halfway. You're doing fine. So you're at 13 -14 minutes.

MR. DIEBENOW: And I have?

THE CHAIRMAN: Twenty-five.

MR. DIEBENOW: Twenty-five. Okay.

So, Mr. Petrone, introduce yourself, if you could.

MR. PETRONE: Wayne Petrone, 9822 Tapestry Park Circle, Suite 205 .

MR. DIEBENOW: Now, Mr. Petrone, did you prepare the traffic study that's been submitted in this matter?

MR. PETRONE: Yes.

MR. DIEBENOW: Okay. And we prepared two traffic studies, right; one for 300 units and one for 280 units, right?

MR. PETRONE: Yes.

MR. DIEBENOW: Under either scenario, does our traffic cause a nuisance for any of our next-door neighbors or anybody else on the peninsula?

MR. PETRONE: No.

MR. DIEBENOW: And your full analysis is in the record, in the materials that we've provided, correct?

MR. PETRONE: Yes.

MR. DIEBENOW: Thank you.

So again, we've got a traffic engineer who has done two traffic studies, who just testified, and also further supplemented by his affidavit and the traffic studies that he did, that we're not going to cause a nuisance from traffic.

On the other side, you have Mr. Harden's comments, not a traffic engineer. You have Mr. Herzberg's comments, not a traffic engineer. No evidence in the record to support that traffic is going to somehow cause a nuisance on the peninsula.

I'm going to pause there for just a second and give you a quick aside. In our original application and what was approved by DDRB, we got 300 units approved, 300 dwelling units approved.

In the package of material that we submitted -- because this kind of a
work-in-progress. We're still designing while we're going through this review process. We submitted a traffic study for 200 -- based on 280 units, because we were driving towards getting to 280 units.

Unfortunately, we learned, the day that we submitted the material, our preliminary pricing that came back was not helpful at all. It was bad. So, as a result, $I$ was hoping to come here and tell you we were going to just only pursue 280 units. Unfortunately, I can't do that. We're still seeking 300 units to be approved, just like we had at DDRB.

However, the good news is that during that design process, we were able to find more parking spaces. So we were able to go from the 358 or 359 parking spaces we've talked about below to 381 parking spaces in the materials we submitted. And then our architect informed me this morning that he had forgotten to count the motorcycle parking spots, which we're allowed to have up to 5 percent motorcycle. So we're actually providing 400 parking spaces, including 12 of which we have dedicated to the public. I know the staff said 10. We've
committed to do 12 .
As a result, the bottom line is, although the unit count is still at 300 , based on this continuing design work that we've done, we've been able to provide more parking, which improves our parking ratios even further above what was approved by -- by the -- by the DDRB.

Streetscape is another one. I don't know why they even filed an appeal over streetscape. Our frontage is about 97 feet. It's all driveway and concrete. The code says you have to plant a tree every 15 feet. If we planted a tree every 15 feet, this site would never get developed, it doesn't matter what's going on the site. So we have to get a deviation from the streetscape in order to develop this parcel.

Now, you might think to yourself, well, this is kind of unique. They're doing something unusual. And the building next door, you know, maybe they're caught by surprise by this. There's lots of testimony in there about our interaction with the building owners, the Aetna building owners next door.

I want to ask Hal Dodt to come up for just a second.
(Mr. Dodt approaches the podium.)
MR. DIEBENOW: Hal was the original owner of both the Aetna building and remains an owner of this parcel that's under development today.

And, Hal, if you could just introduce yourself.

MR. DODT: Good afternoon, members of the Board.

My name is Harold Dodt. I reside at 5332 Southwest Orchid Bay Drive, in Palm City, Florida.

I was the managing -- managing partner of the ownership of the Aetna building from 2004 to August of 2012. From August of 2012 to December 31st, when the property -- when the Aetna building itself was sold, I continued to be the on-site supervising asset manager for the property.

MR. DIEBENOW: Okay, Hal. And your CV and your background -- if you haven't seen his CV, it's unbelievable. I mean, the guy's been developing things his whole career.

Hal, did the owners of the Aetna building, the new owners of the Aetna building, did they
know that that project was going to get -- or that a project was going to be developed next door?

MR. DODT: Yes, they did. Every -- I was personally involved in every tour for the prospective buyers of the property, and they were all informed that there was a property adjacent to the Aetna building that could potentially be developed in the future.

MR. DIEBENOW: Okay. And also, didn't you negotiate a lease, a parking lease, that took into account the fact that those parking spaces would go away when the parcel was developed and that -- that the current owners of the Aetna building negotiated that lease with you?

MR. DODT: To be clear, I am -- our group is a partner with Hines in the separate entity that owns the adjoining land next door. And Walter O'Shea directly handled the negotiations of the parking lease, but it's correct to say that there is a parking lease and a reciprocal easement agreement that contemplates the future development of that property. That was negotiated with the current owner.

MR. DIEBENOW: Okay. Hal, you also played
a big role in putting tenants in that building, tenants such as Baptist, University of Florida, One Call, obviously Aetna. Did you inform the tenants during lease negotiations that the property next door was going to be developed?

MR. DODT: Every prospective tenant that entered that building during our ownership from 2004 on was informed that we intended to develop the property on a vacant lot next door. It was a critical thing. We also had Hines at - up at Hartford to discuss this in detail with Aetna in 2005 .

MR. DIEBENOW: Perfect. Thank you, Hal. MR. DODT: Thank you.

MR. DIEBENOW: The final thing I want to talk about is a comment that Mr. Harden said, that everybody else around here has followed the rules, everybody else is doing what they're supposed to do. Everyone else is -- you know, there's not many setbacks or deviations.

In fact, it's interesting, in Mr. Bean's letter, he says that the condition of a reduced setback doesn't exist anywhere in proximity to the Aetna building.

So Brad, if you could come back up for a
second, and bring those drawings, or the $--I$ may have brought them with me.
(Mr. Wester approaches the podium.)

MR. DIEBENOW: Brad, if you could just -I'm going to hand this out to the --

MR. WESTER: Okay.

MR. DIEBENOW: -- to the members. And if you could just describe to them --

MR. WESTER: Yeah.

MR. DIEBENOW: -- generally what's going on here.

MR. WESTER: Okay. One of the arguments is that our building and our development is not consistent nor compatible or in like kind to the other urban forum and development within our -- in the peninsula, and that's completely inaccurate.

What we're passing around now is essentially a prospective. It's an aerial with our building superimposed on the project site, showing all of the facts; light, air, visibility, views, vistas, access to the river, that we're providing.

And I'll let you note, the blue arrows and the blue circles I'd like you to see --

Prudential Drive, in 2002 , was closed by Baptist. About 363 feet from the river, it was closed for the development of the heart center, completely closed off from the river. Okay?

They provided about 5 feet of waterfront setback along the river there, including a terminus of the Riverwalk. You walk there, you have to turn around.

The other thing is, in context to the parking garage, the parking garage is, roughly, 10 to 15 feet from the Aetna building. They provided a vehicle use area underneath the parking garage through an easement for loading and unloading.

So we've -- we exceed the proximity, we exceed the access, the vistas to the river. We exceed the public use criteria for the easement to the river for the Riverwalk and whatnot. And we continually -- you can see the prospective of our building. Light and air and vistas remain.

MR. DIEBENOW: Thank you. Thank you, Brad.

Hal, if you could come up for one more second.
(Mr. Dodt approaches the podium.)

MR. DIEBENOW: Brad just mentioned that there was a vehicle use area underground or underneath the building. That's right inside the circle on the aerial that $I$ pointed out. That build- -- those buildings are between 10 to 15 feet apart from each other; that is, the Aetna building and the Baptist property.

Hal, were you involved in the negotiations of that condition existing when you owned the Aetna building?

MR. DODT: No. That -- that is an existing condition that we inherited when we purchased the building. My property manager informed me that, prior to our ownership, they cooperated with the hospital in terms of planning that area because that's the delivery area and the trash pick-up area for the Aetna building.

MR. DIEBENOW: And you -- did you negotiate easements, though, that allowed the use of that property between the two buildings?

MR. DODT: Again, to be -- to be fully accurate, that -- that was negotiated before our ownership existed.
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MR. DIEBENOW: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Diebenow, you have about two minutes.

MR. DIEBENOW: Two minutes? Okay.
I guess with the remainder of my time, what $I$ want to do is, I want to point out to you -- I'm going to go through the criteria. This might be a little painful, but $I$ want to make sure that the record is extremely clear.

If you look at Memorandum Number 1, which is the summary that $I$ provided, and you go down each of the criteria, starting with, on Page 1, the build-to/setback lines, under each requirement that has to be met for the deviation, under Letter $A$, the Affidavit of Sean Siebert as Exhibit 10, Page 8; Walter O'Shea is Exhibit 19, Page 7; Hal Dodt is Exhibit 24 on Page 5; Andrés Rubio is Exhibit 32 on Page 4. The Affidavit of Richard Welch is actually Exhibit 36, not 35. There's a typo there. So that's on Page 3. And then Brad Wester is Exhibit 39, Page 4.

If you go down every single one of those criteria and just follow through -- I'm not going to read the whole memo back to you, but
if you just follow through and scan down, again, under Letter $B, C, D$ and $E$, all underneath the setbacks, you have testimony from experts that are available here to answer questions, talk about anything that you want.

Under river view and heights, which starts on Page 5 of my memo, again, under Criteria $A$, B, C, D and E, testimony by each expert under each criteria explaining why and how those individual criteria are met.

Again, on Page 6, Number 3, off-street parking, again, $A, B, C, D$ and E. There's between six --
(Timer notification.)

MR. DIEBENOW: -- and eight affidavits, similarly, on Criteria 4 -- or Deviation 4 and Deviation Number 5 .

With that, we appreciate your time. We're available to answer any questions and look forward to the conversation after Mr. Harden concludes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you,

Mr. Diebenow. Appreciate your time.

Now, if there's no objection, Mr. Teal,
there is no reason we cannot have a five-minute
break? Everyone take -- we've been here an hour and a half now. So before we start public comment, I do recommend no one speak to each other from this panel. Do not talk, but we can at least take a five-minute break. We're going to come back in five minutes and start again with public comment.

MR. HARDEN: Mr. Chairman, I still have a five-minute rebuttal?

THE CHAIRMAN: And then you'll have a five-minute rebuttal after that.

MR. HARDEN: Okay. You're going to do it after the public comment?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HARDEN: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we'll have the public comment --

MR. HARDEN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: -- which will take about 20 minutes. I don't want to start the public comment and get too late. And then you'll have the rebuttal for five minutes, and then we'll have -- we'll close the public hearing and have discussion.

With that, we start this break.

Thank you.
(Brief recess.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you for returning. This meeting is back in session.

At this time, we are going to have -we're going to have public comment. We've got different colored cards for -- supporting the appeal is blue and opposed to the appeal is orange. I have five cards here that were submitted to speak. And Mr. Diebenow has indicated that these folks filled out the cards for their testimony and they are not going to speak. Mr. Brad Wester, Sean Siebert, Hal Dodt, Wayne Petrone, and Courtland Eyrick, you're not speaking. You're not asking to speak at the public hearing, right?

MR. DIEBENOW: Correct.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Very good. That leaves us Mr. Andrés Rubio.

And, Mr. Rubio, you will have three minutes to speak.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you, sir.
THE CHAIRMAN: Please come up and identify yourself.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good afternoon.
My name is Andrés Rubio, architect of record. My address is 3060 Peachtree Road, Atlanta, Georgia 30305 .

I want to make a -- would like to make a correction to try to correct a misperception that can be -- might be generated by some of the statements that Mr. Harden made in terms of the height.

I want to make sure that everybody understands that we are not making a 180 feet wall in front of the river. In reality, what we're doing is a design that has a very articulated massing, that provides different tiers, and is set back to enhance the Riverwalk experience.

So if you go to any of our exhibits and graphics, you will see that we have -- the height actually steps up as you go back from the river. So I want to make sure that everybody gets that so that nobody gets the perception that we're putting just a 190-feet-tall wall in front of the river.

We have basically a two-tier Riverwalk that's actually the result of an existing
condition. So what we're doing right there, we're kind of fixing a condition that is not very friendly for pedestrians and making it better.

Second, we are providing active uses that don't exist at the moment that actually enhance the Riverwalk. We're fixing connectivity, by the way, the way that we see this project. And then we have, on top of that, our amenity deck, that is another step up. And from there, we have our tall element or residential levels.

So that's the correction $I$ want to make. I want to make sure that everybody gets that, and we don't get misled by an idea that we are just doing a very massive, tall building that doesn't respond to the scale of the various areas that are around the building.

One thing I want to point out here, that also, this is trying to balance, very well, a transition between what we think is the pedestrian scale and what is the actual Aetna building, a very tall structure. While we are trying to respect that, we think that we're building, by working, this articulated massing response and -- and creates a better transition
from the Riverwalk back to the tall structure that the Aetna building is.

Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Rubio. Appreciate it.

At this time, Mr. Walter O'Shea.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)
AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good afternoon, Board.
Walter O'Shea, 372 South Mill View Way, Ponte Vedra Beach, 32082 .

Thank you for the opportunity to address you on this.

This site is a unique site. And it's not a unique site because of the geometry, it's a unique site because it is the only property that can provide desperately needed infill residential housing for 6,000 employees, employed by -- in the Aetna building, at Baptist and at Wolfson Children's Hospital, with more employees to come at M.D. Anderson. There is no other property within walking distance. The Strand is a 15-to 20-minute walk, which won't work. This is a unique site because it desperately needs to be residential.

Infill residential provides tremendous
public benefit, in addition to just the Riverwalk. It will stimulate development of additional retail. It will activate the urban core with residents there 24 hours a day. And it will provide for efficient use of existing infrastructure and transit that's in place already.

In regard to traffic, there's one exhibit that when you get a minute you can reference in the book, Exhibit 21, that $I$ would like to point out, because $I$ think it's important to understand the dynamics of traffic in this -in this area.

Infill residential is the ideal use for this site because it minimizes the impact on traffic versus any other use; hotel, office, et cetera. As Steve mentioned, the a.m. and p.m. flows are counter to the dominant flows from the office and medical use. So you've got people going in opposite directions. And because of the unique location of this site, the dominant flows do not cross. And that's what Exhibit 21 shows you.

The p.m. traffic coming into the residential traffic stays north of the
centerline of Prudential Drive; whereas, the p.m. traffic leaving the Aetna building and leaving the hospital stay south of Prudential Drive as they move on their -- on their trips. So it really is ideal in that result.

And you see that in the results of the traffic report. The net result on the critical p.m. peak hour of the eight intersections studied is that the average delay will only increase by 2.3 seconds if you assume that none of the residents work at the adjacent buildings. If you assume a 50 percent capture rate, then that average delay drops to less than one-half of a second. That's one-half of a second over eight intersections studied during the critical p.m. peak hour. So it's a negligible impact.

Finally, in regard to parking, the design provides about one space per bedroom. And that assumes that 100 percent of the bedrooms are occupied. In reality, that will never occur. In a multifamily building, there's static leasing vacancy that ranges at 5 to 10 percent. And let's be realistic. People travel. There's not going to be 100 percent of the
bedrooms occupied. So you're going to end up with excess capacity for parking that will be available. And in the worst case, the adjacent office building will be empty at the time the multifamily building is full. Peak occupancy for parking, for office --
(Timer notification.)
THE CHAIRMAN: You can conclude your sentence.

MR. O'SHEA: Oh, sorry.
The peak occupancy for office is from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., while for residential, it's for -- after 7 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
MR. O'SHEA: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Appreciate it.
Okay. With that, we have a blue card. Mr. Juan Mira.
(Audience member approaches the podium.) THE CHAIRMAN: How are you?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good afternoon, members. Juan Mira. I represent GV-IP, the owners of the Aetna building. I'm the asset manager on the assignment.

Thank you for your service, first and
foremost.
I want to just -- on the record, a few comments.

We, more than anyone, are pro-development and in favor of socially responsible development. I think the path to growth is something akin to additional cancer centers, new employers coming into the area, adding jobs that will eventually fill, you know, properly designed and planned-for residential projects.

We have some significant issues on the peninsula, some of which stem from the trains that we still haven't figured out. We've been at this a long time. If any of you have experienced when one of those trains comes to a standstill, the peninsula gets bogged down. Adding more density before addressing those issues is simply not responsible.

To Mr. Dodt's earlier comments -- and, Mr. Dodt, with all due respect, I don't want to say that we purchased the asset blindly. We knew that the site could at some point in the future be developed. The parking -- the license agreement with Hines explicitly calls for that. So we knew that, but we also looked
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at it within the boundaries of what -- what was called for, the couple of criteria that needed to be met.


