



STAFF DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

MEETING DATE: January 23, 2019
TIME: 9:00AM-10:00AM
LOCATION: CITY HALL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
2ND FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
CITY HALL, 1000 CITY CENTER CIRCLE

PROJECT: PUD with MDA and CDP Rezoning/Harbor Landings Subdivision
ADDRESS: 5687 S. Ridgewood Avenue
CASE NO. 18-4000004

ATTENDING CITY STAFF REPRESENTATIVES

- Penelope Cruz, Planning Manager
- Melanie Schmotzer, Development Review Technician
- Gwen Perney, Senior Planner
- Larry Roberts, Community Development Engineer
- Alex Popovic, Public Works Engineering Intern
- Linda Johnson, Right-of-Way Agent
- Valerie Duhl, Engineering Intern
- Margaret Tomlinson, Construction and Engineering Manager
- Max Garcia, Planner
- Elizabeth O'Reilly, Kimley-Horn for Public Utilities
- Lynn Stevens, Public Utilities Director
- Junos Reed, Public Works and Utilities Engineer
- Shannon Balmer, Assistant City Attorney

ATTENDING REPRESENTATIVES FOR APPLICANT

- Bradley Bauknecht, P.E., Newkirk Engineering, Inc.
- Michael D. Chiumento III, Esq.

ATTENDING CITIZENS

N/A

Comments Received From:

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Landscaping | <input type="checkbox"/> Building |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engineering | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Utilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Right-of-way | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City Attorney | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Works |

COMMENTS/OTHER DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- See attached SDRC letter outlining the staff comments discussed at the meeting or refer to the audio recording of the meeting for more detailed information on the discussion item.

SDRC MEETING DATE OF JANUARY 23, 2019

PUD WITH MDA AND CDP REZONING/HARBOR LANDINGS SUBDIVISION
CASE NO. 18-4000004
OUTSTANDING TECHNICAL COMMENTS AS OF JANUARY 18, 2019

The comments below may be revised and/or supplemented following staff discussion with the development team at SDRC meeting.

PLANNING & LANDSCAPING REVIEW COMMENTS: (Gwen Perney, Planner (386) 506-5673/gperney@port-orange.org):

1. In MDA Section 2, state if it is the intent to subdivide both the single-family and townhome lots for private ownership.
2. In MDA Section 4.A. at the bottom of the first paragraph, strike Oak Harbor PUD and correct to Harbor Landings PUD. In the second paragraph, correct the Future Land Use to Urban Medium Density Residential (4 to 8 units per acre). The Comprehensive Plan amendment to change the future land use is running concurrently with this application.
3. In MDA Section 4.B. paragraph 2, strike Oak Harbor and correct to Harbor Landings.
4. The proposed maximum building height of 40 feet exceeds the maximum building height of 35 feet for the PUD zoning district. Reduce proposed maximum building height to 35 feet [LDC, Ch. 17, Sec. 27]. Revise in MDA section 4.B. paragraph 2 and in 4.B.1.c.
5. **Policy Issue:** In MDA Section 4.B.1.a. The minimum side corner setback for single-family homes is typically the same as the front yard setback. If the 5-foot setback is maintained, this will be a Policy Issue requiring City Council approval. Provide justification for a 5-foot side corner setback. **Suggestion:** Adding Common Area between the side corner lot line and the roadway would declassify the lot as a corner lot.
6. In MDA Section 4.B.1. add the maximum building coverage per single-family lot is 40% as per the PUD zoning district [LDC, Ch. 17, Sec. 27].
7. **Policy Issue:** In MDA Section 4.B.2.a., the minimum rear building setback for buildings in the R-3L (closest compatible) zoning district is 25 feet or equal to the building height for buildings over 25 feet. If the 15-foot rear setback is maintained, this will be a Policy Issue requiring City Council approval. Provide justification for a 15-foot rear building setback.
8. **Policy Issue:** In MDA Section 4.B.2, the R-3L zoning district requires 25 feet of separation between buildings. If it is intended to only provide 20 feet, provide setback in the MDA and provide justification for only providing 20 feet of separation [LDC, Ch. 17, Sec. 11(e)]. If the 20-foot separation is maintained, this will be a Policy Issue requiring City Council approval.
9. **Policy Issue:** In MDA Section 4.B.2.d. and e., the R-3L zoning district requires 40% maximum building coverage and 60% minimum open space on each townhome lot. If the 25% open space standard is maintained, this will be a Policy Issue requiring City Council approval. Provide justification for only providing 25% of open space on each lot [LDC, Ch. 17, Sec. 27].
10. Remove MDA Sections 4.B.1.b. and 4.B.2.b. Separate landscape buffers are not required for individual lots. They are required for the entire property. Landscape buffers are provided for in Section 10.

