The Development Review Committee (DRC) of the City of Winter Garden, Florida, met in session on Wednesday, March 13, 2019 in the City Hall Commission Chambers.

**Agenda Item #1: CALL TO ORDER**
Chairman/Community Development Director Steve Pash called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. The roll was called and a quorum was declared present.

**PRESENT**
Voting Members: Chairman/Community Development Director Steve Pash, City Engineer Jim Monahan, Building Official Skip Nemecek and Assistant City Manager for Public Services Jon Williams.

Others: City Attorney Kurt Ardaman, Assistant City Attorney Dan Langley, City Engineering Consultant Art Miller, Urban Designer Kelly Carson, Senior Planner Shane Friedman and Customer Service Representative Colene Rivera.

**ABSENT**
Voting Members: Economic Development Director Tanja Gerhartz

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Agenda Item #2:** Approval of minutes from regular meeting held on February 27, 2019.

*Motion by Assistant City Manager for Public Services Williams to approve the above minutes. Seconded by Building Official Nemecek; the motion carried unanimously 4-0.*

10:02 am Break in Meeting
10:03 am Meeting Resumed

**DRC BUSINESS**

**Agenda Item #3: Stoneybrook Senior Living – ANNEX/PUD REZONING/FLU MAP AMENDMENT**
Reaves Road – 12920
Applicant acknowledged receipt of staff report and then inquired if staff comments referred to rezoning or site plan aspects of this project? Applicants inquired about some of the comments referring to Planned Unit Development rezoning and other aspects more from the Final Engineering stage? Applicants were confused about what comments they need to respond to at this time in the process. City staff asked specifically which comments they were referring to would help with determination if it is for zoning or for site plan. Staff explained that the Engineering comments stated they are recommending approval and then listed items that will need to be addressed. The Planning items not otherwise noted will need to be included in the resubmittal as part of the project’s rezoning such as landscaping plans, elevations, design criteria, etc. City staff explained that as part of the PUD process applicants will need to submit annexation paperwork for the pond parcel, traffic methodology, landscape plan and wetland report/endangered species report. Many of the comment items in the staff report are there for applicant’s awareness of city requirements, details, etc. City staff explained that the more upfront specifics the applicants can provide, the better for Community Meeting details and support, etc.

Applicant inquired about defining what is proposed common open space? This was explained as a requirement for the rezoning and applicants were asked to break down the calculations in a clear way as part of their resubmittal. Applicants acknowledged.

Applicants inquired about annexation of the parcel with the pond? City staff informed applicants that they should annex this parcel as a separate submittal. It needs to be submitted as part of the PUD but as a separate submittal that will run simultaneously.

**ENGINEERING**

6. Provide traffic study for full build-out of the parcel as proposed. Additional intersection improvements may be required including right-of-way dedications to accommodate additional lanes, etc. Applicants inquired about when the Traffic Study needs to be submitted? He pointed out that both Engineering comment #6 and Planning comment #32 discuss traffic study. City staff stated the traffic study is part of the final engineering and should submit the Traffic Methodology first. Applicants understood and will comply.

**PLANNING**

32. A traffic study is required. Please submit the proposed traffic study methodology for review. See above Engineering comment #6.

**PUBLIC SERVICES**

35. Applicant needs to provide a detail for the dumpster enclosure. Public Services is
concerned that one double dumpster will not be sufficient for 202 units. Applicant should consider using a trash compactor. Applicant inquired about the dumpster details as part of the final engineering item? City staff requested that applicants provide architectural elevations with their next submittal with description of material proposed, etc. Applicants will comply.

Once all these details have been submitted for staff review and have the support of city staff, then applicants can discuss details for setting up a Community Meeting and the date can be finalized, etc. Applicants understood.

Motion by City Engineer Monahan to have the revise and resubmit the Planned Unit Development for another full DRC review cycle. Building Official Nemecek, seconded; the motion carried unanimously 4-0.

