The Development Review Committee (DRC) of the City of Winter Garden, Florida, met in session on Wednesday, April 3, 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 March 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.*

**DRC BUSINESS**

**Agenda Item #3: West Orange Healthcare District – SITE PLAN**
Plant Street E – 1200
Baker Barrios Architects, Inc.

Doug Gibson of Baker Barrios Architects Inc., Tracy Swanson of West Orange Healthcare District, Majid Kalaghchi of SK Consortium, Inc, Tim Keating of RC Stevens Construction
Company and John Salvens of Baker Barrios Architects, Inc.; applicants for the project were in attendance for discussion. The following items were reviewed and discussed:

ENGINEERING

2. Grading & Drainage Plan – Sheet C201: (Informational) The City is currently having Pegasus Engineering modify its permit with SJRWMD to accommodate the WOHC site. This may involve changes to the drainage plan point of connection from the current location (bypasses City pond) to one of the curb inlets on E. Plant Street (outfalls to City pond). Discussion took place about the connection point in drainage plan. It was determined that the city will review the existing lines and do a walkthrough with the applicants to determine what location makes the most sense for connection. Applicants inquired about timeline for permitting process? City state that approximately 30 days after approved submittal of plans.

4. Any new water, sewer, or irrigation connections are required to pay utility impact fees, to be paid prior to issuance of site or building permits or execution of FDEP permits. The plans currently show a 1" potable meter and 1" irrigation meter. Assuming the 1" potable & irrigation meters the following impact fees will be due:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&quot; Potable water meter</td>
<td>$2,715.00</td>
<td>$2,715.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&quot; Irrigation meter</td>
<td>$2,715.00</td>
<td>$2,715.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater for 1&quot; meter</td>
<td>$4,418.00</td>
<td>$4,418.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$9,848.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(does not include connection/installation fee)*

Discussion took place about stub out location and route for irrigation connections. There was discussion of an on-site side bar meeting to determine best route and options for connection point. Applicants discussed possibility of having to cross Plant Street and railroad track, etc. for this connection. City Engineers will get the specifics of where the existing lines are located so the applicants can review how best to determine access point. Applicants agreed. Applicants inquired about timeframe of when this can start? City staff explained 30 days after approvals. This would not stop application process with St. Johns Water Management District.

PLANNING

17. While the overall site design is lovely and well thought-out, especially the pocket parks, the design of the corner of E Plant St and S West Crown Point Road is a little muddy. The design of street corners is a big emphasis of the overlay.

   a. It's unclear what is planted and what is paved (no landscaping is shown on the corner). Perhaps a specialty paving that emphasizes the whole corner (simplify the confluence of sidewalk spurs) and opens up more to the exercise-oriented pocket park will help better meet the intent of the overlay. Discussed options to emphasize corner aspect of building as the entry feature and focal point. Applicants acknowledged.
b. **There is a cluster of existing above-ground utilities on the corner of E Plant & S West Crown Point Road. Can these be relocated or buried?** This comment was clarified and staff expressed that applicants will need to show existing on plan, where they fall on the path location and how they plan to cover/screen existing above-ground utilities on the site. Applicants suggested a walkthrough of the site to discuss and determine how best to address these items and ensure a 12’ sidewalk path, etc.

18. **Are you proposing to maintain the existing street lights on E Plant Street as well as the existing road sign? How will this interface with the proposed streetscape design?** Applicants acknowledged and said the existing street lights will remain.

19. **Per the overlay requirements, kneewalls are 30” – 36” high.** Applicants acknowledged.

21. **The driveway on S West Crown Point Road is +/- 55’ wide, which seems excessive, especially for a pedestrian-oriented site. Please revise.**
   
   a. **Per code - At vehicular entrances, pedestrian crosswalks are required and should have a specialty design which delineates said crosswalks in a decorative manner such as texture paving, brick pavers or other surface treatments; simple striping is not sufficient. Why isn’t this entrance receiving the specialty brick paving like the entrance off of E Plant St?** Discussed options and cross walk materials. Applicants will reduce the width of the driveway and add brick paving to crosswalk.

22. **If any site (monument) signage is proposed, please show it on the plan. A separate sign permit will be required.** Applicants explained that there are no thoughts at this time for specifics on signage. This is yet to be determined.

23. **Please specify the material that will clad the dumpster enclosure.** Applicants plan on split faced masonry and will be called out on plans.

24. **Landscape Plan: In addition to what is already shown, three understory trees per 100 LF are required within the rear buffer (per the overlay requirements and Code Chapter 118, Article X).** Applicants understood
   
   a. **Note: The irrigation system shall utilize reclaimed water or be set up to hook up to reclaimed service in the future if not currently available.** Applicants explained that they need clarity of location and will discuss in walkthrough of site. Applicants inquired about comment “if not currently available”. City staff clarified that there are reclaimed water lines in close proximity of site, so it will be a requirement. Applicants understood.