11. **Policy Issue:** In MDA Section 4.C., the percentages provided for open space conflict with the CDP and with Section 4.B. As per LDC, Ch. 17, Sec. 27, individual single-family lots are required to provide a minimum 40% open space on each lot. As per LDC, Ch. 17, Sec. 17(d), 60% of the total project area shall be established and maintained as open space. The CDP indicates only 54.5% of the total project area is proposed as open space. Additionally, a minimum of 20% of the total project area shall be established and maintained as common open space or common facilities. Indicate on the CDP where the 27.2% proposed common open spaces is located. If the open space and common open space standards are less than required by the LDC, this will be a Policy Issue requiring City Council approval.
12. In MDA Section 5, state if it is the intent to develop the project at one time. If the developer intends to develop the project in phases, state what aspects of the development will be completed in each phase as well as depict phases on the CDP.
13. In the MDA, add a section for architectural controls. Such controls shall provide for a common architectural theme to be applied to all development within the PUD [LDC, Ch. 17, Sec. 17(h)(3)(d)].
14. In MDA Section 6 state the intended source of irrigation for the project.
15. In MDA Section 10, a 20-foot right-of-way landscape buffers are required along the north and west property lines around the multifamily portion of the development that abuts the Fozzard Blvd. and Ridgewood Ave. rights-of-way [LDC, Ch. 13, Sec. 3(d)(1)(c)]. A 10-foot landscape buffer is required along the south property line [LDC, Ch. 13, Sec. 3(e)(1)(c)]. **Advisory:** The planting requirements within these buffers are: 4 shade trees, 4 understory trees and 30 shrubs per 100 linear feet for the right-of-way buffers; and 3 shade trees, 3 understory trees, and 30 shrubs per 100 linear feet in the south buffer. Credit toward the required buffer material will be given to existing trees.
16. According to the survey provided, there are a minimum of 33 specimen trees on site, 7 of which are historic oak trees. Based on minimum specimen tree protection requirements, a minimum 50% of specimen trees (17 trees) must remain on site. Only 11 are shown on the CDP. Additionally, there are three historic oaks that will need separate city council approval for removal. Staff recommends adjusting the proposed plan to accommodate the required number of specimen trees to be preserved [LDC, Ch. 9, Sec. 16].
17. Add a section to the MDA for Parking. Visitor parking is required for multi-family uses at a ratio of 0.25 spaces per unit. The 16 townhome units require 4 visitor parking spaces. Additionally, if on-street parking is not permitted or is restricted on the street frontage on a single-family lot, one visitor space is required per lot. The 10 single-family lots require 10 visitor parking spaces. The visitor space shall be located not more than 100 feet from the unit's street frontage [LDC, Ch. 12, Sec. 4(c)]. State how bicycle parking will be handled for the townhome units (0.10 bicycle parking spaces are required per required multi-family parking space).
18. **Advisory:** If the proposed dock is able to be built, pursuant to the Volusia County Manatee Protection Plan, the proposed boat slips will be subject to the manatee mitigation fee, which is processed in conjunction with the required building permit