And, you know, I'd love to dig in further into the appraiser's report -- I, unfortunately, have not looked at that yet -because to say that there is no negative impact, value or otherwise, on the 841 Prudential building is simply not accurate. The leasability of anything below the ninth floor is just that much less. And what rates do you get? To say that that doesn't impact our value is just -- is just a flat out lie.

Again, we are committed to Jacksonville, as evidenced by our almost two-and-a-half million square feet of investments throughout the greater Jacksonville area. We want to do more. And, again, we are pro-development, but it needs to be responsible. And $I$ respectfully request that you guys take our facts into consideration.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Mira.
Okay. Are there any other public speakers?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody not fill out a card and would like to speak?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. With that, we are going to go back to the appellant rebuttal.

Mr. Harden, you have five minutes.
(Mr. Harden approaches the podium.)
MR. HARDEN: Steve left a list of criteria here because he didn't care about it.

MR. DIEBENOW: Is five minutes going to be enough?

MR. HARDEN: No, it probably will not be. So thank you for your -- thank you for your indulgence.

Paul Harden, representing the appellant.
The fellow from Miami, the architect, I'm sorry, $I$ didn't catch your name, but if he wants us to look at any of these pictures, look at this picture and see if that's a wall on the riverfront. It's 25 feet off the riverfront at that location. So I think his picture belies what he says.

Again, $I$ want you to focus back on your role as a quasi-judicial officer. Look at the
five criteria. Mr. Diebenow says look at the affidavits. Well, I looked at the affidavits, and I went through as quickly as I could what they say. The fact that they address it doesn't mean that there is a public interest in building a Riverwalk because I'm going 190 feet. I can build that same Riverwalk if I go out 60 feet.

All of the items $I$ went through are what they base their positions on the criteria. There is no competent substantial evidence as to any of the criteria.

Now, as to no injury to our property, I am not an MAI appraiser. I am not a veterinarian. I know a horse's behind when I see one. If you build a building that blocks nine floors of your adjoining neighbor's property, you're injuring their property rights. I don't know how anybody can say differently as regards to that.

With regard to the Prudential river frontage, if you will note, in the beginning $I$ said I'm focusing on three specific issues. It was the 25 feet off the river. I didn't raise the Prudential Drive issue and still don't
raise it now.
Now, Mr. Wester, who works for
Mr. Diebenow's law firm, talked about how it furthers the BID, but what he has to show is, it furthers it different than what they could do if they did the 60 foot. They can have a diverse mix of uses at the 60 foot. The marketplace can respond using the 60 foot. There is no furthering of the bids by getting this deviation, which is the point that they have to meet to meet the criteria.

Mr. Seibert, he -- he supported my point, that on the Lomax property that I talked about before, they built 123 -- exactly 123, 5-over-1 in that area, and the market responded to it, and they're building it, and they're building it ahead of this project. The fact that they want to make more money doesn't meet the criteria in the code.

The CCG-1 comment that Steve made, that it's not applicable in the (inaudible) is just not true. It's right inside the Zoning Code. They could go higher if they wanted. They'd just have to move back on the setback.

There is a way to meet it without having
to meet each and every one of the criteria, but they're not -- they're not wanting to accommodate the setbacks by moving them in. They want to move them out.

It's interesting to note that when they were in front of the DDRB, they said, oh, we've talked to the market, we only need 300 parking spaces. Now they're up to 400 parking spaces. They only got 129 to go and they can get and meet the code.

For them to say, well, we don't really need what the code -- what the code requires is inconsistent with why you have a code. The City of Jacksonville did a study and had a determination of what's needed. If you're going to go different than that, you've got to meet the five criteria.

It's not based on the fact that we think we don't need it; it's, if you don't meet the code, you've got to go through each and every one of the five criteria and meet those criteria. It's not whether we think it's a better project if you have less parking. If you think that's the case, go change the Zoning Code. Go change the parking requirements in
the Zoning Code generally.
I didn't really go into the traffic, that wasn't one of the three issues we were dealing with, but it -- it's inaccurate to say the traffic is opposite the hospital. The hospital operates 24 hours a day. There's multiple shifts. There's people operating there all the time.

But if you want to know about the traffic issue, look again at Mr. Wester's picture here. You can see, their access is along this railroad track to come up to Palm Avenue. And it comes up right at where the train tracks are located. And every time there's a train coming across there, which is blocked five times a day, there's going to be traffic backed up.

It backs up down Palm Avenue -- I mean down Prudential, down Palm Avenue, and backs up all the way to the interstate. And when you have people coming out, at that location it is difficult. Again, that's not one of the beefs that we raised, but $I$ couldn't let it go unrebutted.

Mr. Wester talked about the setbacks, the hospital complied with the setbacks of the

Zoning Code that were there when we were built. We were built some time ago.

I know healthcare is really an imposition to the community, but we are trying to operate a facility on this peninsula with limited infrastructure. We -- because we know that we need parking in the area, you need parking in the area, we're building a $2,200-$ space parking garage.

Where do you suspect the second roommate's going to park their car if there isn't a spot there? It's going to be right across the street.

Where do you suspect, when people come in and visit, they're going to park their car to (inaudible) across the street?

Where do you suspect people are going to park their car when the ten Riverwalk sites -and remember, it's not just the Riverwalk in front of them, it's the Riverwalk up, as it heads back, on the other side of the bridge, and then the additional footage that Aetna and the hospital are going to operate with the city.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Harden.
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MR. HARDEN: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's five minutes.

MR. HARDEN: All right. I'll sit down, unless Steve wants to give me more time.

MR. DIEBENOW: I think we're good, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. With that, this public hearing is closed. And now we will open it up for discussion of the DIA members.

Members, we have five deviations. We have four options. We're going to go around the room and ask questions. It does not mean -- if you don't get your questions asked or if you don't -- if you think of one later, we're going to come back.

We're going to start with -- Mr. Barakat, why don't you start this, and we'll go through. And if you want to -- Mr. Teal, should we address these by the deviations or just have the conversation first and then -- and let them call up whoever they want to for questions or do them by the --

MR. TEAL: Mr. Chairman, that's certainly your discretion.

You know, just for the Board's
edification, how this will work is -- I mentioned at the outset that each of these will have to be voted on separately. So if the chairman decides to have some discussion before a motion is made on any of these items, you can certainly do that.

Once that period is over, then there will need to be a motion on -- for example, on the deviation request for setbacks from the street. There will be a second. Any discussion on it, you can discuss that particular deviation request at that time. There will be a vote taken on that deviation request, and then you'll move on the next.

Once the deviation requests are all voted on, then you will have a better picture of what was, I guess, approved for the project as a whole. So then there will be a motion on the project as a whole, incorporating your votes on the separate deviation requests.

So we can walk through that when we get closer to -- closer to that period --

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.
MR. TEAL: -- if there's still any questions.
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THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let's try it like this: Let's start with Item Number 1, the setback from the street. We'll discuss that. You can ask questions of anyone you like. Everyone is at your disposal.

So, Mr. Barakat, addressing the setback from the street deviation, can you -- and I hate to bounce back five times to the same person, so -- I'm trying to simplify this. Can we just go ahead and go through all of them, ask questions as they have them, or is it easier to go back five times to Mr. Barakat and go through each one?

MR. TEAL: Again, that's your discretion.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. TEAL: You know, whatever you think would be the most appropriate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we're going to try it. Mr. Barakat, you've got five deviations here. And let's go ahead and address those deviations, while we have you, and then we'll go to the next person.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: I don't have any questions as it relates to the setback. I think that's, to me, pretty clear why the
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appellee was not able to honor the code and requested a deviation.

As it relates to the river views and the diminution of property value, $I$ can speak to some history. I think Mr. Dodt referenced that when they owned the property and mentioned to prospective tenants about a potential structure being constructed, which may impede the views and has impact on the desirability of the building, $I$ can -- I can testify that's correct because I represented some clients that were looking at leasing space in that building.

The proposed project, at the time, the footprint was different than the proposed project today. The footprint was thinner, from what I recall, but the building was a lot taller. And the spaces available, however, were in the tower of the Aetna building.

I think one thing to note today, the spaces that Aetna vacated are in the lower portion of the Aetna tower, on the L-shaped part of the building, where the new project, the new apartment project, would have an impact on the views for certain. So I think the -the point is, the leasing environment for that
tower is a little bit different today.
You know, as far as the impact on the value of the property, I do think it would impact leasing. At the same time, having development near the site does bring some dynamism to the area. Developing the Riverwalk is an asset. So what the net impact on the lease rate would be, that's very, very tough to say. That's very tough to say, but I do think that is probably the toughest -- in my view, the toughest part of the deviation request out of all of them.

As it relates to off-street parking, I have a question for Mr. Diebenow.

You've mentioned, Mr. Diebenow -- we are in a position to ask questions currently?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, absolutely.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: There were three projects in downtown that had a lesser parking ratio. Do you know which three those are?

MR. DIEBENOW: Yes. So the -- I'm going to speak to the worst-case scenario for our application, which was the 300 units, and then the 405 bedrooms with 381 parking spaces.

Do we have more copies of this?

I'm going to give you a graphic that depicts them, the seven projects.
(Tenders document to Board Member Barakat and to Mr. Harden.)

MR. DIEBENOW: So the graphic that $I$ just handed out has the seven projects that we looked at, studied, but, in general, I'll just quickly summarize.

220 Riverside has, you know, less parking per -- per dwelling unit and less parking per bedroom.

The Strand and the Peninsula have less parking per unit and less parking per bedroom -- I'm sorry. They have more parking per dwelling unit and less per bedroom.

The Carling -- I'm not going to summarize it. Just look at the graphic. It's easier. It's easier than me summarizing it. Those are the three that have more on a per-unit basis and three that have less.

If you examine it by a bedroom count, which is the other way to look at it, 220 Riverside has about . 67 parking spaces per bedroom. The Brooklyn, which is the one by Fresh Market, it has about 1.04 parking spaces
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per bedroom. The Carling and 11E have about . 77 parking spaces per bedroom. And the Strand and the Peninsula have about . 76 parking spaces per bedroom.

So what you have in front of you is a dwelling unit count. What $I$ just read to you is the bedroom count. There's three of them that provide even fewer parking spaces per bedroom than what we're offering to provide.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Okay. You're at
1.23 in this graph; is that correct?

MR. DIEBENOW: So in that, in that graph, that's -- yeah, that's the 1.23. And what that includes, is that includes 369 parking spaces, so we have deducted 12 for the public, but it does not include the 19 motorcycle parking spaces. So it's a little bit higher than that, but the graphic -- if you add that back in and do that math, it doesn't change where we fall in the lineup. We're still going to be right in the middle.

And not only -- it's important to know that not only was that approved, all of the ones that have been built, there's no evidence on the record of anybody parking off site.

There's no evidence in the record of anybody causing any problems for anybody nearby, and yet we're parking at a ratio that's right down the middle of what was previously approved.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Okay. Thank you. So to my colleagues, I was trying to see if there was a commonality between those projects that have less parking density, and there doesn't seem to be. You know, 220 is in Brooklyn, a lower density part of downtown. The Carling is right in the center of the city. And the Strand is right on the riverfront. So you have three different characteristics that have less parking density.

So it's difficult to say or argue that this density is not in line with market trends regardless of demographics or location within downtown. So $I$ can't make that argument there.

That's my only -- since I'm not voting, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to try to opine too much, but $I$ just have one more comment as it relates to the traffic.

And $I$ think, Mr. Harden, you made a comment about traffic density and certain hours. So does the hospital and its
employees -- and this includes, to some extent, the employees in the Aetna building. Is it not a rush hour? Is there not a peak time either in the morning or in the afternoon?

MR. HARDEN: There's a time where more people are coming out than others, but the peak time related to employees -- there's people coming to the hospital all the time, not just the employees, not just the peak hours.

I have some pictures on my phone that I took when a train was backed up there at an off peak, and $I$ happened to be in the Aetna building, in one of the hospital offices, and looked down on it. And as I said, this -- this was at like $10 o^{\prime} c l o c k$ in the morning, and the traffic was backed up all the way down Prudential, all the way down Palm, under the interstate, on the other side. So, I mean, one car coming out at that time would be difficult.

Look, the traffic is not one of the things, much like the Prudential setback is -that we're raising issues with, but in taking the totality of the project, and $I$ think you ought to think about the traffic issue, but sure, there's a peak time. But because it's a
hospital, it's a 24-hour operation, both employees and patients.

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Thank you.
MR. HARDEN: Can $I$ make a comment on this parking issue?

THE CHAIRMAN: Can he?

MR. HARDEN: May I? Let me restate that.
THE CHAIRMAN: Or ask a question. How about, you might get asked that question, so --

MR. HARDEN: Okay. All right.
Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: So let's -- all right.
Mr. Barakat, streetscape, waterfront? BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: No comments on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And you're not
voting, but your -- your opinion and your thoughts and knowledge in this do help.

Mr. Gibbs.

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: I, too, like Mr. Barakat, am concerned about the diminution of value. Mr. Harden, what evidence do you have of diminution of value?

MR. HARDEN: Well, Mr. Herzberg's
affidavit talks about it. And he talks about
blocking the views. And Mr. Barakat talked about the -- again, you don't have to be an expert to know that if you block the view, then you don't get to look at the river. There's -and it's not diminution of value. If you look at what it says, it says injure or affect the property rights of somebody else. So it doesn't have to be quantified if there's any injury at all. It doesn't have to be a calculable number on there, but I'm just saying, the common - $\quad$ think common sense is, if you block somebody's view of the river, it makes their property less valuable.

If somebody built an office building in front of somebody who has a view of the river and you no longer have that, you're not going to have the same rents or value there. So...

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: With regard to parking, is your client building a parking garage?

MR. HARDEN: Yes. We're building two parking garages, but the one that's 2,200 is straight acro- -- if you look at a map here, whatever the -- if you look straight across Prudential Drive, it -- it's almost -- the
construction is moving along. We're building a parking deck that's straight across from their entrance, straight across from the Women's Pavilion. So that big building that's going up there has a parking deck.

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Has your client explored any possibility of leasing those spots to potential residents?

MR. HARDEN: Well, it's free parking. It's public free parking already. So we don't charge there. We don't limit who can come in and out of the location. We're building it to accommodate hospital patients and the employees. We're building another parking lot on the other side of M.D. Anderson, which is, I think, 600 spaces.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes. I can address that more.

MR. DIEBENOW: Yeah, Mr. Tickell is the real estate officer at Baptist. Do you mind if he speaks?

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Not at all.

HARDEN: Thank you.
(Audience member approaches the podium.)

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Keith Tickell. I'm vice
president of strategic assets and real estate at Baptist Health. Address is 841 Prudential Drive.

With regard to the parking garage, we've done exhaustive studies with the group called FreemanWhite, they are a hospital planner -they are actually owned by the Haskell Company here in town -- analyzing and projecting future needs on parking.

As Paul mentioned, we are building that garage right there, the 2,200 spaces. And it is designed to accommodate patients, visitors and employees. We don't have the spaces to lose. That deck will add, roughly, 500 spaces in capacity to the downtown campus there, because we've got to take down an existing garage. It's at the end of its useful life. That's the current $P 2$ garage on Palm. It's got to come down, so that's why we're doing this construction.

It is, without a doubt, one of our biggest challenges for our patients and visitors. That's what we're focused on, and that's why we're so concerned about it. We do not charge for parking. We're trying to provide access to
the community. That's why we don't want any of those spaces impacted in any way.

MR. HARDEN: Tell them about the other garage.

MR. TICKELL: So then there's a second garage that will accommodate M.D. Anderson. Actually, two garages. The building itself will have a 625-space garage that will be part of it, but under the $P$ UD requirement that the City -- we negotiated with the City, unfortunately, the employees for M.D. Anderson have to park on the other side of what is the outpatient center and the JOI building. So we'll be constructing a garage there and building a sky bridge so that those employees can get to work in the cancer center.

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Thank you.
I would -- $I$ would also like to know whether or not Mr. Klement or Mr. Jones heard anything today that may change their opinion. I don't mean to put you on the spot, but you gentlemen have sat through this --

MR. JONES: Well, I mean, I will say one thing, and $I$ didn't mention this earlier, that I did -- you know, as a board, when we -- we
got to final -- and this was the first time we heard anything of this. So one of the most -the elephant in the room to us was how curious this whole scenario was, that we go through an iterative set of workshops. We go through a process of conceptual approval and, you know, working with our neighbors. You have opportunities to come and, you know, vet your concerns. We worked with Baptist to come up with a design that was mutual for their garage, you know, making concessions, working with them to make sure that they have the best product, because we think it's a wonderful site. You know, everybody's a neighbor in there.

And then to be at the last moment, when we're ready to move to final, and then we hear, out of the blue, that we were blind sided essentially by this, that we didn't know that this could happen here. And we just find it a little bit curious that, through all that time, to not think that this was going to happen or that, all of a sudden, our views were going to be blocked.