Agenda Item #4: Royal Sky Plaza – SITE PLAN
Colonial Drive W – 14811
Highland Engineering, Inc

Dr. Amit Aggarwal of Wilma Estate Developer, LLC and Jeff Banker, P.E. of Highland Engineering, Inc; applicants for the project were in attendance for discussion. The following items were reviewed and discussed:

Applicants had received the staff report and discussed the plat aspect. They explained that the preliminary plat has been approved and working on final plat. He clarified that they will not be able to pull a building permit and occupy the space until the final plat is approved. Applicant explained that he has a few clients very interested in rental of medical offices for this site. He explained that there is a high need in the area for specialty doctors and thinks he already has 3-4 of the 5 buildings filled with tenants within a few months. He explained that he is needing addresses for the 5 buildings on this site in order to seek bank loans and approvals, etc. City staff explained that the addresses will not be assigned to the site until this project has final plat approval. Applicant understood.

City staff explained that the project will need to go through the review process per building if the project does not want to present all five buildings as a whole upfront. City staff explained that this review process could be lengthy per building if done individually. Applicants acknowledged.

ENGINEERING

2. All utilities shall conform to Chapter 78 of the City Code. Impact fees will be required for any utility connections and shall be paid prior to issuance of building permit and City execution of FDEP permit applications. The site shall be served by City water, sewer and reuse. All utilities required for the development shall be run to the site at the Developer’s expense, including potable water, reclaimed water and sanitary sewer. 100% of all required water, irrigation and sewer impact fees shall be paid prior to City execution of FDEP permits and issuance of site or building permits. According to the plans there will be (5) 1” potable meters, (1) 1” irrigation meter. Based on the above, the utility impact fees are as follows:

| 1” Irrigation meter | 1 ea. @ $2,715.00 | = $2,715.00 |
Applicant inquired about impact fee payment timing and asked if possible to only pay fee for the back building #5 instead of for the entire site? City staff stated that the applicant is paying the impact fee to reserve for future development. If he only pays for one building at this time, then there may not be capacity available at the time of later buildings. The building placement on the parcel and all other considerations would not be allowed and the project would have to be reconsidered. Applicant understood and will not elect this option.

4. Sheet CS01 – General Details:
   
   d. All dumpsters shall be enclosed and shall provide 12' minimum inside clearance (each way inside of bollards), and access by solid waste vehicles. Coordinate additional requirements (compactors, access, etc.) with Public Services Department, Solid Waste Division. The dumpster details were discussed and applicant will need to consider the double wide width of 24 feet plus the gate space for clearance, etc. Applicants understood and will adjust the width to accommodate the gate space for clearance for (2) 12 feet interior dumpsters. Applicants understood.

PLANNING

11. REPEAT COMMENT: The proposed landscape plans do not meet City Code.
   
   d. Per code: Side or rear buffers adjoining noncommercial or residential parcels, churches or institutional uses shall also require a six-foot masonry wall in addition to the minimum ten-foot wide landscape buffer requirement. The wall shall be constructed from decorative "split face" concrete masonry, "Norman" brick or standard concrete masonry clad with painted stucco or other masonry veneer. The wall shall include a continuous cap and end column features. The wall shall be placed a minimum of six incites from the adjoining property line. The city and applicant must mutually agree on which landscape buffer requirements are most appropriate with the submission of the development and/or site plan proposal.

   As an alternative to the six-foot masonry wall, a minimum 20-foot wide landscape buffer with 50 percent opacity may be permitted on application to and approval by the planning and zoning board at a duly noticed public hearing. The planning and zoning board shall review the proposed alternative buffer and approve such buffer upon determining that the buffer will (1) be planted in accordance with Table 3.4.1, (2) include additional shrubs and groundcover planting to achieve 100 percent coverage, and (3) meet all other relevant landscaping standards set forth herein.

