



**Ad Hoc Sustainability
Committee Minutes
February 10, 2021
Council Chambers
6:00 PM**



I. CALL TO ORDER

Committee Chair Marc Walch called the meeting to order. In attendance were committee members Karen Simasek, John Hazelroth, Courtney Christl, and Lisa Roberts. Also in attendance were City Manager Sharon Anselmo and Assistant City Manager Mark Reggentin.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. PRESENTATIONS

There were no presentations.

IV. PUBLIC PERIOD

The Committee Chair opened the public period. There were no members of the public wishing to address the Committee and the Chair closed the public period.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. MINUTES FROM JANUARY 13, 2021

A motion to approve the minutes of 1/13/2021 was made by Lisa Roberts, seconded by John Hazelroth and unanimously approved.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

1. RESOLUTION TO CREATE PERMANENT SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY BOARD

Chairperson Walch opened the item and recognized Staff liaison Sharon Anselmo. Ms. Anselmo presented a draft resolution for the Ad Hoc Sustainability Committee to transition to a Sustainability Advisory Board. Staff mentioned the only concern is that as structured the members' terms would all expire at the same time. Member Christl asked if three years term is standard for boards, and Ms. Anselmo responded that it is standard and explained the filing of unexpired terms. Member Simasek asked what the process is for sending to Council and Ms. Anselmo explained that the Committee would need to take a vote recommending the item and it would be placed on the City Council agenda and typically a member of the Committee, such as the Chair, would attend to represent the Committee. Member Simasek asked was the item going on March 22nd, and Ms. Anselmo clarified it would be February 22nd. The Chair stated it would be nice if the item was on consent and Committee members could just send

emails in support. The Committee and Ms. Anselmo discussed whether consent was the right place for the item, or if Council would want to discuss the item. Lisa Roberts made a motion seconded by Karen Simasek to forward the item to Council. The Chair opened the public period for the item.

Vance Guthrie, 1504 Druid Isle Road asked whether when the item comes to the Council, will it state when the board meets. Ms. Anselmo stated that rules for meetings are attached to the resolution and included in the by-laws and constitution, but like most boards the actual dates of meetings are not in the documents. Although the Board meets on a regular schedule, the actual date may change due to availability of board members. The Chair asked does the document spell out the Board meets monthly, and Ms. Anselmo explained it may change over time so that is typically not included.

The Chair asked if anyone else wanted to speak and with no one else wanting to be heard, the public period was closed.

Lisa Roberts made a motion seconded by Karen Simasek to send the item to City Council, which was unanimously approved.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

1. REVIEW OF LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE

The Chair recognized the staff liaison to present the comments made by Committee members on the Land Development Code. Ms. Anselmo stated that the document being presented and sent to the Committee has merged comments from 4 of the Committee members together. After going over the comments, staff can put together the comments in a memorandum or similar format for recommendation.

Ms. Anselmo stated the first comment relates to the purpose of the Downtown plan and believes that this comes right from the adopted plan. Member Simasek stated she wanted to be sure somewhere the plan addresses leaving green space, so that in the future someone would be prevented from converting the open space. Ms. Anselmo stated that development site plan require a minimum amount of open space and they cannot go below the approved threshold. The next comment related to the Maitland Edge district, and Ms. Anselmo explained the intent of the edge district and that this section is just explaining the two districts. The next comment related to the principal uses, specifically under Public uses, would "public parks and recreation facilities" include a public garden. Ms. Anselmo clarified that the table includes active and passive uses, and that a public garden would be designated a passive public park and would be allowed in the downtown. Member Simasek clarified she was talking about front yard

