



**Planning and Zoning
Commission
Minutes
July 17, 2025
Council Chambers
6:00 PM**



I CALL TO ORDER

Present: 4- Glen Jaffee (Chair); Kathleen McIver (Vice-Chair); Greg Hardwick; Jody Barry.

Absent: 1- Eddie Baird

Chair Glen Jaffee called the July 17, 2025 meeting to order at 6 pm. Staff also in attendance: Attorney Drew Smith, Chief Planner Sara Blanchard, Senior Planner Barrett Chaix, and Planner III Jamie Kay Bennett.

II PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

1 PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 5, 2025.

RESULT: Adopt the Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes of June 5, 2025

MOVER: McIver

SECONDER: Hardwick

AYES: McIver, Hardwick, Barry, Jaffee

NAYS: None

IV PUBLIC PERIOD

Chair Jaffee opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone in the audience present who wished to speak on a non-agenda item. Seeing none, the public period was closed.

V PUBLIC HEARING

1 CDP(2025)-0001: COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN (CDP) AMENDMENT MAITLAND CONCOURSE NORTH, LOT 6.

Sara Blanchard, Senior Planner, provided a presentation on the item.

The applicants, David Weekley Homes and Kimley-Horn and Associates, are proposing to amend the City of Maitland Comprehensive

Development Plan (CDP) Future Land Use Element. The amendment would alter the Maitland Concourse North area of special consideration's Overall Land Use Mix (Table 1.1.13.11) to add 85 townhomes and also exclude residential parking garages from the calculation of floor area ratio (Standard 1.1.3.10). The applicants are proposing to develop the 85 townhome units on Lot 6 of Maitland Concourse North Planned Development.

The applicants have provided an analysis of the proposed CDP amendment, including fiscal analysis and analysis of the amendment on levels of service. On April 3, 2025 the applicants held a neighborhood meeting at Maitland City Hall to provide information about the project and solicit comments and answer questions from the public. The applicants provided notes from this neighborhood meeting which are included for reference.

BACKGROUND:

Maitland Concourse North (MCN) was previously approved as part of a CDP amendment (Ord. 1236) and subsequent rezoning to Planned Development with an accompanying PD Plan (Ord. 1303). The CDP amendment allowed a mix of office, residential, commercial and public/semi-public uses on the Maitland Concourse North property. The area designated as Lot 6 was permitted for a mix of office, residential (10-20 DU/acre) and commercial uses. The floor area ratio for these uses was capped at 0.50, excluding parking structures.

At present, the transportation and stormwater infrastructure for MCN has been completed, as well as the development of approximately 75,000 SF of commercial structures, an Assisted Living Facility, and a 350 unit multifamily development. Another 75,000 SF of commercial structures have been approved as part of the PD plan and are currently in site construction permit review. A 10.12 acre passive park has been given a Parks and Recreation land use designation and ownership has been transferred to the City of Maitland. Lot 6 and Lot 3 remain undeveloped, and are subject to PD plan approval prior to development.

NEXT STEPS:

After a recommendation by the Planning and Zoning Commission, the application for CDP Amendment would be placed on a City Council agenda for a decision to either deny the application or transmit it to FloridaCommerce for review and comment. After expedited state review, the City Council would hold a second hearing to amend the CDP. If the CDP is amended, the applicant would next amend the Planned Development prior to Site Plan Review, Platting, and building permits. An

application to amend the Planned Development was submitted to the City on June 12, 2025 and is undergoing staff review.

After staffs' presentation, Glen Jaffee asked for clarification on the new townhome units, that we're not adding additional square footage to the overall project, only that additional townhome units were being added to the table in the CDP. Jody Barry pointed out that the addition of townhome units would use square footage allocated to other uses, we just didn't know which ones. Greg Hardwick asked for the acreage of Lot 6, which is 7.67 acres. Kathleen McIver asked what the SF allocated for Lot 6 was, and it was clarified that issue was not in the CDP, but only in the PD plan. Jody Barry asked about the uses available to the lot within the PD without a CDP amendment. Blanchard clarified that any of those other uses, up to four stories in height, could be built without amending the PD including office or other commercial uses. Barry asked if it's common for PDs to be subject to minor changes such as this. Blanchard explained that some are, but this one was established in the CDP and it must be amended in addition to the PD amendment, such as the recent amendment to add a drive-through use to Lot 1. Jaffee observed that it was unlikely that the PD could absorb the entirety of the square footage approved for it. Blanchard explained specific areas in the middle of the PD, including Lot 6, were designed for higher intensity and four-story height.

Jonathan Huels of Lowndes Law spoke on behalf of the applicant. He described the development process and provided details on the project. He stated that the site is currently entitled with 167,000 square feet of office use with a structured parking garage that does not count towards site FAR limits. He showed aerial images of the site. He showed a preview of the PD amendment site layout and conceptual building elevations. He pointed out the existing drainage easement between the townhomes and the natural area/park. He noted that the transmittal hearing at City Council will be on August 11. He referred to the application material and stated that he believes the project is consistent with the overall PD and CDP in scale and character. He noted that the proposed project would be more consistent with the intent of the PD plan than a potential project implemented through the Live Local Act. He stated they believe it's a better transition than the office product would be and also result in less traffic and using less water. He asked for P & Z's recommendation of transmittal to City Council.