   The plan as shown does not meet these requirements.

   Discussion took place about the buffer along the pond/ parking lot/ residential community behind the property. Applicants will need to consider either a heavy thick landscape buffer along the 20-foot buffer to block the parking lot view or consider a
fence/wall to block the residential neighborhood behind the property. If they decide to go with landscaping plan rather than wall, it would need a variance approval, etc. Applicants understood and will determine options and propose a plan.

12. **REPEAT COMMENT:** A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) must be conducted in accordance with the latest edition of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) standard E-1527 (Phase I ESA Process).

*While an Environmental Assessment was provided, a Phase I ESA identifying potential areas of contamination was not provided.* Applicants will submit the Phase I ESA report with this aspect.

13. **Building Elevations:**

   a. **REPEAT COMMENT:** Per Code, all parcels adjacent to State Road 50 shall have as the primary customer entrance, an entrance along the facade that faces State Road 50. Additionally, secondary entrances facing other public streets or adjacent buildings shall be encouraged.

   Furthermore, building walls facing the front yard or street side yard shall have window(s) and door(s). Such facades shall have display windows a minimum of six feet in height along no less than 60 percent of their horizontal length.

   **The facade that faces W Colonial Drive still doesn’t meet the intent of the overlay requirements. This elevation is still mostly flat with a small secondary entrance.**

   Discussion took place about proposed elevations for building. It was suggested that applicant schedule a side bar meeting with their project architect and city staff to discuss the details and standards for their proposed medical office. Applicants will comply.

   **Motion by City Engineer Monahan to have the applicants revise and resubmit the Site Plan for staff review only.** Assistant City Manager for Public Services Williams, seconded; the motion carried unanimously 4-0.

Applicants inquired about being able to submit the interior building plans for building permits? City staff stated they could submit but these are just going to sit in building department until the site plan is approved. Building could review them ahead of time but Planning cannot sign off on them until after site plan approvals. Applicants understood.

**Agenda Item #5: Maddox Electric, Training Institute – SITE PLAN**

Garden Commerce Parkway – 710 & 720

MM&M PM LLC

Randy Maddox of Maddox Electric, Darcy Unroe PE of Unroe Engineering, Cory Cooper of C4 Architecture, LLC and Clark Stranahan of C4 Architecture, LLC; applicants for the project were in attendance for discussion. The following items were reviewed and discussed:
Before the staff report comment discussion, City staff asked applicant to explain in detail what this project is? Applicant explained that this will be an internal facility office for staff as well as a training center for leadership amongst their staff. They are an electrician trade industry predominantly working in the theme parks and need to train their future leadership. They would be using this large conference room on site for this training. Applicants confirmed this is not a school or trade education facility.

**PLANNING COMMENTS**

18. *Sheet ELEV1: The elevation facing the right-of-way is very flat and should have additional facade features such as bump outs, reveals, a cornice and awnings per Exhibit C of the Winter Garden Commerce Center Ordinance 13-42.* The applicant had the concept color rendering of the elevation to discuss the look of the building. There were suggestions for applicants to vary the front of the building height and add some additional details over the windows, etc. When the detail height elevation was compared to the concept rendering submitted, these two items did not seem to match. Applicants are going to review and resubmit for consistency. Applicants were strongly reminded that what is submitted and approved is what is expected to be built. The Planning Department does review the building permits to confirm that the approved design is what is actually built. Applicants understood.

Applicants were also asked to submit their photometric plan. Applicants will comply.

*Motion by City Engineer Monahan to have the applicants review and resubmit the Site Plan for another full DRC review cycle. Building Official Nemecek, seconded; the motion carried unanimously 4-0.*

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no more business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:47 a.m. by Chairman/ Community Development Director Steve Pash.

**APPROVED:**

[Signature]

*Chairman, Steve Pash*

**ATTEST:**

[Signature]

*DRC Recording Secretary, Colene Rivera*