



506 WEST BERCKMAN STREET  
FRUITLAND PARK, FL 34731

PHONE: 352/ 360-6727  
FAX: 352/ 360-6652

<p><b>Board Members:</b>  City Manager Gary La Venia, Chairman  City Engineer Duane Booth  City Land Planner Greg Beliveau  Jeff Gerling, Building Official  Judd Wright, Fire Inspector  Tracy Kelley, CDD</p>	<p><b>Board Members:</b>  Chief Mike Fewless, Police Department, Vice Chair  Chief Donald Gilpin, Fire Department  Dale Bogle, Public Works Director  Lori Davis, Code Enforcement</p>
---	--

---

**MINUTES**  
**TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**JUNE 5, 2018**  
**10:00AM**

---

- I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:** Meeting called to order at 10:03AM
- II. MEMBERS PRESENT:** All board members present with the exception of Jeff Gerling, Building Official and Judd Wright, Fire Inspector.
- III. MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING:** Motion to approve May 1, 2018 meeting minutes by Lori Davis, Code Enforcement Officer. Second by Greg Beliveau, City Land Planner. Approved 8-0.
- IV. OLD BUSINESS:**
  - A. IC International Car Wash Revised Major Site Plan Application with Variance Amendment; Vacant Property (ALT Key 1170621 & 1699754)

Planning Project Manager, Rick Hartenstein attended on behalf of applicant. Typographical error and page omission error noted by CDD Kelley. Planning Project Manager Hartenstein submitted the revised landscape plan and stated that the typographical error on the plans has since been corrected. The revised landscape plan has not yet been reviewed.

Property Owner Fruitland Park Holdings, LLC submitting a revised site plan application with a variance for the design standards for the one way isle width from twenty (24') feet to fourteen (14') feet for construction of a proposed car wash facility under the existing zoning land use of C-2 (General Commercial).

Regarding the variance request City Land Planner Beliveau asked if the City Fire Department had any comments regarding destabilization adjacent to the fourteen (14') foot lane width for fire purposes, which has been mentioned in prior. Planning Project Manager stated that it would not obstruct access in the event of an emergency. City Engineer Booth pointed out that the justification letter mistakenly stated that other cities had similar requirements as what is proposed. City Engineer Booth stated that other cities actually hold similar standards to what the City of Fruitland Park enforces. The justification letter states that Lake County allows for a fourteen (14') foot lane width, which City Engineer Booth states is incorrect, as Lake County requires twenty-two (22') foot lane width for 90 degree parking. Upon researching surrounding cities City Engineer Booth stated that one city did allow sixteen (16') foot for a one way drive with no parking. Planning Project Manager stated that the vacuum stalls were not classified as parking. CDD Kelley clarified that a space used to park and turn the car

off is classified as a parking space. City Engineer Booth agreed that the spaces in question are classified as parking stalls. City Engineer Booth states that the problem with the request is that NFPA 1 requires a twenty (20') foot unobstructed access. City Engineer Booth would like the City Fire Chief to make the determination on whether a curb is an obstruction. NFPA 1 also requires one-hundred fifty (150') foot max allowable space from access for backing up unless a turnaround area is provided. Fire Chief Gilpin questioned the Community Development Director as to whether we have any similar situations as what is being proposed currently located in the city. CDD Kelley stated not to best of knowledge. Fire Chief Gilpin stated that he would not recommend the variance as it will start a precedence for others to follow. Also, the City Fire Department will be purchasing a new ladder truck that will be larger than what is currently being utilized, which will make it harder to safely access the site in the event of an emergency. City Engineer Booth gave his experience with another municipality that required him to show the turn radius; fifty (50') foot outside; twenty (20') foot inside turning radius on a ladder truck. Planning Project Manager requested that he be able to show that the proposed turn radius will be effective. City Engineer Booth stated that he needed to utilize CAD to convey this to the City Fire Department. City Engineer Booth stated that he was concerned that the proposed project as-is would not be able to meet the twenty (20') foot unobstructed access as defined in NFPA 1 and is seeking advisement of the City Fire Department. Chief Gilpin stated that it would depend on the specs of the truck being purchased. Planning Project Manager stated that they would comply with worst case scenario which would be the largest truck proposed to be purchased. City Land Planner Beliveau stated that he has utilized the CAD program's time elapse software to confirm compliance, which resulted in approval. Planning Project Manager stated that they would be able to move the curb over to allot for more space to make a stabilized surface and change the width to comply with the unobstructed accessible route requirement. City Engineer Booth recommended that Planning Project Manager look up NFPA 1, which CDD Kelley stated that she would provide the referenced sections. City Engineer Booth asked Fire Chief Gilpin if a curb is considered an obstruction and if the fire truck can drive over the curb. Fire Chief Gilpin stated that he would review. Planning Project Manager stated that he may be able to move the curb. City Manager La Venia asked for any further comments. CDD Kelley provided the referenced chapters of NFPA 1; Section numbers 18, 2, 3, 5, 1, 1. Public Works Director Bogle made the comment that the lift station belongs to the developer and the City will not be responsible for maintenance. City Manager La Venia stated that the same would apply to the Village Park Development as well. Brett Tobias, BESH Engineering, noted that they have not yet seen a response addressing some of the comments made. Mr. Tobias referenced the easements shown in the resubmittal on the reciprocal easement agreement. Mr. Tobias noted that the drainage plans were not clear; cannot tell where the pipe is in relation to the easement. Mr. Tobias needs clarification that none of the piping on the plans are located outside of the easement. Mr. Tobias did say that the agreement is that the piping will be maintained by the owner of the property where it is located and wanted to make sure that the plans are completely clear to who owns which section of the piping to avoid future conflict of maintenance responsibilities. Planning Project Manager stated that the storm pipe will be maintained by the developer regardless of location. City Engineer Booth requested that this be noted on the plans. CDD Kelley asked if another formal TRC meeting would be required for this project since there are still some concerns. City Engineer Booth stated that there are revised plans as well as comments that need to be reviewed but another formal TRC is not required. City Engineer Booth stated that if the City Fire Department is satisfied regarding the width of the aisles then the City Engineering Service will be satisfied as well. Once the fire review is completed and accepted, the revisions will move forward to further review. City