And, quite frankly, $I$ mean, in a downtown, this is what's going to happen. We're going to
continue to see more development happen. We're going to see views that were once of the river that are probably going to be blocked. And that, to me, is a sign of a successful downtown. I mean, I -- I just came back from -- I don't want to sound hyperbolic here, but $I$ was just in Toronto, and one of the things that $I$ saw were cranes everywhere, buildings happening.

So I think there's a little bit of that that we have to have here, is a discussion about, you know, as we move forward, we could, theoretically, railroad a lot of projects over parking and traffic if you use the minimum suburban design standards for that.

So in my case, I just thought that -- and in the sense -- or at least collectively as a board, we felt that, you know, it's time to kind of get away from some of those issues because, quite frankly, the amount of spaces that are required per unit are -- you know, it's -- again, you can apply these to, you know, doing a project off Southside Boulevard. And this is a different animal.

If we're going to get people to walk and

```
take transit, we have to essentially say
parking requirements need to be shifted off to
the side here a little bit to make things
happen. I mean, I think that was part of the
conclusion that we reached at the end.
    BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Thank you.
    Did you hear anything today?
    MR. KLEMENT: Just a reminder that when I
speak to the Board, it is a professional board.
It's made up of professionals. It includes
the --
```

THE CHAIRMAN: Your mic, sir.

MR. KLEMENT: Oh, I'm sorry.

When we speak of the DDRB board, it is made up of professionals. By a requirement, it includes two architects, one landscape architect, one contractor, three downtown property owners and two urban planners. So these are individuals that put their profession forward in terms of presentation, review and critique of projects. Presumably, they have had a wealth of experience. We just heard our chairman speak to his visits to other cities and other communities, to, again, bring back that information to this board. And I think
that they are dedicated and they take their work serious.

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Thank you.

Finally, $I$ think $I$ heard someone say that there would be employees working at M.D. Anderson, or perhaps at the hospital or at the Aetna building, that may reside in this particular building. I have forgotten which presentation $I$ heard that from, but I was wondering if any market studies were done to analyze what the cost per square footage or cost per unit would be in this particular residential unit.

THE CHAIRMAN: In particular, anyone, or Mr. Diebenow or --

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: I can't remember. I know it was from Mr. Diebenow's team.
(Mr. Diebenow approaches the podium.)

MR. DIEBENOW: Steve Diebenow, 1

Independent Drive, Suite 1200 .

I think your question was how many people were going to work -- that worked in the vicinity would park or live in the residence -BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Correct.

MR. DIEBENOW: -- basically.

```
So there's testimony on the record from Mr. Siebert's affidavit. Their last two projects that they developed in the medical district in Fort Worth, more than 50 percent of their residents live within a mile of their work.
And so that's the exact reason why they came to this site, was because they anticipated that there would be employees, nurses, doctors, LPNs, certain real estate professionals, all make over the amount that would be required to move into or live in that -- in that -- in that building. So yeah, it definitely was something that was taken into account.
BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Would you agree, Fort Worth, Texas cost of living may be different than Jacksonville?
MR. DIEBENOW: Oh, yeah, different for sure, but still medical professionals. Again, in the medical district in Fort Worth, there's -- like here, there's five or six hospitals within a mile of their two most recent projects. Here, Wolfson, Baptist, M.D. Anderson, you know, the heart center, you've got three different branded hospitals, but
```

probably four or five different, distinct hospitals in the area.

And I'm happy to share this with you. We did do a market rate study in terms of projected rental rates and annual income to support them and rates per bedroom, which I'll give to you to pass around to the other board members, that answers the detailed question about was there --

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Great.

MR. DIEBENOW: -- a market study done.

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: That would be helpful.

Thank you.
Nothing else, Mr. Chair. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
(Mr. Harden approaches the podium.)

MR. HARDEN: Mr. Chairman, he asked that generally speaking. They told us the rent rates were a buck 90 to $\$ 2$ a foot. That's part of the -- that may be what's on that study, but that's $\$ 2,000$ a month for a thousand-foot apartment. And that would be about 50 percent of the net income of a nurse. So I don't suspect that that's going to be the market.

Maybe they've got a lot of doctors there, I don't know, but we don't agree with their contention that a lot of our employees will be living there simply because it's -- \$2 a foot is at the top of the rack in Jacksonville right now. That's -- and $I$ know this because we did it -- when we were looking at the shipyards, two years ago, a buck 35 was the top of the rate.

More recently, along Riverside, they've gotten up to a buck 95 and $\$ 2$ a foot. The top of the rate is now going to be that Lomax apartment $I$ talked about, which is a little over $\$ 2$ a foot. So this is the very top of the market of apartment rentals in the Jacksonville market.

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Thank you.
MR. DIEBENOW: Mr. Chairman, we don't want to go back and forth on rental rates and viability. I mean, we're happy to spend all afternoon talking about the viability of the project. Clearly, if we didn't think it was going to work, we wouldn't be here. So if you want more detailed information on market rates, Walt O'Shea is happy to address those in more
detail, but $I$ don't know how much more time you want to spend on this in any event.

Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: No. This is very helpful.

Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Gibbs.
Okay. Mr. Meeks.
VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Just to clarify, if I
might. Mr. Harden?
MR. HARDEN: Sir.
VICE CHAIR MEEKS: If I have understood
what I've heard so far, am I right to say that
you don't have expert testimony from a real estate appraiser that would refute the real estate appraiser that Mr. Diebenow has used? Is that correct, sir?

MR. HARDEN: We do. The real estate appraiser that Mr. Diebenow used talked about diminution in value. That's not the criteria. The criteria, does it injure our property -and I don't think you have to have expert testimony -- Mr. Herzberg says it in his report.

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Mr. Harden --

MR. HARDEN: Yes, sir.
VICE CHAIR MEEKS: -- if I was giving a definition -- or rather, a deposition, you haven't answered my question. Do you have a real estate appraiser like Mr. Diebenow does that addresses -- it says, "substantial diminution of value." It also says, "substantial injury to property rights." Do you have a real estate appraiser that addresses that?

MR. HARDEN: Where are you reading from? I'm sorry.

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: I have a copy here.

MR. HARDEN: Okay.
VICE CHAIR MEEKS: That's C. It says,
"will not substantially diminish property values." And then further down it says, "will not substantially interfere with or injure the rights of others."

MR. HARDEN: Right. That's -- that's the one I was talking about. I don't have anything -- $I$ don't have a real estate appraiser about substantial diminution of value, but there is another caveat, that it injures your property rights. And $I$ think
blocking of the view does that. And I think that's -- I don't think you need an expert, but I understand your question. No, we don't have a real estate --

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Okay. The second question, much like the first, then -- if $I$ understand, Mr. Diebenow has an expert that addresses parking issues. And if I'm understanding correctly, you don't have an expert who addresses that; is that correct?

MR. HARDEN: Yeah. Mr. Tickell just came up and said that they did the same thing to determine how many parking spaces we need.

But, Mr. Meeks, the issue is not whether or not they need the parking spaces. They -they're saying they don't need them. The code requires them. If the code -- now if, as Mr. Jones says, we don't need that many parking spaces, then change the Zoning Code.

What we're saying is, there's a
requirement in the code. Whether you like it or not, that's the requirement in the code. And to change that, you have to meet those five criteria. But no, I don't have anything other than Mr. Tickell.
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VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Okay. That was my question.

MR. HARDEN: Yeah.
VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Thank you.
MR. HARDEN: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anything else?
VICE CHAIR MEEKS: No, sir.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Moody.
BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Okay. We've heard a lot of information. You know, philosophically, it sounds to me like it's going to come down to a question of do we want to develop this site or not. And some of the positive of the site, obviously, is that it is an infill residential site. It is a unique site with a unique product. It provides downtown living, which is residential, walkability, bikeability. It's going to have a 12 -foot multiuse trail. It's going to be a diverse mix of land uses. Those are the positives.

And then, quite frankly, there are some negatives where there's the congestion, traffic issue. Parking, is it underparked? The setbacks are an issue. And then the biggie for me was, is there value decreases for nearby
buildings and property.
And I did, late last night, read through Mr. Eyrick's report. He did a good job. It was a market-derived study, and I think he did a good job in quantifying the fact that, when you go to the marketplace, there's not a substantial decrease in value that can be proven. I mean, it just doesn't prove itself out right now. There may be an immediate effect, but for a longtime stabilized basis, I don't think you can see that.

As we look at the height of the building, when we go from 60 to 90 -- or 60 to -- what is it?

MR. TEAL: 190 .
THE CHAIRMAN: 190 .
BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Yeah, 190, that's going to come down to a feasibility question. I mean, it is absolutely a question that the developers have to deal with. And the only way to make it feasible is to go higher.

I am curious, though. The Hines project, originally, how high was it? How many floors was planned? Because $I$ went over there, I looked at the units, and it seemed like it was

50 floors or 40?
(Mr. O'Shea approaches the podium.)

MR. O'SHEA: Walt O'Shea, 372 South Mill

View Way, Ponte Vedra Beach.

That project was 54 stories in height, the building. And then the parking level -- the parking garage, which basically filled the full site, was an 8-level garage about, you know, 85 feet. So, roughly, equal to the height of the annex of the Aetna building.

BOARD MEMBER MOODY: So had it been approved and went through all the hoops and so on and so forth?

MR. O'SHEA: It had -- it had full DDRB, you know, approval. It had a full set of building plans that were, $I$ think, approved, if my recollection serves me right.

BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Again, $I$ was concerned about the traffic issue. And it sounds like the experts have given us a pretty clear answer there.

And beyond that, no other questions.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Moody.

Ms. Durden.
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BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

This is definitely a complicated procedure. I think that -- I've spent quite a bit of time thinking about the project and the concerns that have been raised. And as a lawyer, and in particular, as a land use lawyer, I definitely understand the deviations and the -- and the need to go back to the deviations and pay attention to the code and to the deviations, but $I$-- so I want to go through each one of them. I think, for me, that's about the easiest way for me to stay straight.

So on the setback from Prudential, there is simply no way -- it doesn't matter what project ever occurs on this site, there's never going to be a project where there's not a deviation necessary for the setback from Prudential, regardless of whatever it is.

So, you know, in looking at the deviation criteria, there's just no doubt in my mind, given the -- given the shape of the parcel, which has been handed to us -- that's a given. We -- we have to function with the shape of the
parcel. So, obviously, that's -- there's no doubt, that's a practical difficulty.

It certainly is not based exclusively on a desire to reduce the cost, et cetera, et cetera. I could go through each one of them, but, really, it's so clear to me that that is not even an issue.

I'm going to go on the easy ones first. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Streetscape.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Is that okay? I think that's Number 4, streetscape.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Again, I mean, we're not going to -- this -- the dynamics of this particular site, the uniqueness of it, clearly demonstrates to me that a deviation is absolutely mandatory. And, again, as far as I'm concerned, it meets all five of them. And there's no -- five criteria under . 22 .

Number 5, the 50-foot setback, this is an interesting one because when $I$ read the statements made by the appellant they seemed to say that their concern associated with this has
to do with the reconfiguration of the $--I$ guess there's an access easement. And in my mind, whether it's set back 50 feet or 25 feet, that's not going to make any difference in the world with -- in regards, that $I$ can see, with that access easement.

So yes, now -- I mean, that is what they talked about on Page 7 of their -- when they filed their appeal. So, in a sense, I don't see what their concern there is.

The other thing $I$ want to raise -- and, you know, this is sometimes, depending upon which side you're on, you know, good or bad, but in reading carefully Paragraph -Subparagraph C, in . 22 , it talks about the proposed reduction or deviation will not substantially diminish property values in the area, property values in the area surrounding the site. So we're talking about more than just one site.

And it will not substantially interfere with or injure the rights of others whose property would be affected by the deviation. So the property right that would be impacted is a view right. And $I$ don't think that we have,
or Baptist or Aetna, has a view -- a right to a particular view that I'm aware of.

If Aetna had been concerned when they sold this property to -- I think that's how it went. When they sold the property and they were concerned about their view in their buildings, they would have reserved an easement for view. So I don't know that -- I don't believe that there is a property right that is being interfered with substantially as far as Paragraph C goes.

So let me go back to -- that's -- the other thing that $I$ want to mention is that, there's quite a bit on height in 656.361.14. And it talks about -- it almost anticipates that we're going to have requests to exceed the building height because it talks specifically -- the request for additional height shall be evaluated on the basis of public benefits provided, the possible impacts of the additional height, consistency with the City's land use policies, so -- and it takes into account what's around it.

So it's hard for me to give a lot of credence to this issue about the height.

Clearly, it's close in. When you look at this picture, we have tall buildings that -- all around it. So I -- I'm having a little bit of a hard time finding that the deviation for the height was inappropriate.

And then on the parking, I think the data that's been provided to us shows that -- that the number of parking spaces, in fact, has been -- is within the realm of what's reasonable.

I think that our world is, quite frankly, changing. And while that is the -- while our code still says that there's a minimum number of spaces, $I$ think that we are recognizing that the need for parking spaces should not drive what our development looks like. And so I believe that the parking that's been provided is adequate, and $I$ will -- and I think that it meets the deviations -- the criteria for the deviations.

I'm just going to say one thing, kind of -- you know, it's hard for me to understand as a lawyer why we would say for -- if it's a redevelopment, that certainly 50 percent is perfectly fine, but for new development, for
residential or a hotel, no, we've got to have -- go to the minimum.

You look for rational -- a rational basis. And $I$ don't see a rational basis between -clearly, the development, whether it's a redevelopment or it is new development, is going to generate, you know, similar traffic. And, I mean, that's not the basis for my decision, but $I$ do think that -- that it's -it's an -- to me, it's an antiquated rational -- reason in our code.

So again, going back to the deviations and the criteria for that, $I$ do think that there are economic difficulties. I do think that it certainly is not based exclusively on a desire to reduce the cost of developing the site. I don't think it's going to diminish the property values or interfere with the property rights of others. And I don't think it's detrimental to the public health.

And $I$ don't think that the effect of the proposed reduction -- well, let me turn that around. Somebody said there was a difference between -- in E, somebody talked about how "furthers the objectives" is different from
"promoting the objectives." I think that they are the same. Promoting and furthering the objectives of our BID Plan, to me, they're one and the same. I think that the project, quite frankly, does do that. So thank you. THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Durden. Mr. Padgett. BOARD MEMBER PADGETT: I guess I get to go last. I've looked through A and E, and just to cover all bases, I agree with Ms. Durden. I can't find where this property really violates any of these. And I'm going to go into some of why that is, but I'm going to tell you, straight out, A through E, there's no reason that we can't approve this.

Number one, this code, as we started out the meeting with, is not a prescriptive code. Everybody needs to remember that. This code is designed for us, as a board, to agree or disagree that these deviations should or shouldn't be met for the type of project that's going to go in.

We've got the DDRB to do that for us, and they've already done that. For whatever
reason, and as this gentleman here mentioned, after probably six, seven or eight months of going through meetings and workshops, suddenly, Aetna and Baptist show up here, in the eleventh hour, after this gentleman spent probably hundreds of thousands of dollars trying to get this thing across the finish line, they woke up one morning and decided they didn't like the deal anymore, which, by the way, is a way better deal than what Hines was going to do. Hines was doing a $50-s t o r y$ project with a parking garage that covered the whole entire site. I mean, I'm shocked that you guys are sitting here today, to be honest with you, shocked.

On the parking -- we build apartments all over the country. I've got them as small as .75 a unit, one-and-a-half units. You know, one-and-a-half spaces a unit is the norm, but that is normally for a garden-style project, out in a residential area, as Mr. Harden mentioned. We're not in a residential area. We're in an urban setting. In an urban setting, one car space per unit is good. Now, let me remind everyone that an
average apartment unit in the apartment world is a thousand square feet average. A thousand square foot average is driven because you have a lot of three-bedroom and two-bedroom units to go along with one-bedroom units that are probably 6- or 700 square feet.

This project has a whole lot of studio apartments, which will likely have one person, maybe two in them; a whole lot of one-bedroom apartments; and less than 50 percent of the project is two-bedroom apartments. And there's no three- or four-bedroom apartments except maybe the townhouses, if I'm correct, and there's very, very few of those.

So the average square foot of this project is way under a thousand square feet per unit, which means you're going to have fewer people per unit on an average in the project. So to be over one space per unit in an urban setting is actually pretty good.

To do a project on this site -- this is a very unique site. You can't do what was done over at Lomax. Lomax, you can get enough parking spaces this way (indicating) to be able to go five stories that way (indicating) and
get enough units across that. This site doesn't drive that. That's why we can't do a 50-foot setback. We have to have --

And, by the way, Hines had a 12. We're at 15, which is, again, not 50 stories. We're at 13. And we're not at a 12 -foot setback, we're at a 15-foot setback, which is still better than what Hines was doing. And the first four or five floors that front the river are -- they look like -- if you look at the next picture that shows it facing the river, they're only five stories. The architect can probably tell us.

