

**CITY OF WINTER GARDEN  
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
JULY 14, 2010**

The Development Review Committee (*DRC*) of the City of Winter Garden, Florida, met in session on Wednesday, July 14, 2010 in the City Hall 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Conference Room.

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**Others:** Planning Consultant Ed Williams, City Attorney Kurt Ardaman, Assistant City Attorney Dan Langley, Community Relations Manager Andrea Vaughn, Principal Planner Bill Wharton, Planner Brandon Byers, and Planning Technician Lorena Blankenship.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Approval of minutes from regular meeting held June 23, 2010.

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

## **DRC Business**

### **2. 13000 W. Colonial Drive (Krystal Hospitality, LLC), Site Plan**

Sanjay Patel, Tejinder Singh, and Michael August, applicants for the project were in attendance to discuss the Development Review Committee comments.

Comments included in the July 09, 2010, memorandum from the Development Review Committee were acknowledged and addressed. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 3**: *Utilities/Fire Protection (Sprinkler) System: Show Point of Service for fire protection system with note that all work downstream of the POS shall be constructed by a licensed fire sprinkler contractor. Call out the wet tap to the City's 8" water main. Fire Department shall review and comment on plans for fire protection.* POS to be shown on plans with note. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 5**: *Driveways shall meet all requirements for commercial/industrial driveways. Pursuant to City Code, "On corner lots, no curb cut or driveway shall be constructed or maintained closer than seventy five (75) feet to the point of curvature of either street, except where specific approval is granted by the City Manager as provided in this section." Staff will support a waiver as granted by the City Manager due to the low volume on traffic on this section of Ninth Street.* Discussion took place regarding **comment # 7**: *In lieu of constructing the 5' wide concrete sidewalk on the north side of Magnolia, Developer may pay into the City's sidewalk fund at \$30.00/s.y. as discussed at DRC.* City Engineer Miller stated the City will provide the Applicants with the exact amount. Discussion took place regarding **comment #9**: *All irrigation shall be connected to reclaimed water mains. Provide separate connection, meter and backflow preventor for irrigation, to be supplied from the potable water main until reclaimed water is available in this area. It appears the irrigation meter is connecting to the existing 1" water service – provide separate connection to the water main.* Plans to show separate service connection for irrigation to the water main on the east side of Ninth Street. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 10**: *Permit from SJRWMD is required as well as permits or exemptions from FDEP (water, wastewater and NPDES), and FDOT (drainage, driveway, utilities) prior to issuance of site or building permits. Provide copies of all permits.* Planner Byers instructed the Applicants to submit the SJWMD and FDOT permit copies before the pre-construction meeting.

***Motion by City Engineer Miller to place the Site Plan on the next available City Commission meeting provided the applicant resubmits revised plans addressing all City Staff conditions (see attached). Seconded by Building Official Lukert, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.***

### **3. Oaks at Brandy Lake, Construction Plans**

John Townsend, Jeff Porter, and Jimmy Wallace, applicants for the project were in attendance to discuss the Development Review Committee comments.

Comments included in the July 09, 2010, memorandum from the Development Review Committee were acknowledged and addressed. City Engineer Miller emphasized in regards to **comment # 1**: *Water and Reuse Services: Cap the un-used meter connection at the wye of the 1 ½" service line. For water services coming off of the existing fire connection, the un-used 2" line shall be capped (no valve) below grade.* Design Engineer said they would comply. City Engineer Miller emphasized in regards to **comment # 2**: *Sanitary Laterals: The un-used lateral cleanout shall be capped below grade (6" minimum).* Design Engineer said they would comply with revised plans. Discussion took place regarding **comment # 3**: *All construction shall conform to City of Winter Garden requirements; use updated City standard utility details sheets in plans and include City title block.* Design Engineer said they would comply. Discussion took place regarding the Performance Bond (see plat review comments and discussion).

***Motion by City Engineer Miller to allow the applicant to proceed to Pre-Construction meeting provided the applicant resubmits revised plans addressing all City Staff conditions (see attached). Seconded by Economic Development Director Gerhartz, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.***

#### **4. Oaks at Brandy Lake, Final Plat**

John Townsend, Jeff Porter, and Jimmy Wallace, applicants for the project were in attendance to discuss the Development Review Committee comments, the City Attorney's memorandum dated July 6, 2010 and the City Surveyor's memorandum dated July 6, 2010.

