



WINTER GARDEN

CITY OF WINTER GARDEN
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES
October 12, 2016

The Development Review Committee (*DRC*) of the City of Winter Garden, Florida, met in session on Wednesday, October 12, 2016 in the City Hall Commission Chambers.

Agenda Item #1: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman/Community Development Director Steve Pash called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. The roll was called and a quorum was declared present.

PRESENT

Voting Members: Chairman/ Community Development Director Steve Pash, City Engineer Art Miller, Building Official Skip Nemecek, Economic Development Director Tanja Gerhartz and Assistant City Manager for Public Services Don Cochran.

Others: City Attorney Kurt Ardaman, Assistant City Attorney Dan Langley, Senior Engineer Jim Monahan, Senior Engineer Brian Warren, City Development Consultant Ed Williams, Urban Designer Kelly Carson, Planner Jessica Frye and Customer Service Representative Colene Rivera.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Agenda Item #2:

Approval of minutes from regular meeting held on September 28, 2016.

Motion by City Engineer Miller to approve the above minutes. Seconded by Assistant City Manager for Public Services Cochran, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

10:02 am Break in Meeting
10:05 am Meeting Resumed

DRC BUSINESS

Agenda Item #3: Gardenia Plaza – PRELIMINARY PLAT

Colonial Drive W – 14120
Denham Engineering, LLC

Brian Denham of Denham Engineering, LLC, Nicholas Bowden of Epic Development

Group and Daren Williams of DSD; applicants for the project were in attendance for discussion. The following items were reviewed and discussed:

ENGINEERING

1. **Provide agreement and/or other documentation from FDOT for the joint use of the FDOT stormwater pond, including easements and maintenance responsibility. A portion of Lot 6 is within property owned by FDOT. The stormwater calculations submitted to the City will need to include the FDOT basin information.** Applicants stated that they have the agreement for use of the pond, can expand the pond and then when business/project is completed the pond will go back to FDOT. Applicants will provide a copy of this agreement to city staff. Applicants intend to submit for PCD for this project and will complete application form and submit.
2. **There is a proposed traffic signal on the northwest corner of the property. Provide documentation from FDOT that this is acceptable prior to City site plan approval. It should be noted that FDOT constructed a directional median opening at this location due to the proximity of the traffic signal located at the intersection of S. Park Avenue and SR 50 to the east. The City will not support a traffic signal or full access median opening at this location.** Applicants stated they want to pursue a traffic light at the intersection and already have approval from FDOT. City staff will review plans, traffic study analysis and are open to consideration and review based on applicants providing details and list of actual uses for this site. Applicants were advised to submit the traffic light aspect at resubmittal for project.
3. **The entrance on the northwest corner of the property is unacceptable in its current configuration. There is not adequate distance between the travel lane of SR 50 and the left turn into the site along the 24' cross access agreement. There are safety concerns with cars waiting to exit blocking the left turn into the site and cars being stopped in the outside east bound travel lane of SR 50. The cross access shall be moved south to the rear of the outparcel lots.** Applicants understood this comment and will adjust the cross access point further from the intersection.
5. **Lot 1 does not appear to be buildable due to the existing FDOT pipe and easement, existing ditch, etc. Provide proposed use, etc.** Applicants stated that they are planning to move the storm pipe to the access driveway area and in a ditch. Applicants understood comment and repeated that they understand that this lot has many constraints including small size and cannot have the pipes underneath the building.
6. **Provide more information regarding overall traffic circulation, access points to SR 50, etc. A right-in, right-out driveway is shown between Lots 3 & 4 that will need to be discussed.** Applicants understand this will be addressed in the traffic study.
7. **A lift station will be required. Lift stations serving more than one property shall be designed to City Standards to be dedicated to the City for ownership and maintenance. Lift station site (minimum 30' X 30') shall be conveyed to the City fee simple via warranty deed.** Applicants inquired about ownership and details of lift station in southwest corner of property. City staff explained that they will research and get back to applicants about ownership and options for existing lift station capacity. Applicants are concerned about current capacity of lift station not meeting current needs and then with this project

connecting to existing could cause even more of a hardship. City staff will research and follow up with applicants on this issue.

12. The pond berm shall not encroach into, or block in any way, the existing drainage ditch along the south side of the project. A clay core/liner shall be shown on the typical pond berm detail section. Applicants will provide a stability analysis report to city staff and address breach or potential breach concerns.
14. All underdrain pipes shall be double wall HDPE pipe or PVC pipe as shown. Applicants were inquiring about underdrain pipes, etc. This was clarified and applicants will comply.
15. All offsite drainage coming onto the site shall be accommodated. This comment was clarified and applicants will comply.