So the first five stories that are actually on the river, if you go back to the nine -- or the 13 stories, I think the 13 stories are probably within a 50-foot setback or more, even though the entire building footprint does not sit on that setback.

And it is a tiered -- it's tiered for the riverfront. It steps up. You've got a pool overlooking the river. The units are on the river. Now, the parking garage is off the river, which $I$ think is a good idea. I don't
like the parking garage on the river.
So let's talk about diminishing values and river views and the right to river views. I happen to own a building on Riverside Avenue, across the street from the river. So I ask myself, if somebody builds on the lot on the river, I'm going to lose my river view. Am I losing my rights to a river view? No. You know why I'm not losing my rights to a river view? Because I didn't buy a river view, everybody. I don't have a property on the river. I've got a property across the street from the river. And if somebody builds something in front of me, I don't really have anything to say about that because they've got as much right to build over there as anybody else down the street or as I did across the street.

So you guys aren't losing any rights. You don't have any rights. You don't have a right to a river view. And most of the building is over here (indicating). This building's over here. You're losing a little bit here. You can still see the river that way (indicting), you can still see the river that way. But let
me remind you, you don't have any right to the river view, none, because you're not on the river. If you wanted a river view, you should have bought the land. It was for sale, and you probably could afford it, you should have bought it.

So I'm not starting the motion, but I'm going to approve everything with no exceptions. That's going to be my vote.

That's it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you,
Mr. Padgett.

Okay. With that, $I$ would like to ask a couple of questions. And just for -- just to get an understanding of why and how -Mr. Barakat and $I$ were on the DDRB when the Hines project was approved, along with Bayard Spector's 65-story building and steve Pardo's complex over at the JEA property, and Commodore Point and many, many other projects. We had 14 high-rises on the books at the time. Things are a little different to me now.

But, Mr. Jones, when Mr. Gibbs asked you, were -- if you heard anything that would change your mind, you said you were blind-sided by the
opposition, and you -- but you didn't answer the question, if you heard anything that would change your mind had they been in the time frame that you have preferred. Did you hear anything that would change your mind?

MR. JONES: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Look, that's what the process is for. Whenever there is opposition, you have ample opportunity. Whether it's the last day or the first day, it doesn't matter to me. That's why you have these open hearings.

Mr. Kytell [sic] -- is that --
MR. TICKELL: Tickell. Close enough.
THE CHAIRMAN: How long have you been with Baptist real estate?

MR. TICKELL: I joined Baptist two years ago. I have -- I'm sorry.
(Mr. Tickell approaches the podium.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. TICKELL: Keith Tickell, 841

Prudential Drive.

I've been with Baptist now two years.
Prior to that, I was chief operating officer for Flagler Development. We're the largest commercial developer in the state of Florida.

We've developed in South Florida, Tampa, Orlando and Jacksonville.

THE CHAIRMAN: While you're here, can you help me with the parking garage? And we're all familiar with the railroad, the trains that go by there --

MR. TICKELL: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: -- five times a day and the egress and ingress. Where is the egress and ingress for that parking garage on Peninsula - Prudential?

MR. TICKELL: So the parking garage will have two egress/ingress points. One will be on to Palm Avenue. That will be a three-way access point. There will not be a southbound on to Palm Avenue. The other access point will be on what we call Baptist Way. That's actually a private drive. Palm is a public street. Baptist Way is the roadway that transverses that site east to west.

THE CHAIRMAN: How does somebody cross the road from the parking garage over to the Aetna site?

MR. TICKELL: They would go right. And then right now we have a situation where

Prudential T's into Palm, and it's not signalized or -- it's stopped for Palm going into Prudential.

THE CHAIRMAN: So how would a pedestrian go from the parking garage -- from the new garage --

MR. TICKELL: Unfortunately, it is a mid-block crossing. Given the current configuration, there's not a way to get to a street corner to cross. So it's mid-block, actually, between Prudential and the railroad tracks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And who owns that -you might not know this. Mr. Diebenow might be able to answer this. Who owns that building or -- or that space at the entrance?

MR. TICKELL: The building itself is actually owned by Baptist. There was a former marketing trailer that Hines had used there. That piece and -- it's a small, rectangular triangle. There's a little bit of surrounding land that's owned by Baptist.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
Look, I -- I -- we all want the same thing. We're here to try to help promote and
develop downtown.
And, Mr. Padgett, I agree, you know, we're -- if you want it, you buy it.

I'm a little concerned with the 3 foot. Every 3 feet is a 1-foot setback; is that correct, Mr. Harden? Is that what you said, every 3 feet --

MR. HARDEN: Every 3 feet up -- excuse me.
THE CHAIRMAN: -- requires a foot of
setback? That's not -- that's "shall."
MR. HARDEN: That's in the CCG-1 section of the Downtown Overlay. And it says "shall."

THE CHAIRMAN: So how far -- if you go up, how far off is the top of the building compared to what it would be if they applied the 3 foot to 1 foot, do you know?

MR. HARDEN: Yeah, $I$ can do the math for you. You'd start at 50 feet as opposed to 25 feet. You go 60 minus 190, which is 130. You'd divide that by 3. So that's about 43 feet. So you'd be 93 feet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. You know, it does affect the people that -- thank you, Mr. Harden.

It does affect the people sitting down in
that building looking out that way. I go back to when -- when Mr. Balanky was going to build San Marco Place, and Mr. Pardo was going to build a large building on the corner and -- of course, the Strand and so on. Mr. Barakat, you may remember this.

There was a conversation about how you make this work to -- to work for everybody around the -- in the neighborhood. Mr. Balanky turned his building. Mr. Pardo was going to turn his building. Everybody was in agreement with how we could make it work for everyone's benefit.

Mr. Jones, I -- I deeply value the work of the DDRB. I've served on it, and I know what you do and how you do it and all the time that goes into it.

We have four options here. One is to grant the appeal, and we overturn the decision of the DDRB; grant the appeal with conditions to modify it and -- and modify the DDRB conditions -- or decision; or deny it and uphold your decision; or it can go back to the DDRB for further discussion.

Obviously, we would like this -- as the

DIA, we would like this decision to -- to move this project forward. Obviously, everyone likes this project. I don't think anybody is opposed to the project. Opposing whether it's economically feasible or not or whether it's a nice project and good to have, $I$ don't think that's the question. It's trying to tuck it into a space that's already got difficulties.

And if you watch this area, you know this area and see it, it's a complex area with a train going through there. Nothing is going to change that. We're not going to change that probably in our lifetime. I know there's efforts to make some changes and keep the train moving a little faster, but $I$ sat there and watched an ambulance on the outside of the train, waiting for the train to go by the other day, and it's chaos around there at times. And I'm not sure what "peak" is. I don't know what "peak" means in a hospital setting.

Baptist has always been a great city
business. They've done great things for this city, as has Aetna, yet we want to see these kind of projects done. We want to move these projects along. We're excited. We're never
going to be able to have these kind of things if we don't -- if we don't work at it and make them happen. This property would probably sit there with no movement whatsoever. I don't know how anybody could do it and make it work.

Is there any possibility of moving the -rearranging the entrance and exit off of the railroad drives? Mr. Jones, did y'all discuss the --

MR. JONES: Yes. I mean, that was part of the genesis behind recommending a workshop. We -- and I don't know how -- I can't recall how long we were there. We were probably there for about three hours, and we worked directly with the architect. And we spent, I recall, a substantive amount of time dealing with just your point, about how to make the setback work.

I mean, you know, again, it's not the most ideal situation. And again, it's not our point to argue whether a building should be here or not. Maybe in the perfect world, it happened in some other place, and we're not even here, but the reality is, is that they do have the right to do this project here. And that was why we had a separate level workshop, to sit
down and deal specifically with this particular issue.

And that, as a matter of fact, was why they convert -- you know, the big issue, the elephant in the room at the time was the -- was the garage structure sort of fronting the river. We said, you know, we've got to figure out a way to soften that up. We've got to figure out a way to ensure that we're activating that space and how we can make this a liveable spot for people who may actually want to work at Baptist or Aetna, or whoever in there, and how we can get people from Prudential and how we can get people on the Riverwalk there.

So there was a lot of discussion about the setbacks. And that's just what we were able to do to make it work within the site constraints. I don't think -- I mean, we sliced it and diced it probably five or six different ways, and this was the most optimal configuration.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I don't think that the egress and ingress is of issue except was there an opportunity for creating more parking space by doing that and having the Baptist space in
the front of this and the Aetna garage right next to it. I assume y'all looked at any opportunity to try to create extra parking or - -

MR. JONES: Yes. And, of course, you know, with my -- I mean, $I$ do have -- I'm a transportation planner, so $I$ can talk all day long about parking and traffic needs in urban settings. And again, if anything, I thought we were -- I was one of the first to say we don't need that much parking along that, we need this to be a wider, multiuse path instead of having parallel spots all the way up and down it, but, you know, we recognized what was needed to make the site work.

But again, $I$ think one of our bigger concerns was just a little bit about that, that intersection, could we improve -- a big thing to me was, how could we improve pedestrian safety along, you know, Palm Avenue and Prudential. I mean, somebody was hit yesterday. I don't know if you know that, but I think somebody was severely hurt on Prudential Drive yesterday.

So, you know, one of the things we were
trying to do is think about how we can ultimately make Palm and Prudential much more pedestrian safety -- or much more safe for pedestrians and cyclists, but, you know, we -we got as much -- and to their credit, to be able to find some additional spots, $I$ think, speaks well because we were more than content on making the -- I think the original 359 work for the site.

THE CHAIRMAN: I attended your workshop and $I$ attended your final meeting when you approved it. And I'm aware of the work that went into this and the effort by the developer to try to make this work.

I keep going back to the -- you know, it works and -- from an economic standpoint at this level, but if it didn't at this level and it had to be closer or higher, you know, what would you have done.

Does the traffic study indicate accidents or injuries or anything in the past? I mean, do we have a history? And did y'all look at that at DDRB as to the --

MR. JONES: We did. Again, it's not necessar - -- again, not the responsibility of
them to address that. I think that's a bigger city issue. We just did, as you know, invest in a road diet project on Riverplace Boulevard. THE CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. JONES: We're taking a lane out. You know, so I think, again, when we start looking at the treatment here -- I mean, of course, we have a challenging condition with the railroad track. But no, other than really just making comments about how it would be wonderful to be able to get people to the river and to basically, you know, come down Prudential Drive a little bit more safe, but not something that would be put on the burden of the applicant.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if we have all this parking -- go ahead, Mr. Diebenow.

MR. DIEBENOW: I was just going to answer your question, Mr. Chairman, if you want to, about the traffic study. Yes, we did look at crashes and pedestrian safety. And Table 16 in our traffic study actually outlines improvements that we, that the developer, the applicant below, would make to improve pedestrian safety.

Isn't it ironic that Baptist is building a

2,200-space parking garage across the street, and yet they leave a mid-block pedestrian crossing that they won't even spend the $\$ 10,000$, or whatever it cost, to change the crosswalk, and they put that burden on us. Well, you know what, we're happy to --

MR. HARDEN: Steve, that's just -- now, we're building an overpass there. It cost us two-and-a-half million dollars.

MR. DIEBENOW: Yeah.
MR. HARDEN: And I think you know it.
VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Mr. Chairman.
MR. DIEBENOW: Where's the --

VICE CHAIRMAN MEEKS: Mr. Chairman, I think we're getting pretty far afield here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right.
VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Shortly, I'd like to introduce a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're going to do motions on every one of these. I just want to make sure --

MR. DIEBENOW: My point is, the traffic study addresses pedestrian safety. We're going to make improvements that we can deal with.

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: If I might, let me
clarify that with Mr. Teal. Can we have one motion, if such a motion was offered, to reject the appeal in total or do we have to take each item individually?

MR. TEAL: You need -- I believe you need to address each item individually. And then once you address those items individually, you can make a motion on the entire project as a whole.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We were going to go through them.

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Let me clarify that, if I might. Can that all be done in one motion if they're all five listed?

MR. TEAL: No, because you have to have separate findings on each of the different deviation requests. And so the burden of the DIA is to determine whether there's competent substantial evidence on each of the deviation requests, each of the five requests, to support the request itself.

Your formula for deciding whether there's evidence to support the requests are, you know, the five criteria that are in Subsection 22, and so whether there's evidence to support each
of those criteria on each of the separate requests.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Teal, if we have 1 through 5 that we -- a motion doesn't pass, how do you pass the project as a whole?

MR. TEAL: Well, you could, for example,
find that there's competent substantial evidence that the real parking number might be 400 instead of 349 . I think there was testimony as to that. So instead of the deviation request for 349 spaces, you could make the deviation request for 400 spaces, for example. You know, you could -- you could approve it for that, for example.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. TEAL: On the height, you know, you could say no, you know, you haven't demonstrated your case for the height, and then you could approve it at a lower height. Now, then it's up to the developer to decide, you know, whether or not that project that's approved by the DIA would be worth pursuing, but your job is to decide what project meets the requirements of the code.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So we're going to go
through this. Are there any other comments by the board members?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Barakat, do you --

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Heard all your questions
and answers and --

BOARD MEMBER BARAKAT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let's start with the deviations. And if $I$ could get a motion on the setback from Prudential, the deviation. Do we have a motion?

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: I'd like to move that we deny the appeal on that item.

THE CHAIRMAN: Second?

BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor, say aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, like sign.

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And there is no
public --

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Do we need

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., P .O. B ox 2375. Iacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300
discussion?

MR. TEAL: You do need discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I was holding back on the public discussion.

MR. TEAL: Right. And just to clarify the motion, the motion would be to approve the deviation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. TEAL: Okay. And then once you get to the final vote, it will be to deny the appeal or to grant the appeal, you know.

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Should I rephrase the motion then?

MR. TEAL: I think we understand.

THE CHAIRMAN: No. I think it was -- I think it was clear. Now, the only thing is we're not having public comment on these things, so -- but we do have discussion of the board members.

So we have a motion and second, and you had some discussion on that?

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Yeah. The setback that DDRB found was 25 feet? Because I heard somebody say 15 feet.

MR. TEAL: Let me clarify that point.
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There's technically two setbacks that you're worried about here. The first setback is from the project to Prudential. The second setback is on the waterfront design standards, from the edge of the water to the edge of the building. So the setback from Prudential to the building is what? It's a request from zero to what?

MR. KLEMENT: Yeah, I believe --

MR. DIEBENOW: 758 feet is the setback that's requested from Prudential to the edge of the building.

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: And the water setback, please?

MR. DIEBENOW: The water setback, which is Criteria 5, is from 50 to 25.

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: And we're voting on the setback from Prudential. And the waterfront is from 50 to 25.

Okay. With that, any other questions or comments, discussion?

Ms. Durden.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Primarily, for the record, in looking at this, $I$ think that it
does meet the deviation -- what happened to my sheet? That the deviation does meet the criteria set out in 656.361.22, in that there are practical difficulties in carrying out the strict letter of the requirement, primarily as a result of the shape of the parcel, and that it does not -- it's not based exclusively on a desire to reduce the cost of developing the site. It's primarily the way the site is shaped. I think that it does -- the other criteria are also met in regards to this particular deviation request.

THE CHAIRMAN: So yes, the approval of the deviation is what you're voting for, correct? Right?

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other discussion
on Item 1, the setback from Prudential?
BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: We have a motion and a second. All in favor, say aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
(Board Member Barakat abstains from
voting.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, like sign.

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Number 2, do $I$ have a motion for the height deviation?

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Mr. Chairman, I move --

THE CHAIRMAN: Approval of the height deviation.

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: I move to uphold DDRB's findings with regard to the deviation on the height.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do we have a second?

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any discussion?

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: For the record,
which I think -- Mr. Teal, do we need to make
some findings in regards to these?

MR. TEAL: I think that the record has probably been developed --

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay.

MR. TEAL: $\quad-\quad$ pretty clearly.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. Great.

MR. TEAL: So you can rely on the evidence
that you've heard today from both sides, you know, to support your vote.

Diane M. Tropia, Inc., P .O. B ox 2375. Iacksonville, FL 32203 (904) 821-0300


MR. TEAL: The request that's been made to the DIA at this point is for a reduction of the parking spaces to 349 spaces. So that is the request that's made. Like I mentioned before, you've heard some evidence on a different number. So $I$ just wanted to make sure that you were aware that there may be a different amount or reduction that could be considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we heard 369, and that did not count the motorcycle spaces. And I don't know how a motorcycle space is -- Marc, you may know this, or you may know how that affects the number. Is it a percentage of spaces? And how --
(Mr. Diebenow approaches the podium.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Let me make sure first. I don't want to get it --

So the -- we're asking for an approval of the deviation to 349.