Comments included in the July 09, 2010, memorandum from the Development Review Committee were acknowledged and addressed. Discussion took place in regards to **comment # 1**: *Per the PUD Amendment, please note on the plat that Lot 44 shall be 2-stories and similar in architecture and mass to the adjacent townhomes.* After discussion it was determined that the applicant must place a note on the Lot Grading Plan that will be filed with the Building Department, to represent that Lot 44 shall be 2-stories; same note should be entered in the City's HTE database for this lot as a "red flag". Discussion took place in regards to **comment # 4**: *Tract B, 30' drainage easement (formerly Tract "W"): Reduce the width of Lots 51 and 52 (if needed) to maintain the 30' easement width. Tract "B" should include drainage and utility easement. Verify that the existing 48" diameter storm pipe is centered within the new Tract "B" easement.* City Staff will check to see if the PUD amendment requires specific numbers of 50' and 60' lots. If the 60' lots cannot be reduced by the 2 or 3 foot total, Staff will allow Tract B to be less than 30 feet, with additional easement width being made up on the lots on either side. Discussion took place in regards to **comment # 5**: *The boundary survey submitted with the re-plat shows 5' Utility Easements on either side of the common lot line between existing Lots 69 and 70 (going to a concrete transformer pad). Has this easement been accommodated in the*

re-plat (the lot line between proposed lots 56 and 57 does appear to line up with the easement)?. The Applicants stated they would coordinate the relocation of the easement and transformer with Progress Energy and would make the necessary adjustments to the re-plat. Discussion took place in regards to **comment # 9:** *Based on the Design Engineer's certification, the cost of the utility connection improvements is \$11,700.00, for determination of the performance bond amount. Final plat will not be scheduled for approval by the Planning & Zoning Board and City Commission unless the improvements have been completed or a performance bond or letter of credit for 120% of all incomplete improvements has been provided to the City. City requires the bond or letter of credit and final plat mylar before scheduling for Planning & Zoning Board or City Commission.*

***Motion by City Engineer Miller to place the Final Plat 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 Monday July 19, 2010. Seconded by Building Official Lukert, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.***

## **5. Oakland Park, PUD amendment**

John Rinehart, applicant for the project was in attendance to discuss the Development Review Committee comments. Comments not noted below were accepted by the Applicant.

Comments included in the July 09, 2010, memorandum from the Development Review Committee were acknowledged and addressed. Discussion took place in regards to **comment # 4:** *DRC believes that due to size and magnitude of the PUD, with the different type of homes and varying lot sizes, the applicant must provide an overall parking plan to accommodate the entire PUD development (i.e. (3) three spaces per each residential unit and sufficient on-street parking for commercial and guest parking). Therefore, an overall parking plan shall be provided with each pre-plat to ensure adequate parking. On page 6 and 8 regarding parking and "granny flats", please provide the following additional language as written in the original PUD ordinance: "A lot must have at least four parking spaces when the lot includes an Accessory Apartment. This would be either two garage and two pads or one garage and three pads." In addition, the Utilities Department will require separate water metering for the "Granny Flats" on the final plans that will include additional water/wastewater impact fees based on 1 ERU per "Granny Flat". Applicant stated they would provide an overall parking plan for the development. Discussion took place in regards to **comment # 6:** *Although the Parks and Open Space Plan may meet City Code requirements regarding the percentage amount of usable and common recreation/open space, a significant number of acres and amenities appear to have been removed from the original PUD plan. Staff has concerns regarding this reduction and the applicant's disclosure that the "(d) design drawings for all amenities...can be modified by the developer at the developer's sole discretion." This leaves few protections for the existing residents of Oakland Park and changes the original and current vision of Oakland**

Park regarding the provision of healthier lifestyles and resource conservation. Given the reduction of recreation/open space acreage and the lack of commitment to physical amenities such as a clubhouse, how does this amendment satisfy the original vision proposed to the City? Staff feels that a clubhouse or a community meeting facility, with a minimum occupancy to accommodate at least 100 residents, shall be provided with the revised PUD. Mr. Rinehart stated that the timing of the construction of amenities will be provided at a later time. Discussion took place in regards to **comment # 7**: On page 7, the impervious surface ratios exceed City Code requirements. Please make appropriate changes to meet City Code minimum requirements (Section 106-18). City Engineer Miller explained that because this project was grandfathered, the applicant cannot exceed the impervious surface ratios that were approved under the original PUD. The applicant stated they would have their Design Engineer provide a tabulation of the impervious areas to meet this requirement. Discussion took place in regards to **comment # 8**: Additional information is needed regarding residential lot dimensions. This is particularly a concern for lot widths for detached units less than 50 feet in width. The 35 foot wide lots for the Manor House Lot Detached are of the most concern. The project shall have a minimum 1,000 square foot living area (under roof) for residential homes (excluding the Apartment House Lot). The Apartment House Lot shall have minimum living area standards by number of bedrooms. The minimum living area for apartments in the City Code is 750 square feet for 1 or 2 bedrooms. While 750 square feet may exceed what is necessary for this project, 450 square feet for each unit is too small as proposed in the revised PUD. Since lot depth is not required for the project, the other dimensional requirements will be more critical to ensure that individual lots are functional and meet the intent of the City's PUD zoning regulations. Provide performance standards for design conditions of any lots with 5' side yard setbacks that address any drainage issues, location of utility equipment etc. In addition, the minimum building separation for single family detached houses shall be 15' with a minimum 5' side yard setback. This condition will require a separate meeting to continue the evaluation of the issues. Discussion took place in regards to **comment # 11**: On page 13, AV-36/75 and NC-36/65 are listed on the roadway network but are not represented in the table. Please make appropriate changes. Also, the planter widths on page 13 have been reduced. Does this imply that the parking space width has been reduced? Pursuant to the previous PUD approval, the following are the City's requirements on pavement widths for the various street sections – all roadway widths except the rear lane shall have a 12" concrete gutter **in addition to** the pavement widths shown. Staff will accept the use of a Type "E" mountable curb in lieu of Type "F" curb BUT PREFERS TYPE "F".