PLANNING

16. Pages 3 under Dimension Plan Notes:

- a. The calculations provided on the plans include the entire project. Each lot will be required to meet open space requirements, landscaping, impervious surface ratio, setbacks, etc. This comment was discussed and once the applicants submit a PCD application, some of these comments will be clarified. At this point, applicants have not submitted revisions to the submitted PCD application, so city staff comments are based on the individual lot requirements and stated as such. Applicants understood. Also discussed the pond agreement details. Applicants understood.
 - b. Do the calculations include the existing FDOT pond? Discussion took place regarding calculations and applicants know they need to ensure that each lot of project can stand alone. Discussed pond ownership and maintenance, etc. as part of the agreement, noting that the pond would be owned by FDOT once improvements are completed.
17. The landscape buffer proposed on LS-01 shall meet the requirements for the State Road 50 Overlay, please see the table provided in Section 118-1523 regarding required caliper size, ground coverage, gallon size, etc. The front buffer was the only provided landscaping, all proposed lots shall be required to meet landscaping requirements, information regarding landscape buffer requirements between parcels can be found in section 118-1524. Landscaping shall be in a landscape tract, please show tract on each lot. City staff discussed tract vs. easement around pond and perimeter of property. It was clarified that landscaping along the front of entire property will need to be consistent.
 19. Per section 110-206 the proposed development shall provide cross access to the adjacent properties to provide circulation to create a unified system. Applicants understood and will comply.
 22. Informational Item: Per Section 118-1524 (c) Side or rear buffers adjoining noncommercial or residential parcels, shall require a six-foot masonry wall in addition to the minimum 10' 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 inches from the adjoining property line. Please provide landscape tracts on each lot. This comment was discussed and applicants inquired about the 6' masonry wall. City staff

clarified that the wall is a city code requirement and the residential neighbors do want the wall. Previous proposed project plans showed the wall at the top of the proposed pond berm with extensive landscape along the slope. City staff advised that the landscaping details could be discussed at a later side-bar meeting with applicants.

24. **Informational Item: Planned Commercial Shopping Centers require a Special Exception Permit in the C-2 Zoning District.** Applicants inquired about the definition of a “Planned Commercial Shopping Center.” City staff explained that a PCD gets around many of the staff comments and once there is an established PCD on the property, it will override many of the staff current comments. Applicants understood.

PUBLIC SERVICES

25. **Under Dimension Plan Notes, Utility Services; the city provides solid waste collection, not through private contract. Also under electric, please change Progress Energy to Duke Energy.** Discussed commercial recycle dumpsters/ bins. At this time, the city does not have plans to accommodate commercial recycling dumpsters and pick-up. At this point, it would have to be a private matter.

STANDARD GENERAL CONDITIONS

33. **A separate tree removal permit is required to remove any trees. Coordinate with Building Department.** Discussed mass grading plan submittal and separate tree permit. Discussed details of trees on property, what size trees to address on property and types of trees, etc. and general tree plan. Applicants also inquired about pad elevation on site for mass grading plan. Applicants stated they plan on building pads flush with road within 1-2 feet and city staff acknowledged this is correct. Discussed details of mass grading plan, including utilities on plan and what this submittal requires based on meter size details, etc.

Applicants inquired about early land clearing package submittal items. City staff stated applicants would need to provide: mass grading plan, erosion & sediment control plan, FDEP de-watering permit and discharge details, access to property for construction entrances, St. John’s permit, NPDES NOI, and the tree permit submitted with land clearing package. Discuss submitting land clearing package details along with being able to use construction plan set for staff comments. City staff stated it could work if plans have enough detail for construction plan review.

Applicants inquired about contact for final plat surveyor. Applicant’s project surveyor can contact City Engineer or City’s Reviewing Surveyor for project question and details, etc. Also applicants were reminded that they will need to plan for dark skies lighting. Applicants will comply.

Motion by City Engineer Miller to have the applicants revise and resubmit the Preliminary Plat addressing all city staff conditions for another full DRC review cycle. Building Official Nemecek, seconded; the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

10:45 am Break in Meeting
10:46 am Meeting Resumed

Agenda Item #4: Tremaine Boyd – SITE PLAN

Boyd Street S – 109
Tremaine Boyd LLC

James Costello of J&J Building, John Rinehart of Civitas and Frank Starkey of People Places; applicants for the project were in attendance for discussion. The following items were reviewed and discussed:

Applicants explained this project is restricted at this time due to city work being done at/ near this site. Project is at the exploratory stage and looking for confirmation from city staff of overall project to move forward with development and direction. Applicants acknowledged the project submittal at this time is incomplete with many details being worked on for clarification.