MR. TEAL: That was the request that was made of DDRB.

THE CHAIRMAN: And, Mr. Jones, how many spaces are there?

MR. JONES: Oh, as they're -- as we're approving for --

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. JONES: 359 spaces is what we, I
think, approved for. And, I believe, with the motorcycle -- I'm not sure. I can't quote the quota, but you're allowed a certain percentage of motorcycle spaces to count into that total number.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Diebenow, if we need to clarify that --

MR. DIEBENOW: What we would -- what we would ask is that 381 be approved as the deviation amount, and then that would be the number.

THE CHAIRMAN: What was approved by DDRB?

MR. DIEBENOW: I think the number that was approved by DDRB was the 359 number that Fred just talked about. 346 was kind of the number that we went in talking about, and $I$ think they approved 358 or 359 .

Just to simplify it, 381 , which includes the 12 that we're reserving for the public. So it would be 369 for use by the development and 12 for the public. That is what we would ask for approval on today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Everyone understand
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that?

Okay. So we have a motion on parking -or did you make a motion?

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: I think $I$ was starting to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do we have a motion on the parking deviation?

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: That we approve the deviation on the parking as just explained by Mr. Diebenow as 381 spaces.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we have a second?
BOARD MEMBER PADGETT: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion?
BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Hearing no discussion, all
in favor, say aye.
BOARD MEMBER PADGETT: Aye.
BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Aye.
BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Aye.
BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Aye.
VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Aye.
(Board Member Barakat abstains from voting.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, like sign.
I oppose the parking.
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Streetscape, Number 4 , approval of the deviation for the streetscape. It was not -well, $I$ don't even know that there was a deviation on the streetscape, was there?

MR. TEAL: There was a deviation on streetscape --

THE CHAIRMAN: But it wasn't an issue with the developer?

MR. TEAL: They did not raise it at today's hearing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has it been raised in the past?

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: It's raised in the --

MR. TEAL: Well, whether they raised it or not, you still have to find that there was evidence --

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. TEAL: -- to support the request.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do we have a motion for the streetscape?

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: I would move the DDRB's findings with regard to the deviation on the streetscape.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Do we have a

## second?

BOARD MEMBER PADGETT: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor, say aye.
BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
(Board Member Barakat abstains from voting.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, like sign.
BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Waterfront setback
from 50 feet to 25 feet, do we have a motion to
approve the deviation as set by DDRB?
VICE CHAIR MEEKS: So moved.

THE CHAIRMAN: Second?

BOARD MEMBER PADGETT: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion?
BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: No discussion. All in favor of the waterfront setback deviation, say aye.

BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
(Board Member Barakat abstains from voting.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, like sign.
BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)
THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Everything was
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approved. With that, we come to the project as a whole.

MR. TEAL: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the project as a whole, there were some conditions on the approval that DDRB assigned to it. And if you want Mr. Klement to go through those --

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah.
MR. TEAL: -- he could talk about what those conditions were.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Klement, if you come up to the microphone and tell us -- you're going to tell us what the conditions were.
(Mr. Klement approaches the podium.)
MR. KLEMENT: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Board.

There were conditions that were attached to the approval that further clarified some of the improvements that were looked at as part of the project. They are in my staff report and they are in the approval letter from the chairman, and I'm going to try to highlight them here for you.

The first one dealt with the review and approval by the Downtown Development Review

Board, design to install a 12-foot multiuse path. The multiuse path shall run across the property from Prudential Drive. And there's a paragraph that goes on that clarifies the specific length, width and design that relates back to that $25-$ foot setback in front of the building along the waterfront.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Klement, can I ask, the 12 foot is in addition to or is that a total of 12 feet?

MR. KLEMENT: That's in addition to. The total would be the 25 feet.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
MR. KLEMENT: Setback is what we're talking about.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right. And that's along the railroad side?

MR. KLEMENT: That's along the waterfront side.

THE CHAIRMAN: The waterfront side. Okay.

MR. TEAL: Correct me if I'm wrong on
this, Mr. Klement, but $I$ believe that's both, both the path from Prudential, back to the property, and then along the waterfront in front of the property.

MR. KLEMENT: Correct.
MR. TEAL: Okay.

MR. KLEMENT: I'm sorry. Yes. It's referred to as Exhibit $A$ in our staff conditions.

B is subject to review and approval by DDRB. Developer shall expand the existing portion of the Riverwalk along the south bank of the St. Johns River, running through the property, from its current width of 8 feet to a total width of 20 feet. The developer shall grant to the City a pedestrian access easement over the Riverwalk to run with property deed in perpetuity. Specific terms of the easement are subject to review and approval by the City's Office of General Counsel, Risk Management Department and Department of Public Works. And that was condition $B$.

Condition $C$, developer will construct or cause to be constructed, at their expense, Riverwalk expansion and multiuse path identification -- multiuse path as identified above. The Riverwalk and multiuse path shall be of color scheme and materials to complement existing portions of the south bank Riverwalk
such that it is obvious that the Riverwalk and path are to the benefit of the public and open to the public.

At Prudential Drive, there shall be double-sided wayfinding signage with directions to the Riverwalk and Prudential Drive. Final designs will be subject to Downtown Development Review Board approval. And that was Condition C.

Condition D, developer shall provide for review and approval by the DDRB staff, prior to ten-set, construction review for permit by the City of Jacksonville, the placement, design, (number suggested) minimum four double-faced signs addressing wayfinding for the Riverwalk and river access. That was, again, Condition D.

THE CHAIRMAN: Riverfront wayfaring signage?

MR. KLEMENT: Wayfinding signage.
THE CHAIRMAN: For the public to --

MR. KLEMENT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: $\quad-\quad$ go to the Riverwalk?
MR. KLEMENT: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. That's -- how
do they -- where do they park to go to the Riverwalk?

MR. KLEMENT: There were spaces available as part of this master plan along the rail line frontage that were parallel to and open to the public and designated for public parking for Riverwalk access.

THE CHAIRMAN: That was D?

MR. KLEMENT: That was D. We're on E.

Developer shall provide a traffic operations study for review and approval by the Planning and Development Department prior to ten-set construction review for permit by the COJ. That was E.

And $F$, developer shall provide necessary easements (Riverwalk access from Prudential Drive and Riverwalk acces along St. Johns River) for acceptance by the coJ, the city of Jacksonville Council, prior to building permit approval by the COJ. And that was condition $F$.

THE CHAIRMAN: And that was the end?

MR. KLEMENT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
Okay. Any questions or comments on those conditions?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So, Mr. Teal, now we can vote for the project as a whole. And you have four choices with this project: Grant the appeal, which overturns DDRB; grant the approval -- $I$ mean, the appeal, with conditions, which DDRB can modify; or we modify their decision; or deny the appeal as a whole and uphold the DDRB decision; or it can go back.

Yes, sir.
MR. DIEBENOW: Mr. Chairman, I just have a question for Mr. Teal. I'm sorry to delay this, but there's also three additional criteria that are supposed to be considered by the -- that are supposed to be considered by the board in the context of an appeal. Those are listed on the agenda. There's little Roman numeral i, ii and iii. And $I$ just think that it would be beneficial for the board to make an affirmative finding on little Roman numeral i, double i and triple i.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. It's consistent and compatible -- does everyone have a copy of this, evaluating the appeal (inaudible) to
consider the proposed project?
BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: No.
THE CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary that we approve these items because -- I don't think.

Mr. Teal, why would we -- do you see Number 1, 2 and 3 ? Roman numeral I, II and III?

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Is there a code section, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: There is. I -- I was given this by staff. Item 1 is -- and we'll get a copy for everyone to be able to see. You don't have one of these in your package.

It's consistent and compatible -- I mean, this is what we have been doing this whole time, Mr. Diebenow. It's consistent and compatible with all proposed development and redevelopment with the BID Plan.

Two, is consistent with -- have we got copies?

VICE CHAIRMAN MEEKS: We do.
THE CHAIRMAN: Is consistent with and provides mitigation as may be required by the Consolidated Downtown DRI Development Order and Transportation Concurrency Exception --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry --

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're getting a -we're getting a copy of this to everyone. We'll give it to you.

Mr. Teal, is it necessary to address these in the decision or --

MR. TEAL: And just for the benefit of the DIA, where these are from -- because you're sitting in a de novo capacity --

THE CHAIRMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. TEAL: -- these are general three -three criteria that the DDRB has to consider when it reviews a project. Just like you've got the criteria for when they evaluate a deviation request, these three criteria are what must be met in order to approve a project as -- in its entirety, as a whole project.

So, you know, I don't know that it's necessary for - you know, for you to -- I believe, you know, that there's -- there's evidence that's in the record that would support -- you know, to support a finding on these, but just for benefit of the record, those are from 656.361.7.

And the questions that are asked is
whether the proposed projects -- taking into account the deviations that you just approved, whether the proposed project is compatible and consistent with all proposed development and redevelopment with the BID Plan. So is it consistent with the BID.

Is the project consistent with and provides mitigation as may be required for the Consolidated Downtown DRI and the Transportation Concurrency Exception Area Implementation Plan, which I think Mr. Klement has talked about in his staff report.

I don't believe that that particular provision is applicable in terms of the TCEA Implementation Plan.

The third one is, whether the proposed project -- while considering the design-related issues of the application, whether the project is in compliance with the Downtown District Regulations -- that's the Zoning Code -- the Downtown Design Guidelines and all related approved design guidelines and standards, subject always to the ultimate authority of the DIA to interpret the BID Plan, the Downtown Overlay Zone and the Downtown Design
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Guidelines.

So basically, is it -- is it consistent and compliant with -- you know, what used to be the Downtown Master Plan is now the Downtown BID, the Downtown Zoning Overlay, and, you know, all, you know, requests, really, all -make sure that we're consistent with our Comprehensive Plan. Again, that is addressed by Mr. Klement in the staff report. And it's a lot of the same issues that you heard today that you were provided with testimony and evidence about today.

THE CHAIRMAN: And it's consistent with the work of the DDRB, efforts, before this anyway, all of these.

MR. TEAL: The DDRB did make a positive finding that it was -- it met these criteria.

THE CHAIRMAN: So, Mr. Diebenow, what's your -- I mean, we can -- we can make a motion and -- but I'm not sure that this is --

MR. DIEBENOW: Well, Mr. Chairman, in an abundance of caution, we would ask you to make findings and adopt them regarding those three criteria because $I$ have a feeling that this isn't the last time we're going to be standing
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in front of a body talking about it. So we would ask that you make the findings, as you did before, based on the evidence we have presented, to show that those three criteria from the code have been met.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Does everyone on the board have these notes? They see it? Any questions or comments?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: First off, is there a motion to approve these conditions for the project?

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: I'd like to do that.

Mr. Teal, after all of this, I'm not sure exactly how to propose that motion.

MR. TEAL: Well, the -- the options that are available to you right now are to grant the appeal, which means that you want to overturn what the DDRB did, that you want to grant the appeal by making some changes to what the DDRB did; to deny the appeal, which is to support what the DDRB did and --

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: I'm on 3, deny the appeal. So how do $I$ say that and incorporate these things Mr. Diebenow is asking for?

MR. TEAL: You would just make a motion to deny the appeal. And if it's seconded, then you will have discussion on your motion. And in that discussion, then you can go through the criteria.

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Well, it seems like -BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you find these -- I mean, let him finish his --

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: It seems like -- and in the motion $I$ just thought you would go ahead and reference these items.

MR. TEAL: You could -- you could, in your motion, move to deny the appeal because you find that the proposed project is 1,2 and 3 -VICE CHAIR MEEKS: There we go.

MR. TEAL: -- if you wanted to do it that way. And then during your discussion, you can flesh out more of what that means.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. And, Ms. Durden, will your comments hold for discussion after this motion or -BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: No. THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Ms. Durden. BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Thank you very much,

Mr. Chairman.
It seems that we've made one change on the parking, on the number of parking spaces. So would it be actually to deny with a modification, Mr. Teal?

MR. TEAL: I would say that the proper motion would be to deny the appeal subject to the deviations that the DIA voted on today. You know, we can clarify to say that the effect of the denial will be to grant approval of the project subject to the five deviations and the additional -- additional -- the word's escaping me -- conditions, additional conditions that Mr. Klement read into the record earlier.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Excuse me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Wait. Let me let her finish.

Go ahead.

MR. TEAL: We're just talking about what the motion would be.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Right. But the condition that I'm talking about is -- on the deviation for the parking --

MR. TEAL: Correct.
BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: -- is actually different than what was approved by the DDRB. That's where I'm saying that it's to deny subject to a condition on the parking deviation.

MR. TEAL: Right. But the effect of your action will be to deny the appeal. The appeal just wants the decision of the DDRB overturned in its entirety. So the effect --

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Right.

MR. TEAL: -- would be to deny the appeal, you know, and approve the project subject to the deviations that were presented and approved earlier by the DIA on this item.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: So was the devi- -so just to be clear, the deviation on the parking was for 381?

MR. TEAL: 381 was the deviation for parking.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Meeks, do you --

MR. DIEBENOW: I'm sorry. I have one more thing, Mr. Chairman. Again, it's Steve Diebenow.
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And I'm sorry, but another condition that came out of the DDRB was regarding the building materials, that we had to bring those back to staff as well, as a part of the ten-set review process.

So I just want to make sure that that condition gets wrapped up as well, where the -the building materials are addressed during ten-set review as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you have two -- I mean, that's supposed to be done prior to the final approval. Were the conditions -- were the materials approved in the final --

MR. DIEBENOW: The materials --

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Isn't that G?

MR. DIEBENOW: The materials were approved on paper. And physical samples they wanted to see prior to the ten-set or during the ten-set review.

THE CHAIRMAN: Back to the full committee orstaff --

MR. DIEBENOW: Staff.

THE CHAIRMAN: -- for review.

MR. JONES: To staff and maybe one person from the DDR- -- or just to be there to look
and get a feel of it.
BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Wasn't that $G$ that was read into the record?

MR. DIEBENOW: Oh, I'm sorry. I might have missed that.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: I thought -- I was following along. Is this the same one, G?

MR. DIEBENOW: Yes. I'm sorry.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: And so let's just be
clear that Mr. Klement actually read that.

MR. DIEBENOW: I'm so sorry. Yes, that --

I must have missed that when it was read into
the record, but that is $G$ from the findings below.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Does everyone understand, there's a conceptual and a final? And the final --

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: I only heard A through F.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did too. I had access as F. And, Jim, we never heard G.

MR. TEAL: I'll tell you what, why don't we have Mr. Klement just read $G$ into the
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THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Klement, can you come back up and read $G$ for us, quickly, please?

MR. KLEMENT: I'm looking for my copy of $G$ right now.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: I have one.

MR. KLEMENT: If I may borrow it.
BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: It's actually in the appellant's materials, the staff -- the conditions. It was part and parcel --

MR. KLEMENT: I have a copy here.
Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: -- of the June 6th -- it's two pages.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Klement -- and
Council -- thank you. Council Member Anderson, thank you so much for being here. Appreciate your indulgence.

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Don't rush off. We haven't finished yet.
(Mr. Klement approaches the podium.)
MR. KLEMENT: All right. Going to
Condition G, which -- the developer shall
present to one DDRB member and DDRB staff for
review and approval the appropriate
specifications cut/detail sheets and samples of materials showing colors, textures for exterior building materials, as well as the Riverwalk development that includes lighting fixtures, hardscape, pavers, furniture, railing types, to verify building materials, colors, textures, light fixtures, exterior furniture are in accordance with the development plans presented June 1, 2017, by the applicant.
(Council Member Anderson exits the proceedings.)

THE CHAIRMAN: So the specifications were submitted, but -- okay.

MR. KLEMENT: Correct. They are in part of your package there. I know that they are included in the package.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Okay.
Clear? Okay.

Mr. Meeks, you're going to attempt to make a motion. This is for the project as a whole, correct?

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Correct.

I think, then, if -- Mr. Teal, if $I$ need
to have any of this corrected, I'll defer to
your ability to do that.
I would like to move that we, one, reject the appeal; two, we approve the project with the conditions that have been read into the record coming out of DDRB, understanding that the parking spaces that we're now talking about -- it's the last number $I$ heard, 381. 381?

That we have considered it, in arriving at this motion, sufficient, competent evidential matter. And with particularity, we have considered the three items, little i, little ii and little iii, that are specifically mentioned in the handout in front of us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do we have a second?
BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Second.
THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion?
BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Did I hear -- did I hear in the motion the conditions, including the conditions?

VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Yes.
THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. The conditions -subject to the conditions as voted on today and approved today.

