

**CITY OF WINTER GARDEN
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 16, 2011**

The Development Review Committee (*DRC*) of the City of Winter Garden, Florida, met in session on Wednesday, November 16, 2011 in the City Hall 3rd Floor Conference Room.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman/Community Development Director Designee Stephen Pash 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 Designee Stephen Pash, City Engineer Art Miller, Economic Development Director Tanja Gerhartz, Assistant to the City Manager for Public Services Don Cochran, and Building Official Harold (Skip) Lukert.

Others: City Attorney Kurt Ardaman, Assistant City Attorney Dan Langley, Assistant City Engineer Nicolle Van Valkenburg, Senior Planner Laura Smith, Planner I Alejandra Fazekas, and Planning Technician Lorena Blankenship.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of minutes from regular meeting held November 09, 2011.

Motion by Assistant to City Manager for Public Services Don Cochran to approve the above minutes. Seconded by Building Official Lukert, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

DRC Business

2. Wingate Commercial Building, 756 Business Park Blvd. – Site Plan

Nathan Brown, applicant for the project was in attendance to discuss the Development Review Committee comments.

Comments included in the November 11, 2011 memorandum from the Development Review Committee were acknowledged. Applicant agreed with City Staff comments/conditions, no questions were asked.

Motion by City Engineer Art Miller to approve the Site Plan as shown and place the item on the next available City Commission meeting with DRC and/or City Staff comments/conditions (see attached). Seconded by Assistant to City Manager for Public Services Don Cochran, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

3. Avalon Reserve Village 1, Pre-Plat & PUD Amendment

Randy June, Jeff Sedloff, Jimmy Dunn, Ben Snyder, and Steve Orosz, applicants for the project were in attendance to discuss the Development Review Committee comments.

Comments included in the November 14, 2011 memorandum from the Development Review Committee were acknowledged and addressed.

Discussion took place in regards to **Engineering Comment # 7:** *Vehicular and pedestrian connection with the commercial parcel to the south shall be discussed. Final plat shall provide cross access, utility and drainage easements between the parcels.* Applicants stated that they would like to prevent people coming from the commercial parcel into the residential community and that they believe that for security reasons the pedestrian connection was not necessary. City Staff argued that for emergency situations and convenience to the residents, a second entrance would be beneficial. After discussion it was determined that in lieu of the vehicular and pedestrian connection, a 6 foot high masonry wall and landscape easement should be provided and maintained by the Homeowners Association. Acting Chairman Steve Pash stated that the City will waive the required 5 foot landscape easement, but a 6 foot high masonry wall will be required along the south property line (type and design to be approved in advance by the City). Discussion took place in regards to **Planning Comment # 19:** *General Notes. Item 3 a shall read: "In lieu of the front garage setback requirement as stated in the JPA Design Guidelines a minimum of 40 percent of all residential units shall have the garage doors set back five (5) feet from the front building façade or have side loaded garages. Residential units with the five (5) foot garage recess or side loaded garages may have a twenty (20) foot front yard setback. All other residential units shall have a minimum twenty-five (25) foot front yard setback or a maximum of a thirty (30) foot front yard setback".* Discussion took place in regards to **Planning Comment # 21:** *General Notes Item 3 e. 5 foot side yard setbacks shown on the 60 foot wide lots are acceptable under the following conditions: all mechanical equipment including AC units, pool equipment, water filtration systems, and any other utility or service equipment must be located to the rear of the house, side yards must remain unobstructed, and stormwater design/engineering must be provided sufficiently addressing that 5 foot side yards can adequately support all*

necessary drainage and stormwater management for the property. Discussion took place in regards to **Planning Comment # 22:** *General Notes – An item needs to be added to read that the park will be completed prior to issuing a building permit for the 10th house.* Applicants requested that the number of houses be changed from 10 to 25. City Staff agreed with the request. Discussion took place in regards to **Planning Comment # 25:** *Internal lot setbacks - Add a note that swimming pools will not be permitted on lots where homes are built with a 20' rear yard setback.* City Staff requested the applicants to ensure that a note is included on the plat stating that swimming pools will be reviewed individually on the case by case basis, and some lots might not be able to accommodate swimming pools.

Acting Chairman Stephen Pash asked the applicants if they were coordinating with Orange County School Board in regards to school concurrency issues; applicants responded affirmatively.

Motion by City Engineer Art Miller to place the Pre-Plat and PUD Amendment on the next available Planning and Zoning Board meeting provided the applicant resubmits revised plans addressing all City Staff conditions (see attached) by noon on Friday November 18, 2011. Seconded by Assistant City Manager for Public Services Don Cochran, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

4. Oakland Park, PUD Amendment

John Rinehart, applicant for the project was in attendance to discuss the Development Review Committee comments.

Comments included in the November 14, 2011 memorandum from the Development Review Committee were acknowledged and addressed.