garden in residential areas. Ms. Anselmo stated that she would check with Planning and Zoning to make sure there are no rules prohibiting front yard gardens in residential areas. The next comment relates to gas stations, Member Simasek asked about how the gas station in the downtown could improve the type of fuel it offers. Ms. Anselmo explained that they can change out pumps, etc. as long as they don't expand their use and will check with P&Z to confirm that they are a non-confirming use. The next few comments relate to references to other sections asked by Member Hazelroth, Ms. Anselmo clarified that this is alerting the reader to other sections that would apply in development, such as stormwater standards. Member Hazelroth's next comment was on building alignment for energy savings. Ms. Anselmo explained that this section applies to the build to line, along street frontage. The next comment was from Member Simasek who inquired as to whether allowing a smaller parkway width would result in less shade (smaller trees). Ms. Anselmo explained that different types of trees are required on a site plan to meet standards, and that a landscape architect would have to certify that the reduced width would not impact the long term viability for the tree. Member Simasek asked why we would allow a smaller parkway strip. Ms. Anselmo explained that there are some parcels in the downtown that are very narrow, between the train track and 17-92 or other challenges that make a 26 foot area (10 parkway, 8 sidewalk, 8 activity) difficult to achieve. The next comment related to the list of trees, and does the word "similar" mean a non-native and native tree are valued the same. Ms. Anselmo stated she would clarify with Community Development and provide the Committee with the list to review. Member Simasek asked if perhaps the City's PIO could work with the Committee to develop some educational material related to the benefits of small trees and shrubs. Ms. Anselmo stated that UF-IFAS may be an option for on-line classes, and Member Roberts stated that they are back offering online classes. Member Roberts comment was that comparables should be approved by a landscape architect, rather than the Community Development Director. Ms. Anselmo explained the code typically calls out directors or the manager, rather than outside consultants or technical staff members. In this case, the director would confer with Public Works and either the arborist / landscape specialist or an outside consultant before approving. Member Simasek asked about lighting and in the lighting section there is concern are we using the most energy efficient for the City standard. Ms. Anselmo stated that Duke Energy should be coming next month with their lighting expert to present to the Committee. Member Simasek questioned whether cement or concrete is more sustainable as it relates to sidewalks. Member Simasek provided a local group who could present to the Committee. Member Hazelroth mentioned whether the spacing of pavers periodically could create less impervious areas. Member Christl questioned who ensures that the pervious pavers are maintained, since if they become clogged, then they are not serving the purpose for which a development may have received

sustainability points. Ms. Anselmo stated that maintenance is an issue, if the paver system is not maintained, similar to any other code issue, Public Works could take action. Member Simasek asked if the LDC can prohibit the use of plastic straws or if that is something the Chamber of Commerce would help with. Ms. Anselmo mentioned that the Chamber was interested in participating pre Covid and will check with Community Development to see if they considered this in the LDC or if it belongs elsewhere in the code. Member Hazelroth asked if the LDC could require the use of air curtains or other means for transition between indoor and outdoor dining to reduce energy use created by the loss of a/c. Ms. Anselmo will include this question in the list for Community Development. Member Simasek asked whether new buildings are allowed to use old types of air conditioners. Ms. Anselmo clarified that would be determined by building code, asking for more efficient air conditioning types could go into the sustainability code. Member Hazelroth asked about dedicated parking for alternative mobility and deliveries (Uber, Lyft, Fedex or Amazon) to eliminate the issue of double parking. Ms. Anselmo stated this will be added to the list for Community Development. The next comment is related to mulch and ground cover, Member Hazelroth asked if there is mulch and ground cover that is more sustainable. Ms. Anselmo will add this to the list of questions for Community Development. Member Hazelroth asked whether the street wall could include hardy landscape as part of the wall (rather than all construction materials). Ms. Anselmo stated she doesn't believe so, that it is meant to screen the parking completely, but this question will be added to the list of outstanding questions. Member Simasek's comment related to bicycle or scooter rentals and whether these should be encouraged and have places for people to use them, say on the westside to get to the RDV from the office buildings. Ms. Anselmo added this to the list of questions. Member Hazelroth asked about exterior lighting and whether energy efficiency is addressed. Ms. Anselmo added this to the list of questions. Member Roberts had two comments, first to not reduce tree requirements and allow developers to pay into a tree fund and to encourage tree and shrubs that are of value to wildlife. Ms. Anselmo will include those comments on the list. Chair Walch stated he had several comments of relating to either referencing the Climate Change Resolution or including the language from the resolution. Ms. Anselmo will include this as a question for Community Development, where this language may be appropriate as a preamble to certain sections that impact sustainability. Member Hazelroth had two additional comments regarding landscaping, first could St. Augustine be banned due to its water needs compared to other sod and encourage xeriscaping. Member Simasek also commented on this same section as to whether the City should require native ground cover. Ms. Anselmo will add these to the list for further discussion. Member Hazelroth commented on the possibility of encouraging more sustainable materials (recycled) in building construction. Ms. Anselmo added this to the list for further discussion. Both