Jody Barry asked for clarification of the width of the drainage easement (167 FT) and noted it wasn't the applicant's intention to build up to the treeline. Jaffee asked about the number of trips generated by the different uses, noting that it would be a reduction in daily trips. Hardwick asked how likely the numbers (of trip generation) were to change. Huels stated

that the numbers would not change since they were based on the number of units which would be set in the CDP. However, both noted the PD amendment hasn't completed staff review. Jaffee asked if it would be a for-sale product. Huels said it would be platted and sold as a fee-simple lots. Jaffee then opened the hearing for the public to speak.

Paul Herwig stated that he opposes 85 townhome units. He's concerned about the elevation of the units. He stated that some units on Lot 6 should be limited to two stories because the other residential uses on Lot 7 have a "transition zone", for consistency. He stated that Kimley-Horn's own drawings has acknowledged a transition zone and they are seeking special treatment. He stated that the amendment is incomplete and needs to be denied.

Nicole Herwig, 1410 Druid Isle Road, stated that the notes on the neighborhood meeting by the applicant were a complete misrepresentation. She stated that their comments about their neighborhood were ignored. She stated they don't want noise or boats and that it would destroy their neighborhood. She stated that they are being ignored right now by the applicants and they aren't being heard. She stated that everyone is on vacation and that's why they aren't here. She stated there are two sides to the story and this would destroy the natural area. She stated they went to Tampa and that it was horrible, like a storage facility, and that would be what they would build in Maitland. She said that they do have to do a step-down.

Jessica Guthrie, 1504 Druid Isle Road, stated she had been a resident there since 1967. She stated that she's seen it change a lot and she believes there is a glut of office space, if its allowed, it would be a much worse situation than building residential. She said that a parking garage would result in transient people with no connection to the community. She prefers a residential development, but one with guardrails. She listed ideas from the neighborhood meeting she was interested in seeing: A gated community because it would bring in the type of people that they would like to see in the community, no lake access, no preserve access, no short-term rentals, living there for a year before doing long-term rentals, only allowing a certain percentage to be rented, or disallow rentals altogether, light and noise pollution must be taken care of. She asked if it's the last public period, and if the easement can be formalized.

Heidi Berry, 1314 Druid Isle Road, stated she was unaware that the parking garage SF wasn't included. She stated she agrees that things in the meeting weren't addressed. She stated that when they built the ALF there were things they wanted, but some things were addressed such as the plantings. She stated that when we ask for things, it's to protect the

value of the homes -- When they ask for a fence, they are trying to protect our homes since they pay high taxes to live on the lake and they are trying to protect our investments over people who don't live there. She asked about the impact fees, to make sure money will support the schools. She stated a huge concern about water going into the retention pond and no drainage into the lake.

Huels responded to the public comments. He stated that he realized the interest is in the details of the project. He stated that: the property doesn't have lake access nor is it being sought; short-term rentals are not being proposed; the drainage easement is being left in place; the stormwater system is already designed and is designed to accommodate the highest and most intense use allowed; this development will pay impact fees and homes will be taxed; we are proposing an improvement in height overall over what is allowed by right -- we are proposing three stories and will agree to conditions limiting us to that; square footage of garage would not be counted towards overall FAR. He stated the garage is integrated into three stories, but not counted towards FAR.

Hardwick asked if we have a townhome ordinance. Blanchard replied that we have a definition in the LDC. Huels responded that the garage would not be facing outwards. Jaffee asked about height transition, and City Attorney Drew Smith clarified that it was to be dealt with at the PD level. Hardwick noted we will have another opportunity to discuss details of the PD. Barry emphasized importance of lighting and discouraging lake access. Huels described that the stormwater system is already in place and will be reverified during the development process. McIver stated she would think the residents would prefer looking at townhomes rather than a four-story office building and structured parking. She stated the financial comparisons to Montecino, meant property sales at 750-800 range, that people spending that kind of money on property would not be disruptive. She stated some things need to be addressed down the road: She'd like to see a gated community; light and noise pollution addressed with LED; drainage goes under the master stormwater plan; Montecino was developed 20 years ago and Maitland has not seen a product like that in 20 years, which is important for residents who want to scale down and stay in the city and live and own. She stated she'd like to see a restriction on short-term rentals, homeowners, rather than investors; a very nice use of the land. Jaffee stated that we also live here, and care as much as you do about our community. He stated that the developers also don't have an interest in creating bad outcomes. He stated he always thought office on this lot was a mistake; and this is a better use to support the businesses, and neighbors do a better job of policing the community than office users will. He stated that you don't own your view, even on the lake, you can drop in cypress trees to help protect and preserve your view that might change. He stated that staff should address it if people

are misusing the lake, but it's not the people who would be living there. He stated short-term rental issues should be addressed by the developer. Jaffee ended the discussion among the commissioners and asked for a motion.

Motion: To recommend to City Council to transmit the proposed CDP Amendment to the state for review;

RESULT:	Approved
MOVER:	Mclver
SECONDER:	Barry
AYES:	Mclver, Hardwick, Barry, Jaffee
NAYS:	None

VI OLD BUSINESS

VII NEW BUSINESS

VIII OTHER BUSINESS THE COMMISSION DEEMS ADVISABLE

Jaffee suggested a workshop to see if there were things we could be doing better as a city to work with developers. Barry also seconds that and thinks we need to hear from those that have had bad experiences. Hardwick also stated he doesn't see any barriers to holding a workshop on the topic with P & Z and City Council.

Staff provided an update on development projects underway.

IX ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:32 pm.