Discussion took place in regards to **Engineering comment # 1:** *The Preliminary Plat for each phase shall identify the building setbacks for each lot and shall include specific details on what auxiliary uses will be allowed such as pools, porches, patios, garage apartments (granny flats), etc. All conditions of approval of the previous PUD and Developer's Agreement shall remain in force unless specifically changed by this proposed amendment.* Discussion took place in regards to **Engineering comment # 5:** *Minimum width for drainage and utility easements between buildings shall be 30'. Narrower easement widths (20' minimum width) will be allowed for shallow drainage pipes 12" diameter or less. Additional drainage and utility easements will be required adjacent to the proposed rights-of-way for telephone, electrical power, gas and cable TV facilities (10' minimum width pursuant to Code).* Discussion took place in regards to **Engineering comment # 8:** *regarding transportation: An additional main north/south road connecting to S.R. 50 (Motamasek) is required, as well as additional intersection improvements. The applicant will be required to pay a proportionate share (proposed at 10% - subject to City*

review and approval of the Applicant's traffic study) of the Plant/Oakland Avenue/Avalon intersection improvements now estimated at \$300,000. This will be in lieu of the Motamasek connection that was required in the original Developers Agreement. Developers Agreement needs to be amended to reflect the changes made to the PUD. The applicant agreed with the portion of the comment: *".....the proposed traffic signal at the central project access on Oakland Avenue shall be designed, permitted and constructed by the Developer prior to issuance of the 450th residential building permit or construction of 10,000 or more square feet of non-residential building area (total aggregate) south of Oakland Avenue, whichever occurs first."* Discussion took place in regards to **Engineering comment # 9:** *Permit approvals from the St. Johns River Water Management District and FDEP are required. Orange County shall provide approval for all crossings, etc. of the West Orange Trail prior to construction.* It was recognized by the DRC that the West Orange Trail crossing will be submitted to the State of Florida, not Orange County, and the City will assist in the application.

Intensive discussion took place in regards to **Planning comment # 11:** *Provide clarification of recreational amenities and open space. Please show a side-by-side comparison of all open space and recreational amenities which are being proposed and those which were approved with the original PUD (Ordinance 05-26), also include justification and explanation of each proposed modification, addition, and/or deletion.* Senior Planner Smith asked the applicant to ensure that the language or terminology on the resubmitted PUD be consistent with the language presently contained within the approved PUD (ordinance 05-26), and the Developers Agreement. Discussion took place in regards to **Planning comment # 12:** *Provide clarification of the exact number of single-family and multi-family units proposed by the amendment as compared to the original PUD (Ordinance 05-26). This should include a statement explaining the effect, if any, that the proposed amendment will have on the PUD density approved by Ordinance 05-26.* The applicant explained that the acreage contained in the portion of the project located in Winter Garden was reduced from 54.3 acres to 50.7 acres. Discussion took place in regards to **Planning comment # 14:** *The following house types are being proposed with a reduced minimum living area from the original approved PUD: Manor House: existing (1200-3800 sq ft) proposed (1000 sq ft); Tandem House: existing (800-2000 sq ft) proposed (800 sq ft); large House Lot: existing (1750-5200 sq ft) proposed (1400 sq ft); Cottage: existing (800-2000 sq ft) proposed (800 sq ft). Provide explanation of removal of the range used for minimum living area which was originally approved with the existing PUD for the above referenced house types, and provide explanation of the reduced minimum living area for Manor House and Large House Lots.* Applicant agreed to include the maximum living area for the proposed house types. Discussion took place in regards to **Planning comment # 17:** *Parking requirements and garage/carport options need to be addressed more comprehensively. The existing PUD requires that each residential unit have a garage and two outside parking spaces on their individual lot. However the proposed amendment shows that up to one space per unit may be on street with the exception of cottage common lots, and further proposes that lots which include "Granny*

*Flats” will be required to provide one additional space on site. Please clarify the need to modify the existing parking standards/requirements and provide a parking plan for the entire PUD project to support the proposed amendment. Further, parking requirements and planning will need to be addressed concurrently with preliminary platting of each phase. A parking plan for each platted phase which reflects the overall parking plan for the PUD referenced above will need to be submitted at time of preliminary plat for each phase. Applicant agreed to provide a parking plan at the time of the preliminary plat review. Discussion took place in regards to **Planning comment # 18:** *Garages are shown on the proposed amendment as optional though they are required in the existing PUD. Please explain the need to have the garages/carports as an optional feature, also clarify whether the houses will be built to accommodate the future addition of a garage/carport and how the visual impact of inconsistent garage/carport construction will be reconciled with the architectural standards.* Applicant agreed to accommodate the onsite parking with a driveway to lead onto for those lots where the garage is optional.*

Senior Planner Smith suggested that the effective date of the PUD amendment ordinance will be upon execution of the amended Developers Agreement.

Motion by City Engineer Art Miller to have the applicant revise and resubmit the PUD Amendment addressing all DRC and/or City Staff comments/conditions for another full DRC review cycle. Seconded by Building Official Harold (Skip) Lukert, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

Note: City Manager Mike Bollhoefer was present during the review of the Oakland Park PUD amendment item.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no more business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:46

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

Chairman Ed Williams

Planning Technician Lorena Blankenship