- for the dock and slips. The dock proposed would be considered commercial, so the manatee mitigation fee would be \$1,000 per slip. A boat slip allocation request will be required to be submitted to the City's Community Development Department in writing along with a sketch of the proposed dock with slips and length of shoreline identified.
19. How will mailboxes and garbage receptacles be addressed? **Suggestion:** Staff recommends common facilities to be located in a common area.
 20. On the CDP, add the parcel numbers of the lots to be included in the PUD.
 21. On the CDP, the curve distances are missing on the west (Ridgewood Ave.) property line. Provide length of west property boundary.
 22. On the CDP under the Overall Site Development Usage Table:
 - a. Note number 1, change to state the Future Land Use is Urban Medium Density Residential (4 to 8 units per acre).
 - b. Note number 5, cite the correct code reference [LDC, Chapter 17, Section 17(h)(2)(k)].
 - c. Remove note number 6. 15% of the square footage of the development is required to be set aside for the protection of existing trees. This includes the area required to protect specimen trees, buffers, and other landscape areas. A minimum of 50% of the required minimum number of trees (1 tree per 2,500 square feet of lot area) are required to be existing trees within the 15% tree preservation areas [LDC, Ch. 9, Sec. 17].
 - d. Add a note stating compliance with the environmental preservation code may necessitate modification of the conceptual plan.
 23. On the CDP, the width of the proposed sidewalk along Riverside Drive may be reduced to 5 feet [LDC, Ch. 5, Sec. 4(a)(3)(d)].
 24. On the CDP, if the entrance from Riverside Drive is to be gated, show proposed gates. Allow a minimum of 20 feet for stacking between Riverside Drive and the gate. If this gate is proposed, then it needs to be included in the MDA as well.
 25. **Policy Issue:** Subdivisions with 25 lots or more are required to have two points of access into the subdivision [LDC, Ch. 5, Sec. 4(a)(1)(c)]. If it is the intent for the access to Ridgewood Ave. to be for emergency purposes only and to not provide a second point of access, it is a policy issue that will require approval by the City Council. The applicant will need to provide justification or alternative design proposals for the requested deviation proposed with the next submittal.
 26. On the CDP, show a gate across the emergency access drive to Ridgewood Ave. Delete the note regarding tying into an existing driveway with gravel.
 27. On the CDP, under the Site Development Usage table, revise the Landscape Buffer requirements. Landscape buffers are required around the perimeter of the site, not individual lots. Only one table is needed. The north and west landscape buffers are 20 feet in width as they abut rights-of-way and are around the multi-family portion of the development. The south landscape buffer along the multi-family portion of the development and the east landscape buffer is 10 feet.
 28. On the CDP, a maintenance easement for the existing wall should be shown across the rear of Lots 23 to 26. Ownership and maintenance of the wall must be the responsibility of the HOA.

29. Lots 2 and 3 are corner lots. Corner lots are required to be 15% wider than the minimum required lot width in order to accommodate the secondary front setback [LDC, Ch. 5, Sec. 6(c)(8)]. (see Planning comment #5 for additional information)

ENGINEERING DIVISION REVIEW COMMENTS: (Larry A. Roberts, Engineer (386) 506-5665 lroberts@port-orange.org; Lisa Epstein, Engineering Specialist (386) 506-5662 lepstein@port-orange.org; Valerie Duhl, Engineering Intern (386) 506-5664 vduhl@port-orange.org):

Conceptual Development Plan

1. Grading slopes cannot exceed 4:1 per LDC Chapter 10, Section 5 (d) (1). **Suggestion:** Show a combination of building stem walls and/or retaining walls to honor the 4:1 slope requirement.
2. On the CPD, show a ten-foot drainage easement at the ditch top of bank shown at the northeast corner of the property [LDC Chpt. 5, Sec. 6 (d) (1) (c)]. **Advisory:** A dwelling or accessory structures cannot be located within the drainage easement.
3. On the CDP, add a note that driveway slopes exceeding a 7% change will require an engineer's seal with its respective building permit.

Master Development Agreement

4. The MDA states that the stormwater system will comply with the city's LDC and regulations of the FDEP in full. If deviations to the LDC are intended to be proposed, they should be discussed and included in the MDA.
5. In Section 6 of the MDA, add a clarifying statement to address compensatory storage. **Suggestion:** "This project is a residential in-fill development on existing subdivisions; MB 9 - page 199 and MB 11 - page 91, as such, pursuant to LDC Chapter 8, Section 9 (c) (6), compensatory storage is not required."

