

**CITY OF WINTER GARDEN
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES
AUGUST 24, 2011**

The Development Review Committee (*DRC*) of the City of Winter Garden, Florida, met in session on Wednesday, August 24, 2011 in the City Hall 3rd Floor Conference Room.

CALL TO ORDER

Community Development Director Ed Williams called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The roll was called and a quorum was declared present.

PRESENT

Voting Members: Community Development Director Ed Williams, City Engineer Art Miller, Assistant to the City Manager for Public Services Don Cochran, Economic Development Director Tanja Gerhartz, and Building Official Harold (Skip) Lukert.

Others: City Manager Mike Bollhoefer, City Attorney Kurt Ardaman, Assistant City Attorney Dan Langley, Senior Planner Laura Smith, Senior Planner Steve Pash, and Planning Technician Lorena Blankenship.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of minutes from regular meeting held June 22, 2011.

Motion by City Engineer Miller to approve the above minutes. Seconded by Building Official Lukert, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

DRC Business

2. Waterside on Johns Lake, PUD

Robert Hutran, Scott Stearns, Tom Sullivan, and Mike Halbrook, applicants for the project were in attendance to discuss the Development Review Committee comments.

Comments included in the August 22, 2011 memorandum from the Development Review Committee were acknowledged and addressed.

Discussion took place regarding the August 22, 2011 memorandum from the Development Review Committee. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 1:** *proposed roundabout on Marsh Road: Provide a dimensioned plan with more detail; radius will need to be large enough to safely accommodate traffic.* Discussion took place regarding **comment # 2:** *Provide description of the secondary access point (eastern roadway connection) shown on Marsh Road (lanes?; gates?; etc.). Turn lanes on Marsh Road may be required.* Applicants stated that secondary exit gate is for residents only, and it will be part of Phase II. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 3:** *Utilities: No information was provided for the project's proposed utilities. On a preliminary basis the project will need to install a minimum 16" water main, 12" sanitary force main, and a 12" reclaimed water main on Marsh Road to serve the development. These lines will need to be extended to proposed or existing stub-outs near the intersection of Avalon and Marsh Roads, at the Developer's expense. As the Design Engineers develop the master utility plan, provisions for the following may be necessary due to the size of the development and its location: reclaimed water pumping station and/or storage tank site; water plant and/or water storage tank/pumping facility; turnouts for reclaimed water connections.* City Engineer Miller noted that because of the location, the water lines and reclaim water lines will be dead-end lines. Applicant will find out how reclaim water will be handled. Intensive discussion took place regarding **comment # 4:** *Developer to discuss the status with OCPS concerning school capacity.* Applicant stated they are working with OCPS staff to resolve the issues related to this issue. Intensive discussion took place regarding **comment # 5:** *Proposed building setbacks need to be discussed with the Developer. Due to utility, drainage and fire safety considerations, we will not support side setbacks less than 7.5.* City Staff is strongly opposed to 5 foot side setbacks. Emphasis was placed regarding **comment # 9:** *A traffic study needs to be provided for review by the City's Transportation Consultant.* Discussion took place regarding **comment # 12:** *Are there any existing agreements between this property and Conserv II concerning reclaimed water?* Developer and Design Engineer are to determine. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 16:** *Site Data: recalculate recreation/open space calculation, landscape buffer areas should be calculated as open space instead of recreation facilities. If recreation requirement cannot be met then provide explanation that financial contribution will be made to the City in lieu of full compliance with recreation requirement.* Discussion took place regarding **comment # 23:** *Provision for future cross access to the properties located to the east and west of the project site, gated entry, and gate location need to be provided on the preliminary plan.* Discussion took place regarding **comment # 30:** *Vinyl and PVC fencing proposed along south project boundary and west project boundary should be changed to provide for stone or other comparable material on all PUD perimeter fencing.* Applicant was required to add a note on the plans regarding the quality of the fence. Intensive discussion took place regarding **comment # 33:** *70 ft wide lots show 5 ft side setbacks and 90 ft wide lots show 7.5 ft side setbacks, prefer 7.5 ft minimum side setback on 70 ft wide lots and 10 ft minimum side setback on 90 ft wide lots.* City Engineer Miller voiced concerns regarding regulations about placing air conditioning

units or other accessory (and after-market) structures on the side of the homes; he inquired if such regulations will be included in the CCR documents as a “Deed Restriction”. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 34**: *How will lots with 20 ft rear yard setbacks accommodate swimming pools?* Applicant was advised that more detail and clarification will be needed. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 37**: *100% of all required water and sewer impact fees shall be paid prior to City execution of FDEP permits and issuance of building permits. Provide flow calculations for Utility Department verification of impact fees. Final plans will not be approved for construction until utility impact fees have been paid and FDEP permits have been issued.* City engineer Miller clarified that on residential developments 50% of the cost for water and sewer impact fees is required at the FDEP permit application. City Engineer Miller also clarified that regarding **comment # 42**, should read: *“Provide certified engineer's cost estimate or executed construction contract as basis of inspection fees (2.25%)”*.