ENGINEERING

1. This submittal is incomplete. See below comments and checklist for specific items needed in the next submittal:

- **LANDSCAPING PLAN & PERIMETER WALL PLAN.** Applicants are not planning on having a wall.
- **DUMPSTER/COMPACTOR ENCLOSURE FOR COMMERCIAL AND MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENTS.** Discussed location for dumpster/compactor, city dumpster use and possible options.
- **ALL NECESSARY PERMITS IN HAND OR "IN PROCESS".** Applicants requested clarification of permits? This is not referencing building permits but permits for St. John's Water and DEP, etc.
- **PROVIDE A NOTE ON THE PLANS STATING THAT ALL SANITARY AND STORM SEWERS WITH LESS THAN 5' OF COVER SHALL BE VIDEO INSPECTED AFTER BASE INSTALLATION.** Applicants inquired about utility lines being videoed? This was clarified.
- **PROVIDE A 10' UTILITY EASEMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CITY OF W INTER GARDEN ADJACENT TO ALL RIGHTS OF WAY.** Discussed easements for power lines, utilities, etc. City staff explained what information they know at this time for location of these items.

PLANNING

10. Please provide a full landscape and irrigation drawing set. Note: All water used for irrigation shall be reclaimed water (if service is available for the property). A rain sensor is also required. Irrigation lines were discussed.

10:58 am Building Official Nemecek left meeting

FIRE

23. Fire Department Connections shall be a minimum of 40 ft. off the building. Fire Hydrants shall be no more than 150 ft. away from Fire Dept. Connections. Both FDC's and hydrants shall be on the same side of the road or driveway. Applicants were directed to contact fire inspector, Vicky Rutherford, for clarification of this comment.

10:59 am Building Official Nemecek returned to meeting

Also city staff request applicants to coordinate with Railroad Museum regarding construction for future expansion for placement of underground lines, etc. and details pertaining to Tremaine Road brick lying for street and perimeter of this project. Applicants inquired about water tower function and fencing. Water tower is iconic/ decorative and not functional. Applicants asked about chain link fence as a barrier but can be upgraded if applicants want to include in overall project? City staff will review plan but yes the fence can be improved.

Motion by City Engineer Miller to have the applicants revise and resubmit the Site Plan addressing all city staff conditions for another full DRC review cycle. Building Official Nemecek, seconded; the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

11:04 am Break in Meeting
11:05 am Meeting Resumed

Agenda Item #5: Waterside on Johns Lake Phase 2B Final Plat

Marsh Road – 17310
CalAtlantic

Travis Rentz of Godbold, Downing, Bill & Rentz, P.A, Aaron Reid of CalAtlantic, LLC and Bill Donley of Dewberry; applicants for the project were in attendance for discussion. The following items were reviewed and discussed:

ENGINEERING

9. **Plat Note 2 needs to be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney. This mentions a “non-exclusive private easement” - Easement granted to the City to be “private”? Can other utilities use this easement? The HOA will not be allowed to have anything other than grass within this easement.** Applicant stated this wording has been removed from the document. Dan Langley is to review and approve wording.
10. **Performance Bond: The improvements are not completed. A Performance bond or letter of credit in the amount of 120% of the cost of all incomplete improvements shall be provided to the City, based on the Design Engineer’s certification and executed construction contract (final pay application). Performance Bond/LOC amount shall include cost of street lighting from Duke Energy (if not already installed); street and regulatory signs, required landscaping, walls, amenities, etc. City Attorney shall approve the form of the bond or letter of credit prior to final plat recording. Final plat will not be forwarded to the City Commission for approval without performance bond (unless C of C has been issued).** City Staff reminded applicants that cost estimates for phase 2B need to be provided for performance bond. Applicants understood and will comply.

PLANNING

14. **Have the street names been renewed? Most of them appear to have expired in March.** City staff inquired if street names are still on reserve? Applicants will have to check.

CITY ATTORNEY

15. **Please see attached memorandum from City Attorney Dan Langley.** Applicants

discussed with city attorney some of the comments and these were clarified. Applicant will get with city attorney and update, etc.

CITY SURVEYOR

16. Please see attached memorandum from City Surveyor Ed Johnson. Applicants will discuss with City Surveyor and clarify some of the comments.

Motion by City Engineer Miller to have the applicant revise and resubmit the Final Plat addressing all city staff conditions for staff review only. Staff review will take place between 14-16 days, after receipt from Planning. Assistant City Manager for Public Service Cochran, seconded; the motion carried unanimously 5-0.

Applicants were directed to submit the project costs estimates and performance bond directly to the City Engineer. Applicants will comply.

11:16 am Break in Meeting
11:17 am Meeting Resumed

Agenda Item #6: Cedar Bay Veterinary Hospital–PROJECT FEASIBILITY

Discussion Only

Story Road E - 32
R C Stevens Construction

Holly Valentine of Cedar Bay Veterinary Clinic and Tom Mikels of RC Stevens Construction; applicants for the project were in attendance for discussion. The following items were reviewed and discussed:

This item was for discussion only. Meeting was adjourned. The Planning, Building, Public Services and Engineering departments stayed for discussion and remaining staff left meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no more business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 11:17 a.m. by Chairman/Community Development Manager Steve Pash.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:



Chairman, Steve Pash



DRC Recording Secretary, Colene Rivera