Members Simasek and Hazelroth commented about the need for EV charging stations to be required in new development. Member Simasek commented on the stormwater section, that there are more sustainable practices rather than aeration and she wants to make sure we are using the best technology wet stormwater ponds. Ms. Anselmo will pass on this information to public works. Member Roberts wanted to know what the definition of "understory trees" are in the code. Ms. Anselmo added this to the list of questions. Member Hazelroth's comment related to recycling requirements, and Ms. Anselmo clarified that this is in a separate section of the the code. Member Simasek asked if "waste disposal" included recycling, and Ms. Anselmo clarified that it includes solid waste, recycling and organic disposal. Chair Walch commented that this may be a section where we can add a reference to the Climate Change Resolution and if the language can be modified or added to be consistent with the Climate Change Resolution, and Ms. Anselmo added this to the list of outstanding questions. Member Simasek commented on the section that allows for exempting remodel, alteration or expansions of less than 50% from having to comply with sustainability standards. Ms. Anselmo explained that this is to allow for maintenance and upkeep of buildings that would not be able to comply with the section and would either go into disrepair or remain until sufficient development rights existed to cover the cost of upgrading or redeveloping and the other exception is for those who were in the development process when these standards were passed. Member Hazelroth how the point system was developed and Ms. Anselmo stated that the City engaged consultants and it was reviewed by staff and P&Z. Member Simasek commented that if the City just required LEED, which would allow for an outside party to verify, this would reduce the burden City staff. Member Hazelroth concurred that using the LEED standard, but due to expense requiring it of all development would be very expensive. Member Christl stated that the requirements to get to LEED may be cost prohibitive for every building. Chair Walch stated that LEED should allow development to by pass the other categories. Member Hazelroth stated he beleived the lowest level LEED would exceed the same benefits received by the points system. Ms. Anselmo added these questions/concerns to the list of outstanding questions. Chair Walch recommended that the Envision certification, which is for roads, building, parking lots, and other horizontal improvements, be added which may apply to large developments where there is significant infrastructure. It is similar to LEED certification, but the points are based on sustainable civil infrastructure. Ms. Anselmo added this recommendation to the list of outstanding items. Member Simasek asked for an explanation of Neighborhood Compatability Standards. Ms. Anselmo explained that this section is trying to address the transition from downtown standards and residential standards, areas such as Minnehaha Road, to protect these areas from the impact it creates a buffer area. Member Simasek asked if the exemption are typical. Ms. Anselmo explained that exempting religious

institutions and schools in those areas from the neighborhood compatibility standards recognizes that the City believes these type of institutions are compatible with surrounding residential neighborhoods, such as Park Maitland School. Member Simasek commented on what criteria is used to determine if a waiver can be granted by DRC or P&Z and whether the sustainability standards can be waived? Ms. Anselmo added this question to the outstanding list of questions.

Member Simasek asked if there can be a discussion about how development can help achieve community goals, and Chair Walch asked if Dan Matthys could come to a future meeting to discuss some of the concerns, such as LEED. Member Simasek stated she would like to see less conditional approvals and to state up front what the City needs and reduce the burden on staff.

2. STAFF UPDATE

Chair Walch asked if there was a staff update. Ms. Anselmo stated that Orange County is still moving forward with PACE and that the City has an orientation with ICLEI coming up. Members of the Committee can also utilize the City's membership and Ms. Anselmo will send a link for those who wish to join. Staff also met with a firm that can assist with the greening of the City's fleet which is older. Chair Walch asked what is the trigger for vehicle replacement. The fleet management group would calculate the break even point for vehicles, comparing gas mileage, age and mileage. The preliminary analysis shows the City can save \$1.2 million over a ten year period by replacing vehicles sooner. Several cities and the property appraiser's office are utilizing this program as well.

VIII. DISCUSSION OR OTHER ITEMS BOARD DEEMS APPROPRIATE

IX. ADJOURNMENT

At 8:02 pm, Member Roberts made a motion, seconded by Member Simasek to adjourn which carried unanimously.

Chairman

Date