Applicants inquired about a couple of specifics regarding the Fire Department comments. City staff requested that applicants contact Fire Inspector directly with their questions and concerns, etc. and she will clarify these questions. Applicants understood.

Applicants inquired about critical path timeline dates of approval process? City staff requested that a motion be made and then this aspect can be discussed. Applicants acknowledged.
Motion by City Engineer Monahan to have the applicant revise and resubmit the Site Plan for staff review only. Building Official Nemecek, seconded; the motion carried unanimously 4-0.

Timeline details were defined based on motion and applicants understood the required approvals, rough timeline of various approvals, etc. and then a pre-con meeting date could be determined after City Commission approval. Applicants understood.

Agenda Item #4: VMGC Office – SITE PLAN
1st Street – 43
Klima Weeks Civil Engineering, Inc.

Jim Coschisnano of Buildico Construction and Selby Weeks of Klima Weeks Civil Engineering, Inc.; applicants for the project were in attendance for discussion. The following items were reviewed and discussed:

ENGINEERING

1. The plans show a one-story building of 3,200 s.f. but the building elevations clearly show a second story that doesn’t appear to be accounted for in the parking calculation. This comment was discussed and clarified by the applicants. They confirmed there will be a mezzanine for storage only and not a second story inhabitable level. City staff (Planning and Building) confirmed these specifics and good with this direction.

5. All irrigation shall be designed to be connected to existing reclaimed water mains. Any irrigation lines within City R/W shall be purple in color. All points of connection to reclaimed water mains shall have appropriate meters, backflow preventors, etc. All irrigation mains within the City’s R/W under the pavement shall be encased within a sleeve. The irrigation plans show connecting to the existing irrigation system. Please confirm this is adequate for the additional irrigation and is a separate meter from the existing potable system – separate irrigation meters are required. Applicants stated they are planning to add (2) new zones for irrigation and will show specifics on plans.

6. Sanitary lines for commercial buildings shall be 6” minimum at a minimum slope of 0.50%. Change 4” sanitary lateral from building to 6”. Add a cleanout on the long (114’) lateral run. Applicants explained the details for the line to be 4” at the building with a 5-foot pipe run converting to 6” at the street. City staff confirmed OK with this plan.

7. Pursuant to our zoning comments a binding lot agreement will be required to combine the parcels. This comment was clarified that Planning is working on this agreement. This would be a separate approval and will not hold up plan approvals, etc. Applicants understood.

11. Pervious concrete pavement is shown for the new parking lot with specific installation and continued maintenance requirements. Pavement shall be tested at final inspection to meet or exceed the 2”/hour infiltration specification and annual inspection reports shall be submitted to the Engineering Division showing the maintenance requirements have been met and the system is operating as designed (i.e. annual vacuum cleaning, etc.). This comment was discussed regarding SJRWMD approvals, etc. Applicants are seeking required permitting process based on SJRWMD requirements.
17. Streetlighting, both internally and on all street frontages, is required pursuant to City Code – dark skies lighting is required. A photometric plan has been provided for review by the Planning Department. Applicants inquired about streetlighting requirements? City staff stated that applicants will need to get with Duke Energy regarding their lighting plan for this area and city generally go with what Duke Energy recommends. Applicants understood.

PLANNING

20. At vehicular entrances, pedestrian crosswalks are required and should have a specialty design which delineates said crosswalks in a decorative manner such as texture paving, brick pavers or other surface treatments; simple striping is not sufficient. Discussed the (1) location of south driveway planning to use colored and/or stamped concrete for cross walk area. Applicants acknowledged.

21. If any site (monument) signage is proposed, please show it on the plan. A separate sign permit will be required. Applicant are not planning to use a monument sign in this project.

23. The trash enclosures are required to be masonry and clad with painted stucco or other masonry veneer. The wall shall include a continuous cap feature. Applicants are planning on 2 hobo containers with fencing around pad for this project.

24. Landscape Plan
   a. Please provide street trees per code. Understory trees may be substituted for canopy trees because of power lines, but they must be provided nonetheless. Higher branching understory trees will meet vehicular sight line requirements and root barriers may be used to help mitigate underground utility conflicts. Applicants will comply and stated they are planning on using root barriers.
   b. Please review the landscape requirements found in Chapter 118, Article X of the municipal code. Specifically, plant sizes and rear yard plantings do not meet code requirements. City staff requested that the Landscape Architect review city code and ensure that they are following these requirements. Applicants acknowledged.

BUILDING

25. Is a commercial dumpster enclosure required? They show using residential sized units. This was discussed in Planning Comments #23.

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

ADJOURNMENT

There being no more business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:44 a.m. by Chairman/ Community Development Director Steve Pash.