Any other discussion?

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Ms. Durden.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: I just want to say that in the past, I've -- in the one other instance where we have had an appeal, $I$ felt that that project had the capability of -- the project and the project site had a capability to meet the letter of the law.

And I want to say -- and I've been a stickler for the code requirements. My role here is the planner, the urban planner for the board. I've been a stickler for these code requirements.

I was very much opposed to this project, you may recall, when it first came before us. And I feel like I -- that the -- the shape of this site and the degree of changes that were made from the time that this project first came before us and first came before the DDRB led me to believe that $I$ could support this project. I believe that there is competent substantial evidence in the record to support the motion that's been made.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Durden.
Mr. Moody, any comment?
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BOARD MEMBER MOODY: No comment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other comments by any board members?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Look, I didn't like this project at the beginning. I'm not sure -- I saw the hard work that went into it with the DDRB and the applicant and how -- what they did to work with the City and work with the DDRB in answering, responding and doing a tremendous job.

I can't deny the fact that we have a great corporate citizen across the street that does wonderful things for this city and always steps up. I would always like to see this -- we go back to the drawing board, and $I$ know we've done that so many times.

It's great to see this piece of property developed. I'm not sure that anybody could ever be exactly -- it can't be ideal because of the closeness to the Riverwalk and all, but I think everybody did a wonderful job.

I just struggle with the -- the great corporate citizen and the work that's being done and how it's all being put into this
corner when we're working so hard on that road diet on Riverplace Drive [sic] and so on. And there's -- there might not be an answer. There might not be a better answer than what we have here.

Mr. Harden brought up some points about, you can do all these things, you just can't do it at the level that it's being done. Well, if that's the case, we might not ever see it or see anything on this site. I have to base this on, everybody has worked together and done what they can.

So, Mr. Jones, I want to thank you for your efforts and all of the work that you have put into this and for appearing here today.

Any other comments by the board?

BOARD MEMBERS: (No response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: No comments by the members. With that, all in favor of the motion, say aye.

BOARD MEMBER PADGETT: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER MOODY: Aye.

BOARD MEMBER GIBBS: Aye.
VICE CHAIR MEEKS: Aye.
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(Board Member Barakat abstains from voting.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Opposed, like sign.

And I am opposed to the final -- I'm not opposed to this project. I'm opposed to -- to the process and not moving in a different direction.

But, with that said, we're 6 to 1 .

BOARD MEMBER DURDEN: No. Actually --

MR. TEAL: For the record, I would like to note that Mr. Barakat has --

THE CHAIRMAN: So 5 to 1. I'm sorry.

MR. TEAL: -- has recused himself both from the votes on the request for the deviation and then also the final vote on the appeal overall.

THE CHAIRMAN: And so all of our votes -well, the final vote was 5 to 1 , correct?

MR. TEAL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. With that, folks, I want to thank you. This is an interesting process. We have to rely on the facts and the information that were provided today in this hearing. And $I$ know it's hard and $I$ know it's sometimes tough, but thank you very much for
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| ```employed [1] - 86:18 employees [14] - 86:17, 86:20, 106:1, 106:2, 106:7, 106:9, 107:2, 109:14, 110:13, 111:11, 111:15, 115:5, 116:9, 118:3 employers [1] - 90:8 empty [1] - 89:4 encountered [1] - 23:24 encourage [2] - 10:18, 19:24 end [8] - 3:16, 27:12, 48:20, 56:7, 89:1, 110:17, 114:5, 166:21 end-all/be-all [1] - 56:7 ended [5] - 21:15, 24:15, 26:9, 26:10, 65:14 ending [1] - 26:8 ends [1] - 24:16 enforce [1] - 49:24 engage \([1]\) - 27:17 engaged \([1]\) - 60:11 engineer \([3]\) - 71:7, 71:14, 71:16 enhance [3]-23:2, 84:15, 85:6 enhanced [1] - 41:11 enjoying [1] - 42:21 ensure [5] - 19:18, 21:1, 26:25, 48:8, 144:9 entered [1] - 76:7 entertainment [1] - 20:14 entire [7] - 27:6, 28:19, 51:13, 56:22, 132:12, 134:18, 149:8 entirety [2] - 169:17, 175:10 entitled [6] - 33:19, 34:7, 34:17, 44:4, 50:2, 50:3 entity [1] - 75:17 entrance [3] - 109:3, 139:16, 143:7 entryways [1] - 51:4 environment [1] - 101:25 envisioned [1]-23:17 epicenter [2]-20:13, 47:3 equal [1] - 124:9 equally \([1]-48: 18\)``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { equity }[1]-66: 2 \\ & \text { escaping }[1]-174: 12 \\ & \text { especially }[1]-53: 6 \\ & \text { essence }[1]-13: 21 \\ & \text { essentially }[3]-77: 19, \\ & \text { 112:18, } 114: 1 \\ & \text { establish }[3]-20: 25 \text {, } \\ & \text { 48:7, } 48: 14 \\ & \text { established }[2]- \\ & \text { 12:20, 19:23 } \\ & \text { estate }[11]-109: 20, \\ & 110: 1,116: 10, \\ & 119: 15,119: 16, \\ & 119: 18,120: 5, \\ & 120: 9,120: 22, \\ & 121: 4,137: 15 \\ & \text { et }[3]-87: 17,126: 4 \\ & \text { ethics }[1]-17: 21 \\ & \text { evaluate }[1]-169: 14 \\ & \text { evaluated }[1]-128: 19 \\ & \text { evaluating }[2]-3: 20, \\ & 167: 25 \\ & \text { evening }[1]-69: 15 \\ & \text { event }[1]-119: 2 \\ & \text { eventually }[1]-90: 9 \\ & \text { everywhere }[1]- \\ & 113: 8 \\ & \text { evidence }[36]-14: 4, \\ & 14: 8,14: 11,14: 15, \\ & 14: 25,15: 3,15: 4, \\ & 37: 16,37: 21,38: 24, \\ & 40: 4,41: 20,46: 14, \\ & 50: 12,54: 11,54: 12, \\ & 57: 15,59: 21,59: 24, \\ & 60: 20,71: 16,93: 11, \\ & 104: 24,105: 1, \\ & 107: 22,149: 19, \\ & 149: 23,149: 25, \\ & 150: 8,155: 23, \\ & 157: 5,160: 17, \\ & 169: 21,171: 12, \\ & 172: 3,181: 22 \\ & \text { Evidence }[1]-31: 6 \\ & \text { evidenced }[1]-91: 15 \\ & \text { evident }[1]-51: 7 \\ & \text { evidential }[1]-180: 10 \\ & \text { ex }[1]-4: 21 \\ & \text { ex-parte }[1]-4: 21 \\ & \text { exact }[1]-116: 7 \\ & \text { exactly }[5]-57: 6, \\ & 59: 4,94: 14,172: 15, \\ & 182: 20 \\ & \text { examination }[1]-67: 5 \\ & \text { examine }[1]-103: 21 \\ & \text { examined }[3]-65: 7, \\ & 65: 12,68: 10 \\ & \text { example }[7]-57: 25, \\ & 61: 7,69: 7,99: 8, \\ & 150: 6,150: 13, \\ & 150: 14 \end{aligned}$ | ```exceed [4] - 78:15, 78:16, 78:17, 128:16 exceeds [1] - 24:17 except [5] - 52:18, 52:19, 133:12, 144:23 Exception [3]-4:7, 168:25, 170:10 exceptions [1]-136:8 excerpt \([1]-59: 8\) excess [1]-89:2 excited [1] - 142:25 exclusively \([4]\) - 39:14, 126:3, 130:15, 154:7 excuse [2] - 140:8, 174:16 Executive [1]-1:18 exempt \({ }_{[1]}\) - \(52: 12\) exemptions \({ }_{[1]}\) - 52:22 exhaustive [1] - 110:5 Exhibit [10]-57:19, 80:16, 80:17, 80:18, 80:19, 80:20, 80:22, 87:10, 87:23, 164:4 exhibit [2] - 57:20, 87:8 exhibits [1] - 84:17 exist [2] - 76:23, 85:6 existed [1] - 79:25 existing [9] - 9:18, 33:10, 79:10, 79:13, 84:25, 87:5, 110:16, 164:7, 164:25 exit [1] - 143:7 exits [1] - 179:11 expand [1] - 164:7 expansion [1] - 164:21 expense [1] - 164:20 experience [6]-21:1, 48:8, 68:5, 69:1, 84:16, 114:22 experienced [1] - 90:15 expert [8]-50:12, 81:8, 108:3, 119:14, 119:22, 121:2, 121:7, 121:10 expertise [1]-58:10 experts [7]-57:23, 58:6, 67:8, 68:2, 68:25, 81:4, 124:21 explain [4]-8:4, 13:9, 41:3, 43:7 explained [2]-31:24, 159:9 explaining \([1]-81: 9\) explains [1]-52:9``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { explicitly }[1]-90: 24 \\ & \text { explore }[1]-28: 2 \\ & \text { explored }[1]-109: 7 \\ & \text { extend }[1]-48: 18 \\ & \text { extension }[3]-22: 21 \text {, } \\ & 42: 15,44: 10 \\ & \text { extent }[2]-24: 10, \\ & 106: 1 \\ & \text { exterior }[2]-179: 3, \\ & 179: 8 \\ & \text { extra }[6]-15: 21, \\ & 17: 12,34: 24,36: 6, \\ & 48: 3,145: 3 \\ & \text { extremely }[1]-80: 9 \\ & \text { Eyrick }[4]-60: 5,60: 7, \\ & 60: 13,83: 14 \\ & \text { EYRICK }[4]-60: 13, \\ & 60: 19,60: 23,61: 3 \\ & \text { Eyrick's }[1]-123: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 45:10, 46:10, 47:8, } \\ & \text { 47:12, 47:15, 47:20, } \\ & \text { 48:5, 48:11, 48:12, } \\ & \text { 48:13, 49:15, 49:18, } \\ & \text { 50:23, 51:2, 51:3, } \\ & \text { 51:19, 51:20, 54:2, } \\ & 61: 23,62: 2,62: 8, \\ & 62: 19,62: 20,67: 13, \\ & 73: 10,73: 12,73: 13, \\ & 78: 2,78: 5,78: 11, \\ & 79: 7,84: 11,91: 16, \\ & 92: 21,93: 7,93: 8, \\ & 93: 24,124: 9,127: 3, \\ & 133: 2,133: 6, \\ & 133: 16,140: 5, \\ & 140: 7,140: 8, \\ & 140: 18,140: 19, \\ & 140: 21,152: 23, \\ & 152: 24,153: 10, \\ & \text { 161:10, 163:10, } \\ & \text { 163:12, 164:10, } \\ & \text { 164:11 } \\ & \text { fellow }[1]-92: 17 \\ & \text { felt }[5]-21: 20,24: 12, \\ & 26: 5,113: 18,181: 5 \\ & \text { few }[6]-2: 24,19: 4, \\ & 43: 2,55: 25,90: 2, \\ & 133: 14 \\ & \text { fewer }[4]-68: 21, \\ & 68: 22,104: 8,133: 17 \\ & \text { fifth }[4]-12: 2,41: 4, \\ & 41: 9,46: 16 \\ & \text { figure }[3]-22: 2, \\ & 144: 7,144: 9 \\ & \text { figured }[1]-90: 13 \\ & \text { filed }[6]-5: 20,5: 22, \\ & 30: 18,43: 7,73: 9, \\ & 127: 9 \\ & \text { fill }[2]-90: 9,92: 2 \\ & \text { filled }[2]-83: 11,124: 7 \\ & \text { final [19] - 9:5, 9:10, } \\ & 9: 16,9: 20,10: 4, \\ & 11: 1,76: 15,112: 1, \\ & 112: 16,146: 11, \\ & 152: 10,165: 6, \\ & 176: 12,176: 13, \\ & 177: 16,177: 17, \\ & 184: 4,184: 15, \\ & 184: 18 \\ & \text { finally }[3]-52: 10, \\ & 88: 18,115: 4 \\ & \text { financial }[3]-6: 13, \\ & 6: 14,6: 21 \\ & \text { findings }[8]-3: 23, \\ & 149: 16,155: 10, \\ & 155: 17,160: 23, \\ & 171: 23,172: 2, \\ & 177: 13 \\ & \text { fine }[7]-42: 18,42: 20, \\ & 48: 22,49: 6,59: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| $\begin{aligned} & \text { GV-IP [2] - 30:17, } \\ & 89: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 120:11, 120:14, } \\ & \text { 120:20, 121:11, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150:16, 150:18, } \\ & \text { 150:19, 155:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79: 16,88: 3,96: 5, \\ & 96: 25,97: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 46:12 } \\ & \text { Implementation [3] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H | 140:11, 140:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { heights [2] - 52:1, } \\ & 81: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 106:13, 107: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { important [10] - 9:13, } \\ & \text { 22:13, 23:25, 25:13, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Hal }[11]-73: 25,74: 3, \\ 74: 6,74: 20,74: 24, \\ 75: 25,76: 13,78: 24, \\ 79: 9,80: 17,83: 14 \end{gathered}$ | ha | hel | 142:20 | 40:11, 51:13, |
|  | Harden's [3] - 5:23, | help [5] - 19:17, 22:10, | hospitals [3]-116:22, | 69:11, 87:11, 104:22 |
|  | hardscape [1] - 179:6 | 139:2 | hotel [3] - 67:22 | imposition [1] - 97.3 |
| half [12] - 35:17, $36: 2$, $46: 2,46: 8,47: 1$, | Harold [1] - 74:10 | helpful [5] - 17:15 | 87:16, 130:1 | improper ${ }_{[1]}$ - 16:13 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 46: 2,46: 8,47: 1, \\ & 82: 2,88: 14,91: 15, \end{aligned}$ | Hartford [1] - 76:1 | 19:11, 72:8, 117:13, | hour [5] - 82:2, 88:8 | impropriety [1] -6:6 |
|  | Haskell [1] - 110:7 | 119: | 6, 106:3, 132 | improve [7]-20:19, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 132:18, 132:19, } \\ & \text { 148:9 } \end{aligned}$ | hate [1] - 100:8 | Herzberg [5] - 50:7, $50: 15,51: 6,60: 1$ | hours [5] - 87:4, 96:6, | $20: 21,21: 17,48: 1,$ |
| halfway [²] - 42:5,70:4 | heads [1] - 97:21 | 119:2 | 143 | 147:23 |
|  | Health [1] - 110 | Herzberg's [6] - 50 | housing [5] - 20:16 | improved [1] - 26:11 |
| ```hand [1] - 77:5 handed [5] - 35:23, 37:12, 55:9, 103:6, 125:24``` | health [2]-41:1, | $53: 4,56: 15,58: 20,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 7,47: 10,47: 18, \\ & 86: 17 \end{aligned}$ | improvements [4] - |
|  | he | high | hundred [4]-35:6, | $148: 24,162: 19$ |
|  | healthy [1]-21:7 | 19:19, 19:25, 27 | 35:8, 47:8, $53: 1$ | improves [1] - 73 |
| handled [1] - 75:19 <br> handout [1] - 180:14 | hear [7] - 28:4, 28 | :23, 136:2 | hundred-unit [1] | improving ${ }_{[1]}$ - 22:15 |
|  | - 11210 114:7 | High [1] - 25 : | 35 | inaccurate [2] - 77:17, |
| ```happy [4] - 117:3, 118:20, 118:25, 148:6 hard [10] - 38:9, 38:10,``` | 137:4, 180:18 | high-density [2] | hundreds [1] - 132:6 | 96 |
|  | 180:19 | 10:20, 19:25 | hung [2] - 2:5, 24:1 | inappropriate [1] |
|  | heard [20] - 3:13 | high-qu | hurt [1] - 145:2 | 129:5 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { hard }[10]-38: 9,38: 10, \\ 40: 1,56: 14,128: 24, \end{gathered}$ | 35:10, 111:19 | $\text { 19:19, } 27$ | hyperbolic [1] - 113:6 | inaudible [3]-94:21, |
|  |  | higher [8]-51:21, |  | 6, 167:25 <br> [1] - 62:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 129:4, 129:22, } \\ & \text { 182:7, 183:1, 184:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $119: 13,122: 9$ | $52: 7,68: 15,68: 2$ |  | include [3] - 14:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { harden }[4]-31: 19, \\ & 58: 23,107: 22,183: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { :24, 137:2 } \\ & : 6,152: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 23,104: 1 \\ & 123: 21,146 \end{aligned}$ | i.e [1] - 29:20 <br> idea [2]-85:14, | 29:18, 104: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Harden }[37]-4: 24, \\ & 5: 2,5: 10,5: 18,5: 20, \end{aligned}$ |  | highlight ${ }_{[1]}$ - 162:2 | 134:25 | 2:14, 60:25, |
| $7: 3,7: 11,7: 16,31: 7,$ | 157:9, 171:10, | highlighting [1] $55: 13$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ideal }[4]-87: 14,88: 5, \\ 143: 19,182: 20 \end{gathered}$ | 63:22, 179:17 |
| 31:18, 32:21, 48:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 177:20, 177:23 } \\ & \text { 180:7 } \end{aligned}$ | 55:13 <br> highly | 143:19, 182:20 identification [1] | includes [8] - 10:8, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 49: 10,54: 21,55: 25, \\ & 57: 10,58: 21,59: 6, \end{aligned}$ | H |  | 164:2 | $4: 10,114: 1$ |
|  | hea | him | identified [1] - 164:22 | 158:20, 179: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57:10, 58:21, 59:6, } \\ & \text { 59:25, 61:19, 63:6, } \end{aligned}$ | 4:20, 8:2, 14:5, 14:9, | 18:8, 184:1 | identify [1] - 83:23 | including [8]-9:22, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:11, 76:16, 81:20, } \\ & \text { 84:8, 92:7, 92:8, } \end{aligned}$ | 18:13, 22:6, 27:7, | Hines [16]-9:8, 26:14, | ignored [2] - 57:11 | 10:1, 42:20, 42:23, |
|  | $27: 9,27: 10,27: 1$ | , 62:3 | 61 | 4:10, 72:24, 78:6, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 84:8, 92:7, 92:8, } \\ & \text { 92:16, 97:25, 103:4, } \end{aligned}$ | -12, 28 : | 6:10, 90:24, | ignores [1] - 67:1 | 180:19 |
| 105:23, 117:17, | 16, 32:4, | 132:10, | ignoring [1] - 36:1 | income [2]-117:5, |
| 119:10, 119:25, | $\text { 82:23, 83:16, } 98: 8$ | $132: 11,134: 4$ | ii [2] - 167:19, 180:12 | 117 |
| 132:21, 140:6,$140: 24$ | 159:15, 160:10, | $134: 8,136: 17$ | II [1] - 168:6 | inconsis |
|  | 184:24 | 139:19 | iii [2] - 167:19, 180:13 | 95:1 |
| HARDEN [49] - 31:20, | hearings [2]-13:21 | history | III [1] - 168:7 | incorporate [1] - |
| $31: 23,32: 19,42: 6,$ | 1 | 10 | imagination [1] | 172:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 42:10, 42:14, 42:21, } \\ & \text { 42:25, 43:2, 48:25, } \end{aligned}$ | heart [2] | $\text { hit }[1]-145: 2$ | 48:14 | incorporating [1] |
|  | 116 | $\text { Hogan }[1]-1$ | imagine ${ }_{[1]}-31:$ | $99: 19$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 49:8, 49:12, 54:14, } \\ & \text { 54:22, 55:5, 55:9, } \end{aligned}$ | heig | hold [2] - 53:1 | immediate [1] - 123:9 | increase [8] - 11: |
| 55:14, 82:8, 82:12, | 11 | , | impact [9]-87:15, | 0:15, 35:15, 36:9, |
|  | 3 |  | :17, 91:8, 91:12, | 47:6, 47:9, 48:4, |
| 82:15, 82:18, 92:9, | 15, 51:12, 51:1 | honest [1] - 132:14 | 1:23, | 88:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 92:13, 98:1, 98:3, } \\ & \text { 106:5, 107:4, 107:7, } \end{aligned}$ | $11, \varepsilon$ |  | 102:2, 102:4, 102:7 | dependent [4] |
| 107:10, 107:24, | 19, 123:12, | hoping [1] - 72:9 | impacted [2] - 111 127:24 | 31:2, 55:17, 115:20 |
| 108:21, 109:9, | $: 5,124: S$ | horse's [1] - 93:15 | impacts [2] - 26:19, | independently [1] - |
| 109:23, 111:3, |  | Hospital [2]-33:8, | 128:20 | 58:9 |
| 119:18, 120:1, | :19, 128:21, | 86:19 | impede [1] - 101: | indicate [1] - 146:20 |
|  | :25, 129:5, | hospital [15] - 33:9, | impinges [2] - 46:9, | indicated [4]-34:14, |