- Avenue "A" 20/75 (two-way - parking on two sides): 20' roadway width plus 7' parking lane each side (**8' total parking width including 12" gutter**).
- Avenue "B" 20/65 (two-way - parking on one side): 20' roadway width plus 7' parking lane on one side.
- Avenue "C" 24/60 (two-way - parking on one side): 28' roadway width to include parking on one side (recommend landscape island bulb-outs at intervals for traffic calming).

- *Street 24/50 (two-way - parking on one side): 24' roadway width to include parking on one side (recommend landscape island bulb-outs at intervals for traffic calming).*
- *Street 20/40\* (one way - parking on one side): 22' roadway width to include parking on one side.*
- *Neighborhood Center Street 24/60 (two-way – parking on both sides): 24' roadway width plus 7' parking lane on each side (bulb-out).*
- *Rear Lane 11/20 (one-way – no parking): 11' pavement width with 12" ribbon curb on each side or 12' wide pavement with 6" ribbon curb on each side (**13' total width required**).*
- *Minimum 7' turning radius from rear lanes required for driveways.*
- *Minimum 5' wide concrete sidewalks shall be provided on Oakland Avenue through the project.*

*\*Note: R/W widths less than 50' will need to be reviewed at preliminary plat and final plan phase to verify that utilities and drainage requirements are met. Applicant stated there was an error on the note regarding Avenue "A", which should be 20/75 as previously approved. The Applicant stated no other changes in roadway, planter, or parking widths were proposed. Discussion took place in regards to **comment # 15**: *The following items were required with the original PUD approval. Transportation: An additional main north/south road connecting to S.R. 50 (Motamasek) is required, as well as additional intersection improvements noted below:**

- *The construction of the Motamasek connection to S.R. 50 shall be completed prior to the issuance of the 175<sup>th</sup> building permit (any phase; any jurisdiction). Motamasek R/W shall be dedicated, with a performance bond to ensure construction completion, in favor of the Town of Oakland.*
- *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 450<sup>th</sup> 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.*
- *Pursuant to the traffic study submitted, the Developer shall also be responsible for 14.1% of the cost of the design, permitting and construction of the traffic signal at the Plant/Story intersection (this item has been satisfied).*
- *Development of the project may be subject to additional transportation requirements as generated from the City's Transportation Engineer review/recommendations that include Avalon Road, Plant Street and Tildenville School Road.*
- *Avalon Road/S.R. 50 Intersection: As approved with the re-zoning, the intersection improvements will include an eastbound left turn signal phase on S.R. 50 and reconfiguration of the Avalon Road lane striping to better accommodate the thru and left turn movements (it is our understanding that this is being included in the SR 50 widening project by FDOT).*

The City's transportation consultant has reviewed improvements for the Avalon/Plant Street intersection. Based on the report by LTEC, the following improvements will be required:

*Eastbound (two lane approach)*

*Combination Left/Thru Lane*

*Separate Right Turn Lane*

*Southbound (single lane away)*

*One-way northbound away movement*

*Westbound (two lane approach)*

*Separate Left Turn Lane*

*Combination Right/Thru Lane*

*Northbound (two lane approach)*

*Combination Left/Through Lane*

*Separate Right Turn Lane*

*These additional improvements may be in lieu of, or in addition to, the previously approved requirements. City has received a preliminary report from LTEC regarding improvements to the Plant/Avalon intersection. The report will be finalized for distribution to the Applicant at a later date. Discussion took place in regards to **comment # 24**: *The Apartment Lot will only be allowed in the southwest area of the PUD.* Discussion also took place regarding the locations of the Live-Work Lot.*

Further discussion took place among the Committee Members and Mr. Rinehart regarding the required construction of the Motamasek connection to S.R. 50.

***Motion by City Engineer Miller to have the applicant resubmit revised plans and information addressing all City Staff conditions (see attached). Seconded by Assistant to City Manager for Public Services Cochran, the motion carried unanimously 5-0.***

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no more business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m.

**APPROVED:**

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Chairman Tim Wilson**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Planning Technician Lorena Blankenship**