Motion by Assistant to City Manager for Public Services Don Cochran to have the applicant revise and re-submit the PUD addressing all City Staff conditions; if submitted by September 09, 2011, the item might be included in the October 03, 2011 Planning and Zoning Board meeting agenda. Seconded by Economic Development Director Tanja Gerhartz, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

3. Bojangles (3331 Daniels Road), Site Plan

David Axer, Dave Davis, Monica Bedfra, and Rachel Christensen, applicants for the project were in attendance to discuss the Development Review Committee comments.

Comments included in the August 19, 2011 memorandum from the Development Review Committee were acknowledged and addressed.

Discussion took place regarding **comment # 1**: *The current property owner has prepared a traffic analysis dated July 30 2011 to review the need for any lane modifications to the driveway access for Daniels Road at the north boundary of the proposed Bojangles Project. Two options were provided in the report. City staff has reviewed the report and discussed the results with the Owner. We are awaiting a response from the owner on their preference to the two scenarios. City Staff will not support a new right in driveway located to the south of the Bojangle's lot.* Community Development Director Williams stated that City Staff will not support a new access point, and a full turn lane will be required. City Engineer Miller stated that according to the City Code the lanes width should be 12 feet. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 4**: *Use City Standard Utility Details for water and sanitary sewer; pipe materials shall be shown. Backflow preventors: Pipe sizes 2” or less shall be Schedule 80 PVC; larger than 2” shall be ductile iron pipe. Coordinate with Utilities Department.* Discussion took place regarding **comment # 5**: *The northernmost driveway entrance is within the turning radius at the internal intersection*

and only has a 10' radius into a 15' wide driveway that does not appear negotiable by regular passenger vehicles. The location and geometrics of this entrance does not appear feasible. Applicant agreed to provide a more detailed drawing of the driveway entrance. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 7:** *The four parking spaces in the front (east) side back out into a main driveway, which is not recommended and has been discouraged in other portions of the shopping center.* Discussion took place regarding **comment # 10:** *The floor drain in the dumpster enclosure will not be allowed to connect to the sanitary system unless the dumpster enclosure is covered to prevent rainwater from entering the sanitary system.* City Engineer Miller requested the applicant provide a detail drawing of the sanitary system. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 12:** *Plans show a 2" grease trap vent into the building, but the grease trap detail does not show this line. Please explain and show where this will be located in the building.* City Engineer Miller requested the applicant to show the "grease trap" on the details, not only on the plans. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 14:** *Parking spaces shall be 9' X 20' or 10' X 18', unless a 2' overhang area is provided that is not part of a required landscape buffer.* Discussion took place regarding **comment # 16:** *The photometric plan does not appear to meet the City's dark skies requirements for lumens at the property line.* Discussion took place regarding **comment # 24:** *The parking layout indicates shared parking that would be used with adjacent future development. A 5' landscape buffer is not provided at the property lot line.* Since applicant is proposing shared parking, Community Development Director Williams suggested that the applicant adds a note requesting a waiver of the 5' landscape buffer requirement. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 30:** *Fire Department Connections (FDC) shall be a minimum of 40 feet off the building. Fire hydrants shall be no more than 150 feet from the FDC. Both FDCs and hydrants shall be on the same side of the road or driveway. FDCs shall stand alone off the backflow.* The applicant needs to contact the Fire Department to obtain more clarification. City Engineer Miller also clarified that regarding **comment # 42,** should read: "Provide certified engineer's cost estimate or executed construction contract as basis of inspection fees (2.25%)".

Additional discussion took place in regards to **comment #1,** regarding the width of the lanes; the applicant asked if it was possible to provide 32 feet instead of 33 feet; City Engineer Miller stated that drawings and lane configurations should be provided to City Staff for additional review.

Motion by City Engineer Miller to have the applicant revise and re-submit the Site Plan addressing all City Staff conditions, for another DRC cycle. Seconded by Assistant to City Manager for Public Services Don Cochran, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

4. Bojangles (3331 Daniels Road), Lot Split

David Axer, Dave Davis, Monica Bedfra, and Rachel Christensen, applicants for the project were in attendance to discuss the Development Review Committee comments.

Comments included in the August 19, 2011 memorandum from the Development Review Committee were acknowledged and addressed.

Motion by City Engineer to have the applicant revise and re-submit the Lot Split addressing all City Staff conditions; if submitted by September 09, 2011, the item might be included in the October 03, 2011 Planning and Zoning Board meeting agenda. Seconded by Assistant to City Manager for Public Services Don Cochran, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no more business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:52 a.m.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

Chairman Ed Williams

Planning Technician Lorena Blankenship