| leaves [1] - 83:19 | located [4]-9:6, 9:12, | M | 125:16, 137:10, | 39:22, 39:24, 40:2, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { leaving }[4]-69: 15, \\ & 69: 16,88: 2,88: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 32:25, 96:14 <br> Iocation [9]-2:5, | M.D [6] - 86:20, | $144: 3,180: 11$ mean [32] - 26:8, | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 8,43: 9,51: 8, \\ & 53: 9,53: 10,57: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| led [1] - 181:19 | 25:1, 33:7, 53:22, | 109:15, 111:6, | 27:25, 50:14, 74:22, | 58:11, 67:21, 67:23, |
| left [1] - 92:9 | :21, 92:22, 96:20, | 11:11, 115:5, | 93:5, 96:17, 98:12, | 94:11, 94:18, 94:25, |
| legal [4]-14:8, 32:8, | 05:17, 109:12 | 6:23 | 106:18, 111:21, | 95:1, 95:10, 95:17, |
| 33:25, 45:19 | locations [1] - 68: | MAI [2] - 61:6, 93:1 | 23, 112:2 | 95:19, 95:21, |
| legally ${ }_{[1]}$ - 16:15 | Lofts [1] - 24:20 | maintain [1] - 21:3 | 石:5, 114:4, | 121:23, 154:1, |
| length ${ }_{[1]}$ - 163:5 | Lomax [6]-47:13, | maintained [1] - 51:25 | 118:20, 123:8, | 154:2, 181:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { less }[17]-24: 21, \\ & \text { 26:19. } 35: 5.68: 3 . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 19,94: 13, \\ & 118: 12,133: 23 \end{aligned}$ | Management [1] - 164:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:19, 126:15, } \\ & \text { 127:7, 130:8, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { meeting [14]-2:9, } \\ & 2: 19,4: 25,6: 9,7: 12, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:19, 35:5, 68:3, } \\ & \text { 88:13, 91:11, 95:23, } \end{aligned}$ | longtime [1] - 123:10 | 164:16 <br> manager [3] - 7 | 132:13, 143:10, | 7:23, 27:13, 39:8, |
| 103:9, 103:10, | look [39]-23:4, 23:8, | 79:14, 89:23 | 143:18, 144:19, | 39:23, 56:8, 67:9, |
| 103:12, 103:13, | 25:17, 25:18, $38: 5$, | Manager ${ }_{[1]}-1: 2$ | 45:6, 145:21, | 83:4, 131:18, 146:11 |
| 103:15, 103:20, | 56:1, 57:18, 59:2, | managing [2] - 74:13 | 146:21, 147:7, | meetings [5] - 7:2, |
| 105:8, 105:14, | :8, 65:17, 66:3 | mandatory [3]-6:4, | 167:6, 168:14, | 7:7, 7:19, 9:20, |
| 108:13, 133:10 | 6, 69:6, 69:21, | 52:25, 126:19 | 171:19, 173:9, | 132:3 |
| lesser [1] - 102:19 | 80:10, 81:19, 92:19, | map [1] - 108:23 | 176:11 | meets [6] - 44:23, |
| letter [6]-39:2, 51:10, $76 \cdot 22,154: 5$ | 92:25, 93:1, 96:10, 103:17, 103:22, | Marc [2]-2:12, 157:11 | $\begin{gathered} \text { means }[6]-13: 2 \\ 14: 6,133: 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 9,66: 13,126: 20, \\ & 129: 19,150: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 76: 22,154: 5, \\ & 162: 21,181: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103:17, 103:22, } \\ & \text { 106:20, 108:4, } \end{aligned}$ | MARC ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1:16 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:6, 133:17, } \\ & \text { 142:20, 172:18, } \end{aligned}$ | 129:19, 150:23 <br> MEMBER [100] - 7:2, |
| Letter [2] - 80:15, 81:2 | 8:5, 108:23, | Marco [2]-23: | $3: 19$ | 7:5, 7:10, 7:15, 7:23, |
| level [5] - 124:6, | 108:24, 123:12, | 141:3 | meant [4] - 12:13 | 17:17, 83:22, 84 |
| 143:25, 146:17, | :1, 130:3, | Market | 56:14, 56:16, 56:21 | 86:8, 89:21, 100:23, |
| 183:8 | 4:10, 137:7, | :14, | measure [1]-20:9 | 02:18, 104:10, |
| levels [1]-85:11 | :24, 146:22 | :18, 25:25, 26:20, | media [1] - 3:4 | 105:5, 107:3, |
| license [1] - 90:24 | 147:19, 176:25, | $5: 19,66: 3,66: 16,$ | medical [5]-59:13, | 107:14, 107:20, |
| lie [1] - 91:13 | 182:5 | 94:15, 95:7, 105:16, | 87:19, 116:3, | 108:18, 109:6, |
| life [1] - 110:17 | looked [15] - 11:6, | 15:10, 117:4, | 116:19, 116:20 | 109:17, 109:22, |
| lifestyle [1] - 20:17 | $11: 13,56: 4,66: 5$, $66 \cdot 6,90 \cdot 25,91 \cdot 6$, | 117:11, 117:25, | Medical [4] - 32:2, 32:22, 32:25, 33:6 | 109:25, 111:17, 114:6, 115:3, |
| lifetime [1] - 142:13 | 66:6, 90:25, 91:6, | 118:15, 118:16 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 114: 6,115: 3, \\ & 115: 16,115: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { light }[4]-43: 9,77: 21, \\ & 78: 20,179: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 93:2, 103:7, 106:14, } \\ & \text { 123:25, 131:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 118:24, 123:4 } \\ & \text { market-derived } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MEEKS [40] - 1:13, } \\ 5: 4,6: 19,17: 11, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:16, 115:24, } \\ & \text { 116:15, 117:10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| lighting [1] - 179:5 | 145:2, 162:19 | 123:4 | 29:5, 30:5, 30:8, | 117:12, 118:17, 119:4, 122:9, |
| likely [1] - 133:8 | looking [9] - 3:25, 16:25, 101:12, | marketing [1] - 139:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:9, 119:12, } \\ & \text { 119:25, 120:2, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 119:4, 122:9, } \\ & \text { 123:17, 124:11, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { limit }[3]-35: 13,53: 1, \\ & 109: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 16:25, 101:12, <br> 118:7, 125:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { marketplace [5] - } \\ & 64: 11,64: 17,64: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 119: 25,120: 2, \\ & \text { 120:13, 120:15, } \end{aligned}$ | 124:18, 125:1, |
| limitation [1] - 52:9 | 141:1, 147:6, | 94:8, 123:6 | 121:5, 122:1, 122:4, | 26:10, 126:12, |
| limitations [1] - 57:2 | 153:25, 178:5 looks [2]-28:13, | massing [3] - 51:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:7, 148:12, } \\ & \text { 148:14, 148:17, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 126:15, 131:9, } \\ & \text { 151:5, 151:8, } \end{aligned}$ |
| limited [4] - 13:25, | looks [2]-28:13, 129:16 | 84:14, 85:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 148:14, 148:17, } \\ & \text { 148:25, 149:12, } \end{aligned}$ | 151:18, 151:25, |
| 28:4, 33:2, 97:5 | Ioop [1] - 23:18 | massive [1] - 85:15 | $51: 15,152: 12$ | 152:22, 153:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { line }[6]-57: 18,73: 2, \\ & 105: 16,132: 7,166: 4 \end{aligned}$ | Loretta [1] - 18:20 | Master [3]-9:22, 23:7, | $55: 13,156: 11,$ | 153:17, 153:24, 154:16, 155:5, |
| linear [1] - 23:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Iose [2] - 110:14, } \\ & 135: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 171:4 | 59:4, 159:8, <br> 59:21, 161:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 154: 16,155: 5, \\ & 155: 9,155: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { lines }[3]-58: 1,58: 13, \\ & 80: 13 \end{aligned}$ | losing [4] - 135:8 | $\begin{gathered} \text { material }[4]-57: 20, \\ 57: 21,71: 24,72: 7 \end{gathered}$ | 168:21, 172:13, | 155:20, 155:22, |
| lineup [1] - 104:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 135: 9,135: 19, \\ & 135: 23 \end{aligned}$ | materials [19]-14:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 172:23, 173:6, } \\ & \text { 173:10, 173:16, } \end{aligned}$ | 156:9, 156:10, |
| list ${ }_{[1]}$ - 92:9 | $\text { love }[1]-91: 4$ | $55: 23,58: 8,60: 16,$ | 78:20, 179:23, | 156:24, 159:12, |
| listed [2]-149:14, | low [1] - 24:10 | 61:1, 67:6, 67:25, 71:3, 72:18, 164:24, | 180:21, 183:25 | 159:17, 159:18, |
| 167:18 | lower [8] - 35:25, | 3, 72:18, 164:24, | Meeks [7] - 5:3, 5:16, | 159:19, 159:20, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { live }[4]-65: 2,115: 23, \\ 116: 5,116: 12 \end{gathered}$ | $52: 23,53: 1,68: 14,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:3, 176:8, } \\ & \text { 176:13, 176:14, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 17:10, 119:8, } \\ & \text { 121:14. 175:22. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 160:13, 160:22, } \\ & \text { 161:2, 161:14, } \end{aligned}$ |
| liveable ${ }_{[1]}-144: 11$ | 68:21, 101:20, $105: 10,150: 19$ | 76:16, 178:10, | 121:14, 175:22, 179:20 | 168:2, 168:8, 173:7, |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { living }[4]-21: 7, \\ 116: 16,118: 4, \end{array}$ | lowest [2]-24:11, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 179:3, 179:4, 179:7 } \\ & \text { math [2] - 104:19, } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { meet }[41]-12: 21,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 173: 23,173: 25, \\ & 174: 16,174: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
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| Room [1] - 1:8 | 152:20, 153:3, | 154:3, 161:1 | 125:25, 154:6, | simple [1] - 63:8 |
| roommate's [1] | 154:21, 155:12, 155:13, 159:11, | 165:12, 166:13, | shaped [2] - 101.21 | simplifies [2]-47:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 97:10 } \\ & \text { roughly [3] - 78:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 155:13, 159:11, } \\ & \text { 159:12, 161:1, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 176:4, 176:9, 176:18 } \\ & \text { setback [52] - 11:10, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shaped [2] - 101:21, } \\ & 154: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 47:24 } \\ & \text { simplify }[4]-20: \end{aligned}$ |
| 10:14, 124 | 161:13 | 2, 12: | sha | 47:21, 100:9, 1 |
| row [1]-22:9 | 161:14, 180:15 | 10, 36:17, 40: | shared [1] - 58 | simply [4]-90:18, |
| Rubio [5] - 80:18, | secondary [1] - 66:3 <br> seconded [1]-173:2 | 48:5, 51:3, 58: | sheds [1] - 43 | 91:9, 118:4, 125:1 |
| 83:19, 83:20, 8 |  | 3, 59:10, 59:1 | sheet [1] - 154 | single [1] - 80:23 |
| 86 |  | 16, 61:12, 61:1 | sheets [1] - 179 | sit [4]-98:3, 134:19, |
| Rules [1] - 31:6 <br> rules [5] - 8:5, 34:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { secondly }[2]-56: 13, \\ & 57: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 61:21, 62:1, 67: | shifted [1] - 114 | 143:3, 143:25 |
|  |  | , 76:23, 78: | shifts [1]-96:7 | site [73]-9:19, 12:8, |
| $57: 7,57: 8,76: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seconds [2] - 42:19, } \\ & 88: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : 24,100: 3,100: 6 \\ & 0: 24,106: 21, \end{aligned}$ | shipyards [1] - 118:7 <br> shocked [2] - 132:13, | $21: 18,21: 25,25: 2$ |
| running [2] - 49:20, | Section [2]-10:2, | 125:15, 125:19, | 132:15 | $34: 8,34: 9,35: 3,$ |
|  |  | 134:3 | sh | 35:7, 35:20, 37:4 |
| rush [2]-106:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { section }[6]-50: 21, \\ & 51: 12,51: 22, \\ & 140: 11,168: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 4:6, 134:7 | 50:1 | 39:6, 39:15, 40:8 |
|  |  | 134:18, 134:20, | shortly [1] - 148:17 | 45:23, 47:16, 54 |
|  |  | 140:5, 140:10 | 25 | 7:3, |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { see }[37]-2: 13,6: 24, \\ \text { 19:15, 19:16, } 23: 22, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : 17,151: 13 \\ & : 22,153: 2, \end{aligned}$ | show [5] - 40:3, 66:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 9,59: 10,59: 12, \\ & 59: 14,59: 19,66: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { safe }[3]-21: 3,146: 3, \\ & 147: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24:8, 43:21, 46:13, } \\ & 55: 11,77: 25,78: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 4,153: 6, \\ & 3: 10,153: 14 \end{aligned}$ | showed [6] - 2: | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 13,67: 3,68: 6, \\ & 69: 3,73: 13,73: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| safety [6]-41:1, |  | :15, 153:19 | $61: 22,61: 23,62:$ | $4: 18,77: 20,86:$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 145: 20,146: 3, \\ & \text { 147:20, 147:24, } \end{aligned}$148:23 |  | 161 | showing [2] - 77:2 | 6:14, 86:15, 86:23, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 20,93: 15,96: 11, \\ & 105: 6,113: 1,113: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 1:18, 163: | 179:3 | 15, 87:21, 90:22, |
|  | 123:11, 127:5, | 163:14 - 0 , | sh | 02:5, 104:25, |
| sale [1]-136:4 <br> samples [2]-176:17, 179:2 | 127:10, 130:4 | Setbacks [1] - 50:21 | $87: 23,129: 7,134: 11$ | :13, 116:8, |
|  | 135:24, 135:25 | setbacks [28]-11:8 | sic [3] - 30:19, 137:12, | 22:12, 122:13, |
|  | 142:10, 142:23 | 24:12, 26:7, 34:10, | 183:2 | :15, 124:8, |
| 179:2 <br> San [2] - 23:10, 141:3 | 172:7, 176:18, | 34:17, 36:1, 36:2, | [12] - 43:22, 44 | 25:17, 126:17, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { San }[2]-23: 10,141: 3 \\ & \text { sat }[2]-111: 22, \\ & 142: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 172:7, 176:18, } \\ & \text { 182:15, 182:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 8,36: 9,43: 11, \\ & \text { 43:14, 44:5, 44:23, } \end{aligned}$ | 71:13, 97:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 127:19, 127:20, } \\ & 130: 16,132: 13, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 183:9, 183:10 | $5: 10,45: 11,50: 20$ | 18, 109:15, | 33:21, 133:22, |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { saw }[5]-22: 25,23: 2, \\ 23: 18,113: 8,182: 7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seeking [5] - 20:17, } \\ & 35: 1,50: 20,58: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $: 9,52: 8,59: 7,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 111: 12,114: 3, \\ & 107.12 \quad 162.1 \end{aligned}$ | $34: 1,138: 20$ |
|  |  | :20, 81:3, 95:3, |  | 38:23, 144:18, |
| Sawyer [1] -5:8scale [2]-85:16, | seem [1] - 105:9 | 24, 96:25, 99:9, | ed | 45:15, 146:9, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { seem }[1]-105: 9 \\ & \text { Seibert }[1]-94: 12 \end{aligned}$ | , 144:17 | $\text { 136:25, } 165$ | 54:9, 181:7, |
| scale [2]-85:16, |  | sets [1]-38:1 | sides [1] - 155:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 181:17, 183:10 } \\ & \text { sites }[1]-97: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\operatorname{scan}_{[1]}-81: 1$ | send [1] - 30:3 <br> sense [5]-21:1, 48:8, | $\text { setting }[4]-132: 23$ | SIEBERT [5] - 65:3, | sites [1] - 97:18 <br> sitting [3] - 132:1 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { scenario [3] - 70:22, } \\ \text { 102:22, 112:4 } \end{gathered}$ | sense [5] - 21:1, 48:8, | 132:24, 133:19, | 65:10, 65:15, 66:1 66:17 | $140: 25,169: 9$ |
| schedule $[3]-3: 17$,$3: 19$ |  |  |  | situation [2] - 138:25 |
|  |  | settings [1] - 145 | , 55:20, 64:2 | 143:19 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sentence }[1]-89: 9 \\ & \text { separate }[7]-16: 21, \end{aligned}$ | seven [12]-20:7, <br> 27.2, 28:13, 41.7, | 64:25, 65:3, 80:16, | six [7] - 58:1, 58:3, |
| scheme [1] - 164:24 <br> screen [1] - 62:11 <br> seamless [1] - 31:15 | $16: 23,75: 17,99: 20$ | 49:13, 58:3, 67:7, | 83:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 58: 4,81: 13,116: 21, \\ & 132: 2,144: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 143:25, 149:16, | $3: 9,103: 2,103: 6,$ | Siebert's [1]-116:2 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sean }[10]-55: 20, \\ & 64: 23,64: 24,65: 3, \end{aligned}$ | separately [4]-16:22, | 32:2 | sign $[7]$ - 113:4, | sliced [1] - 144:19 |
| 64:23, 64:24, 65:3, 65:5, 65:7, 66:21, 80:16, 83:13 | $\text { 29:14, 29:15, } 99: 3$ | several [1]-58:16 | 154:25, 161:7, | slightly [2] - 35:5 |
|  | serious [1] - 115:2 | severe [1] - 50:25 | 159:24, 161:7, | slips [1] - 26:18 |
| second [39]-3:12, | seriously [3] - 37:24, | severely $[1]$ - 145:23 | signage $[3]-165: 5$ | small [2]-132:17, |
| 3:14, 11:13, 35:16, | $37: 25,38: 1$ | shall [16]-51:23, | 165:19 | 139:20 |
| 37:23, 39:13, 40:23, | served $[1]-141: 15$serves $[1]-124: 17$ | 64:1 | signalized [1] - 139:2 | smallest [1] -66:12 |
| 44:5, 47:6, 48:17, |  | :19, 140:1 | significant ${ }_{[1]}-90: 11$ | socially [1] - 90:5 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 61:15, 63:10, 69:24, } \\ & 71: 19,74: 1,77: 1, \end{aligned}$ | serves [1] - 124:17 service [1] - 89:25 |  | $\text { signing }[1]-17: 22$ | soften [1] - 144:8 |
|  | session [1] - 83:4 | 164:7, 164:11, | signs [1] - 165:15 | sold [3]-74:17, 128:3, |