Manager La Venia recommended that the development move forward to Planning and Zoning. Planning Project Manager requested a timeline. Revisions to be in by the week of the 18<sup>th</sup>-22<sup>nd</sup> of June to prepare for July 19<sup>th</sup> Planning and Zoning. No further comments.

**V. NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. Lake Saunders Groves Land, LLP Planned Development Application; Vacant Property  
(ALT Key 1284805, 1284511, 1284503, 1284490, 3883988, 1771625, 1771617, 1284821)

Applicant requesting Ordinance 2006-013 and Exhibit B of the Ordinance to be extended under the PUD zoning

Jimmy Crawford, Esq, in attendance to represent Lake Saunders Grove development application. Attorney Crawford respectfully disagrees with the opinion that the development needs to start from the beginning. Attorney Crawford stated that their developer gave the City a utility easement and met with the former CDD (Charlie Rector) and was assured that the PUD would have no problem going through; now the applicant is applying to renew or extend the PUD. Attorney Crawford believes that under the existing PUD, Section 33 states that it expires in 10 years unless the term is extended by mutual consent of the city and the owner/developer is subject to a public hearing. Whether that means that it has to be extended before the expiration date or not is a question for the City Attorney or the City Manager. City Land Planner Beliveau stated that in his opinion that it means prior to the expiration date. Attorney Crawford disagrees with that opinion and believes that the City Council should come to a conclusion with consideration from the City Attorney and City Manager. Attorney Crawford requests that the PUD be renewed under Section 33 and if it cannot, Attorney Crawford does not agree with the comment that a new preliminary plan must be submitted. The PUD Ordinance in Chapter 154 of the LDRs states that if the applicant so chooses, a conceptual plan may be submitted prior to the rezoning period. City Land Planner Beliveau adds that it also says City Council may require additional information. City Land Planner Beliveau recommended the development set up a workshop up front to convey their objective to the City prior to the hearing process. Attorney Crawford stated that his client may regret giving the City an easement. City Manager La Venia stated that the easement agreement benefits the client as City sewer services are available immediately upon developing the property, but ERU (equivalent residential unit) credits toward impact fees are agreed upon as well. A contracted appraisal is being afforded by the City as well, which is beneficial to the client. A previous verbal agreement that may have been made does not exempt the developer from following the proper approval process. Attorney Crawford's client is not looking to develop the property, but to sell the property. A professional marketer has it listed, but it cannot be pushed until the property zoning is clarified. Attorney Crawford mentioned that starting the project over may push them to consider straight zoning, rather than the PUD. City Land Planner Beliveau stated the City would seek advisement from the City Attorney and that a bubble plan is not recommended as it may delay the entire process. Attorney Crawford stated that upon selling the property, another developer would go through the entire PUD process before developing the property, regardless of the outcome of the process completed by the current owners. Attorney Crawford would rather extend the existing PUD than start the process completely over. City Land Planner Beliveau will seek City Attorney advisement before moving forward. Attorney Crawford stated that the owners are not in a predicament where the project is under a time constraint, but they do not want to allocate the funds design a subdivision that will not be built, as the property will be sold regardless. Straight zoning may be an option since any new developer would need to appear before council with a new

June 5, 2018 TRC Meeting Minutes Continued

Page 4 of 5

development application. City Manager La Venia stated that a PUD would be ideal. Attorney Crawford would like to present his PUD extension request for hearing before making any other development decisions. City Land Planner Beliveau stated that there are ideal options

available regardless of the outcome of the request. Attorney Crawford stated that the PUD allows for 6 acres of municipal use, whether it is use for a sewer plan or not. Attorney Crawford will await the City Attorney's advisement.