CITY ATTORNEY REVIEW COMMENTS: (Shannon Balmer, Assistant City Attorney (386) 506-5535/sbalmer@port-orange.org; or Matthew Jones, Deputy City Attorney (386) 506-5527/mjones@port-orange.org):

1. Provide title opinion for the riparian rights referenced in the legal description of Parcel No. 6314-01-12-0010.
2. Revise references in MDA to "Oak Harbor PUD" to the correct name.
3. Phasing section needs to be clarified in the MDA.
4. Suggest breaking out section or subsection to address the marina.
5. Add language requiring easements for property owners for use of the marina area.
6. City Attorney's office reserves right to make additional comments as new information provided.

PUBLIC UTILITIES DEPARTMENT REVIEW COMMENTS: (Nicole Quinby, P.E. Kimley Horn (407) 409-7005/Nicole.quinby@kimley-horn.com; Elizabeth O'Reilly 407-427-1655/elizabeth.oreilly@kimley-horn.com):

Under Section 6 of the MDA:

1. Under Section 6 of the MDA - Address the means of connection to existing potable water and sanitary sewer mains on Riverside Drive. In the event a

- sanitary sewer pump station is necessary, reference the City of Port Orange Utility Construction Standards for minimum property requirements.
2. Under Section 6 of the MDA - Will the development be master metered with on-site utilities privately owned and maintained or will all water and sewer infrastructure be conveyed to the City?
 3. Under Section 6 of the MDA - Irrigation shall be provided to all landscaped common areas.
 4. The Environmental Report references Orange County, FL. Clarify that information is for Volusia County, and change the report accordingly.

PUBLIC UTILITIES/RIGHT-OF-WAY REVIEW COMMENTS: (Linda Johnson, Right-of-Way Agent (386) 506-5755/ljohnson@port-orange.org):

1. MDA - Paragraph 5 references phased development with infrastructure to be completed in Phase 1. Please elaborate and the number of phases contemplated for development.
2. MDA - Paragraph 9, plat improvements. Please definitively state if the development will be a platted subdivision of the subject Property.
3. CDP - LDC Ch. 17, Sec. 17(h)(2)(a), Boundary Dimensions. Add the boundary dimension along Ridgewood Avenue.
4. CDP - LDC Ch. 17, Sec. 17(h)(2)(i), Graphically depict on the CDP the location of existing and proposed utilities and easements.
5. **Suggestion:** Consider adding the Boundary Survey as a supplemental sheet to MDA Exhibit B (the Conceptual Development Plan).

PUBLIC WORKS REVIEW COMMENTS: (Alex Popovic, Engineering Intern (386) 506-5572/apopovic@port-orange.org; Kristine Martin, Engineering Inspector (386) 506-5597/kmartin@port-orange.org; Mick Neals, Solid Waste Manager (386) 506-5571/mneals@port-orange.org):

1. Extend the sidewalk to the north east property corner. The existing drainage connection in this area may need to be modified (piped) to accommodate the sidewalk. Reducing the width of the easterly sidewalk from 8 to 5 feet may be considered by staff to augment the reconfiguration needed to the drainage connection.
2. Provide a sidewalk off-set at the entrance to Riverside Drive. The off-set should begin at the proposed northerly sidewalk and move east toward Riverside Drive and in-line with the proposed dock. Standard crosswalk (double line) instead of special emphasis crosswalk markings should be used across the entrance driveway. Finally, the sidewalk would then move back to the proposed sidewalk along the southerly side of the entrance driveway. This configuration would provide a safe staging location for residents going to the dock and traffic exiting the development would stage closer to Riverside Drive for visibility and stacking purposes.
3. Place curbing along the north and south edge of the entrance driveway on Riverside Drive.
4. Indicate garbage collection locations.

FIRE DEPARTMENT REVIEW COMMENTS: (Beau Gardner, Fire Marshal (386) 506-5905/bgardner@port-orange.org):

1. NFPA states unobstructed width of 20' for FD access, so no on-street parking allowed.
2. NFPA states that turns in the road cannot reduce the width of the road, it appears as though that is the case in the corner near lot #22.

BUILDING DIVISION REVIEW COMMENTS: (Robert Harrell, Building Inspector/Plans Examiner (386) 506-5621/rharrell@port-orange.org; Allan Tischler, Chief Building Official (386) 506-5627/atischler@port-orange.org):

No comments.