| 128:5 <br> solutions [1] - 12:11 someone [1] - 115:4 something's [1] 30:24 <br> sometimes [2] 127:12, 184:25 sorry [24]-8:22, 19:9, 38:15, 42:8, 43:3, 44:1, 54:22, 89:10, 92:18, 103:14, 114:13, 120:12, 137:17, 152:3, 164:3, 167:13, 169:1, 175:23, <br> 176:1, 177:4, 177:8, 177:11, 184:12 <br> sort [3]-22:12, 45:18, 144:6 <br> sorts [1] - 55:12 <br> sound [1] - 113:6 <br> sounds [3] - 5:9, <br> 122:11, 124:21 <br> South [3]-86:9, <br> 124:3, 138:1 <br> south [3]-88:3, <br> 164:8, 164:25 <br> Southbank [5] - 9:7, $23: 17,33: 1,33: 7$, $44: 11$ 44:11 <br> southbound [1] 138:15 <br> Southside [1] - 113:23 Southwest $[1]-74: 11$ space [14]-10:10, 24:21, 62:22, 63:3, 88:19, 101:12, 132:24, 133:19, 139:16, 142:8, 144:10, 144:24, 144:25, 157:11 spaces [54] - 10:7, 10:9, 11:21, 24:16, 25:9, 50:22, 53:25, 54:4, 68:18, 68:22, 72:16, 72:17, 72:18, 72:23, 75:12, 95:8, 101:17, 101:20, 102:24, 103:23, 103:25, 104:2, 104:3, 104:8, 104:14, 104:17, 109:16, 110:11, 110:13, 110:14, 111:2, 113:20, 121:13, 121:15, 121:19, 129:8, 129:14, 129:15, 132:19, 133:24, 150:11, 150:12, |  | 146:16 <br> standstill [1] - 90:16 start [13]-2:18, 4:23, 8:6, 82:2, 82:6, 82:20, 82:25, 98:16, 98:17, 100:2, <br> 140:18, 147:6, <br> 151:11 <br> started [3]-31:23, 42:9, 131:17 starting [5] - 13:22, 36:11, 80:12, 136:7, 159:4 <br> starts [1]-81:6 <br> State [1] - 1:10 <br> state [2]-19:3, 137:25 <br> STATE [1] - 186:3 <br> statements [6]-59:6, 59:25, 60:1, 67:25, 84:8, 126:24 <br> states [1]-51:22 <br> static [1]-88:22 <br> stay $[4]-3: 18,28: 18$, 88:3, 125:13 <br> stays [1] - 87:25 <br> stem [1]-90:12 <br> stenographic [1] - <br> 186:11 <br> stenographically [1] 186:9 <br> step [5]-15:10, 15:12, <br> 15:13, 51:17, 85:10 steps $[4]-51: 4,84: 19$, 134:22, 182:14 <br> Steve [15]-7:17, 31:1, 32:17, 34:24, 42:14, 54:23, 55:17, 87:17, 92:9, 94:20, 98:4, $115: 19,136 \cdot 18$, 148:7, 175:24 <br> stickler [2] - 181:10, <br> 181:12 <br> still [19]-32:5, 32:11, 32:14, 54:8, 62:10, 72:1, 72:12, 73:3, 82:8, 90:13, 93:25, 99:24, 104:20, 116:19, 129:13, 134:7, 135:24, 135:25, 160:16 stimulate [1] - 87:2 stop [1]-53:13 stopped [1] - 139:2 stories [10]-40:19, 46:11, 48:3, 124:5, 133:25, 134:5, 134:12, 134:14, 134:16, 134:17 straight $[8]-64: 16$, 64:17, 108:23, |  | ```175:5, 175:13, 180:23 submittal [1]-62:1 submitted [14] - 10:24, 13:23, 55:22, 58:2, 60:18, 61:2, 67:7, 70:15, 71:25, 72:3, 72:7, 72:19, 83:10, 179:14 Subparagraph [1] - 127:15 Subsection [1] - 149:24 substantial [21] - 14:8, 14:15, 33:13, 37:15, 37:21, 38:23, 40:4, 41:20, 46:14, 50:12, 54:11, 54:12, 57:15, 93:11, 120:6, 120:8, 120:23, 123:7, 149:19, 150:7, 181:21 substantially [8] - 40:6, 40:8, 45:12, 120:16, 120:18, 127:17, 127:21, 128:10 substantive [1] - 143:16 suburban [3]-25:1, 67:18, 113:15 successful [1] - 113:4 sudden [1] - 112:22 suddenly [1]-132:3 sufficient [1] - 180:10 suggest [2]-25:3, 41:19 suggested [1] - 165:14 Suite [5] - 31:2, 55:17, 63:18, 70:13, 115:20 summarize [2] - 103:8, 103:16 summarizes [1] - 59:4 summarizing [1] - 103:18 summary [5]-9:3, 9:9, 10:25, 56:6, 80:11 superimposed [1] - 77:20 supervising \({ }_{[1]}\) - 74:18 supplemental [1] - 12:9 supplemented [1] - 71:9 support [14]-12:17, 58:2, 71:16, 117:6, 149:20, 149:23,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |




| visit ${ }_{[1]}$ - 97:15 | 161:18, 163:7, | word [1] - 56:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { visitors [3] - 21:4, } \\ 110: 12,110: 22 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 163:18, 163:20, } \\ & 163: 24 \end{aligned}$ | word's [1] - 174:12 <br> words [7]-16:3,53:5, |
| visits [1] - 114:23 | wayfaring [1] - 165:18 | $58: 6,66: 14,66: 15$ |
| vistas [3]-77:22, | wayfinding [3] - | 68:7, 68:17 |
| 78:16, 78:21 | 165:5, 165:15, | work-in-progress [1] - |
| vital [1] - 64:9 | 165:20 | 72:1 |
| vote [13]-18:1, 18:4, | Wayne [2] - 70:12, | workers [1]-21:4 |
| 18:6, 29:15, 29:16, | 83:14 | Works [1]-164:17 |
| 29:19, 99:12, 136:9, | ways [5] - 23:9, 24:13, | works [4]-25:19, |
| 152:10, 155:25, | 65:8, 65:12, 144:20 | 25:20, 94:2, 146:16 |
| 167:3, 184:15, 184:18 | wealth $[1]-114: 22$ Wednesday $[1]-1: 6$ | workshop [5] - 21:17, |
| $\begin{gathered} 184: 18 \\ \text { voted }[6]-29 \end{gathered}$ | Wednesday ${ }_{[1]}-1: 6$ week [1] - 17:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 8,143: 11, \\ & \text { 143:25, 146:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 56:10, 99:3, 99:15, | $\text { weigh }_{[1]}-16: 10$ | workshops [3]-9:21, |
| 174:8, 180:23 | Welch [1] - 80:20 | 112:5, 132:3 |
| votes [3]-99:19, | welcoming [1] - 51:5 | world [6] - 48:2, 66:8, |
| 184:14, 184:17 | welfare [1] - 41:1 | 127:5, 129:11, |
| voting [11] - 18:3, | well-known [1] - 8:15 | 133:1, 143:21 |
| 105:19, 107:17, | west [1]-138:20 | worried [1] - 153:2 |
| 153:18, 154:14, | Wester [5]-63:11, | worst [2]-89:3, |
| 154:24, 156:13, | 63:17, 77:3, 80:22, | 102:22 |
| 159:23, 161:6, | 83:13 | worst-case [1] - |
| 161:22, 184:2 | WESTER [6] - 63:17, | 102:22 |
| W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:25, 64:20, } 77: 6 \\ & 77: 9,77: 12 \end{aligned}$ | worth [1] - 150:22 <br> Worth [3] - 116:4, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { wait }[3]-31: 11, \\ & 156: 25,174: 17 \\ & \text { waiting [2] - } 2: 6, \\ & \text { 142:17 } \end{aligned}$ | 96:24 | wrapped [1] - 176:7 |
|  | Wester's [3]-63:12, | writing [1] - 55:13 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68:8, 96:10 } \\ & \text { whatnot }[1]-78: 18 \end{aligned}$ | wrote [1] - 41:23 |
| waivers [1]-36:22 <br> walk [8]-22:19, | whatsoever [1] - 143:4 | Y |
| 37:23, 38:18, 62:23, | whereas [1] - 88:1 | y'all [3] - 143:8, 145:2, |
| $78: 7,86: 23, ~ 99: 21$, 113.25 | whichever ${ }_{[1]}$ - 29:3 | 146:22 |
| 113:25 | whole [22] - 21:12, | year [1] - 64:7 |
| walkability [5] - 20:21 22:15, 48:1, 48:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 23,29: 16,29: 20, \\ & 74: 23,80: 25,99: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { years }[6]-33: 12,50: 8 \text {, } \\ 63: 13,118: 8, \end{gathered}$ |
| 122:17 | 99:19, 112:4, | 137:16, 137:22 |
| walkable [1] - 20:23 | 132:12, 133:7, | yes/no [1] - 19:15 |
| walking [1]-86:21 | 133:9, 149:9, 150:5, | yesterday [2] - |
| wall [3]-84:12, 84:23, 92.20 | 162:2, 162:4, 167:3, | $\text { 145:22, } 145: 24$ |
| 92:20 <br> WALLACE [1]-1:18 | 167:8, 168:15, | yourself $[7]-63: 15$, |
| $\text { walls [1] - } 51: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 169:17, 179:21 } \\ & \text { wide }[1]-51: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65:2, 69:22, 70:10, } \\ & 73: 18,74: 7,83: 24 \end{aligned}$ |
| Walt [2]-118:25, | widening [1] - 44:10 |  |
| 124:3 | wider [1] - 145:12 | Z |
| Walter [4]-75:19, | width $[3]$ - 163:5, |  |
| 80:16, 86:6, 86:9 | 164:10, 164:11 | zero [1] - 153:7 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { wants }[3]-92: 19, \\ 98: 4,175: 9 \end{gathered}$ | willing [1] - 48:18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Zone }[3]-4: 17,10: 14, \\ & 170: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| watch [1]-142:9 | Wolfson [3]-33:8 | zone [2] - 9:23, 19:22 |
| watched [1] - 142:16 | 86:19, 116:23 | zones [1] - 51:18 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { water [3] - 153:5, } \\ 153: 13,153: 15 \end{array}$ | Women's [2] - 33:8, 109:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Zoning [15] - 10:15, } \\ & \text { 13:17, 14:22, 15:18, } \end{aligned}$ |
| waterfront [17] - 12:3, | wonderful [4] - | 16:1, 36:16, 49:25, |
| 13:3, 20:25, 48:7, | 112:13, 147:10, | 54:9, 94:22, 95:24, |
| 48:9, 48:14, 58:25, | 182:14, 182:22 | 96:1, 97:1, 121:19, |
| 78:5, 107:13, 153:4, | wondering [1] - | 170:20, 171:5 |
| 153:19, 161:9, | 115:10 | zoning [1] - 5:11 |