#### B. Village Park Campus of First Baptist Church of Leesburg Major Site Plan Application

Major Site Plan application for Phases 1 & 2 for First Baptist Church of Leesburg with associated parking and storm water management system to include a variance from Section 162.060 – a.3.C.ii – the 2 foot grass overhang requirement for the 163 vehicle parking spaces that adjoin the sidewalk

Jeff Head, P.E., Farnier Barley & Associates Inc, is in attendance to represent Village Park Major Site Plan Application. Mr. Head is in receipt of comments from the City, as well as Lake County. CDD Kelley stated the corresponding documents from the Westminister's Engineer (Greg Crawford, FL Engineering Group) were received after the agenda packet was complete and a copy was given to Board Members today merely to make the Board aware of the correspondence. CDD Kelley stated that Public Works has not had a chance to review or address the documents yet as they were only received late yesterday. An agreement in the form of a bond pertaining to sidewalk construction has been proposed to avoid reconstructing the sidewalk upon the development of each parcel. Lake County comments address the requirement of a new traffic analysis. City Engineer Booth asserted that all new comments must be reviewed and approved. A contingency approval may be given to the church since construction will have to be started to access other parts of the property. Though there are two projects to be developed simultaneously, a permit cannot be issued for the second project (Westminister Properties) until the approval process is completed. In reference to the parking variance, the code makes a reduction possible by leaving spaces unpaved, which is unlikely. Mr. Head interprets the code to say that a variance is not required, but will request a variance if necessary. City Land Planner Beliveau stated that there are two conflicting sections in the code concerning specific parking requirements. City Engineer Booth stated that the dimensions section requires ten (10') feet by twenty (20') feet parking spots. The same section, part B, also reads specific requirements for reduced length. Designers are encouraged to reduce paved areas by reducing the length of standard parking spaces to eighteen (18') feet of pavement with two (2') feet of grassed overhang area. This will reduce the impervious surface ratio. Wheel stops shall be installed at least thirty (30") inches from an adjacent sidewalk, fence, wall or hedge if required. The stops shall be of the standard concrete curb, or other appurtenance or design feature that keeps a vehicle from obstructing a sidewalk or making contact with a wall, hedge or fence. A sidewalk adjacent to a building may be used for vehicle overhang if the sidewalk is not less than seven (7') feet wide. Section 162.060 (G) reads: wheel stops shall be installed at least thirty (30") inches from an adjacent sidewalk, fence, wall or hedge if required. The stops shall be of the standard concrete curb or other appurtenance or design feature that keeps a vehicle from obstructing a sidewalk or making contact with a wall, hedge or fence. A sidewalk adjacent to a building may be used for vehicle overhang if the sidewalk is not less than seven (7') feet wide. City Engineer Booth questions if this section can be interpreted to reduce the width of the parking stall provided the five (5') feet accessibility is met; though this section is specifically for wheel stops, curbing, and speed bumps. City Engineer Booth is unsure if a determination can be made

June 5, 2018 TRC Meeting Minutes Continued

Page 5 of 5

regarding the variance request based on how the code reads. City Land Planner Beliveau states that his position is that the intent allows the parking stall to be the equivalent of twenty (20') feet, including the two (2') feet overhang area if the sidewalk exceeds five (5') feet. City Engineer Booth questioned that since the parking stall does not have to be all asphalt, can the two (2') feet of sidewalk be included in the required twenty (20') feet? City Land Planner Beliveau answered with yes. Mr. Head stated that the impervious surface ratio would

be the same either way. Mr. Head stated that wheel stops are unfavorable and the two (2') feet strip would be hard to maintain as well as unaesthetic. The seven (7') foot proposed sidewalk is raised with its own wheel stop, it is a nice clean look. City Land Planner Beliveau knows that the width has to be twenty (20') feet. A case by case basis is proposed. City Engineer Booth stated that the flush sidewalk, if a wheel stop is not included, someone could pull onto the sidewalk and block the accessible route. Mr. Head with make sure a vehicle cannot pull onto the sidewalk. City Manager La Venia stated that as long as the conditions are met a car cannot pull onto the sidewalk. **City Engineer Booth only remaining comment is that the other set of plans needs to be reviewed prior to starting the project, the applicant can move forward with conditional approval.** City Land Planner Beliveau asked if there was an agreement for golf cart access. Mr. Head stated that the church chose not to request golf cart access. City Land Planner Beliveau stated that the easements are visible on the plans, but does not allow golf cart access; if golf cart access is wanted, now would be the time to ask for those provisions as it would be very favorable for the church. CDD Kelley stated that this may make them drive on the sidewalk if access is not allowed. Mr. Tobias stated that they would revise their letter to the City recommending conditional approval upon the approval of the newest revised submittal. An application has not been received for the rear development (Westminister Properties), just a set of construction plans. CDD Kelley did convey that concern with the applicant, if the plans are submitted, the completed application needs to be submitted as well to avoid partial reviews. Mr. Head questioned if a variance needed to be filed and CDD Kelley answered no. Per CDD Kelley project will be moved forward to the July 19th Planning & Zoning meeting with the conditional approval.

**MEMBERS' COMMENTS:** No further Comments

**ADJOURNMENT:** Meeting adjourned at 11:00AM