If any person decides to appeal any decision made by the Technical Review Committee with respect to any matter considered at this meeting, he/she will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose he/she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based (FS 286.0105). Individuals with disabilities needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact the City Clerk at least three (3) working days in advance of the meeting date and time at (386) 775-5403.
MINUTES OF THE CITY OF ORANGE CITY TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE, held on Tuesday March 20, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. in the Development Services Conference Room, 205 E. Graves Avenue, Orange City, Florida.

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call**

   Development Services Director Becky Mendez called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., and roll call was taken.

   **PRESENT:** TRC Staff: Glenn Pereno, Chief Building Official; Becky Mendez, Development Services Director; Sgt. Greg Lariscy, OCPD; Carol McFarlane, City Planner; Michael Watson, Public Works Construction Manager; Robert Scott, Fire Marshal

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   Sgt. Lariscy made a motion to approve the minutes from February 20, 2018. Mr. Pereno seconded the motion. Motion passed.

3. **NEW BUSINESS**

   **A. Candlelight Mobile Home Park Planned Unit Development (RPUD-2-18-1316)**

   **PRESENT:** Mario and Ann Mazzola, owners

   Carol McFarlane gave a brief explanation of the project. City Staff and the applicant discussed the comments made by the TRC and the items in the draft Development Order. The following items were also discussed:

   1. Sgt. Lariscy stated that it would be ideal if the park posted more prominent, reflective street signs for emergency responder convenience.
   2. The owners and City Staff clarified that the storage area is only for residents.
   3. City staff clarified that the current rezoning would not exclude the property from being able to be rezoned if the owners wished to expand or add to their current use.

   **MOTION:** Staff recommended that the TRC vote to forward the above-referenced application to the Planning Commission with a recommendation to approve with the following conditions:

   A. Revise the Development Agreement to comply with the TRC comments.
   B. Revise the Development Plan to comply with the TRC comments.
   C. Provide the legal description in WORD format so that it will be legible in the rezoning documents.

   Sgt. Lariscy made a motion to forward the above-reference application to the Planning Commission with the recommendation to approve with the aforementioned conditions. Mr. Pereno seconded the motion. Motion passed.
4. **COMMENTS/DISCUSSION**

A. Staff briefly discussed the upcoming Kentucky Ave. stakeholder meeting.
B. Staff briefly discussed the status of the Dale’s Ales property and the uses of the property.
C. Staff discussed the status of the building to the north the Oyster Bar, as well as the Dickinson House on Volusia Ave. and whether to continue with code enforcement on the properties.

5. **ADJOURNMENT**

Sgt. Lariscy made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Pereno seconded the motion. With there being no further business, Development Services Director, Becky Mendez adjourned the meeting at 9:51 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:                     APPROVED ON

______________________________________________  ___________________

Becky Mendez, Development Services Director
Development Services
To: Technical Review Committee (TRC)
From: Joe Ruiz  
Senior Planner, Development Services Department  
Re: Parc Hill Residential Preliminary Plat  
800 Parc Hill Boulevard  
Case: PPLT-12-17-1306  
Meeting Date: April 3, 2018  
Memo Date: March 27, 2018

**Project Summary:** This is a preliminary plat application of a proposed residential subdivision consisting of 185 single-family lots, on ± 62.40¹ acres, which is a portion of Lot 3 and Lot 4 of the Parc Hill global replat. The subdivision layout proposes nine internal streets with two road connections to Junior Street and one to the proposed Parc Hill Boulevard that accesses Veterans Memorial Parkway. The common areas consist of 16 tracts with one for dedicated Right-of-Way, 11 open space tracts, one lift station tract, and three tracts for stormwater retention/detention.

This portion of Parc Hill is not located within the Orange City Utility Service Boundary (USB) area for water, wastewater, or reclaimed service. A Utility Service Agreement between the developer and Volusia County is scheduled for an April 17, 2018, public hearing. All utilities, including the lift station will be dedicated to Volusia County for ownership and maintenance after the agreement is finalized. All roadways will be dedicated to Orange City.

A preliminary plat requires public hearing before the Planning Commission and City Council. Public hearings will be scheduled upon the revision of the preliminary plat submittal addressing the conditions and staff comments.

City Council previous actions include:
- Ord. No. 567- Adopted the MPUD development agreement on March 28, 2017
- Res. No. 864-17- Approved the Parc Hill global replat on June 27, 2017
- Approved the Capacity Reservation and Transportation Mitigation Agreement on August 8, 2017 (recorded Book: 7449 Page: 520)

**Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the TRC approve Case PPLT-12-17-1306, with the following conditions:

1. Revise construction plans and preliminary plat to address staff comments attached.
2. A Utility Service Agreement shall be approved and executed by Volusia County prior to the issuance a development order.

¹ There are several area calculations throughout the construction drawings. The preliminary plat needs to be revised to verify the correct area calculations.
STAFF REVIEW:

**Development Services, Joseph Ruiz, Senior Planner, 1.18.19**

General Information:

1. **Satisfied.** A minor amendment to the MPUD development agreement (DA) is required to amend the lot width requirements and to bring the newly acquired holdout parcels into the PUD. On January 4, 2018, the applicant submitted documents for staff review, and the application on January 26, 2018. Comments will come under separate cover. The minor amendment must be approved and recorded prior to issuance of any development order.

   The revised DA is in process of recordation.

2. **Satisfied.** Submit a draft preliminary plat in accordance with Florida Statute, Chapter 171 for sufficiency review, approval and public hearing before any development order is issued.

3. **Satisfied.** Submit draft Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, Easements and Restrictions for the Homeowners Association for review and approval. The DCRs must be approved before issuance of the development order.

4. **Not Satisfied.** Submit a proposed street name exhibit for review and coordination with Volusia County 911 addressing.

   The proposed street names need to be depicted on both the preliminary plat and construction drawings.

5. **Not Satisfied.** Submit an engineer’s cost estimate for all infrastructure to be constructed in accordance with Section 5.1.1, Orange City Land Development Code, assuming that the applicant will want to post a performance bond in lieu of installing, and the City accepting, required improvements prior to the approval of a final plat.

6. **Not Satisfied.** Provide a copy of an approved Gopher Tortoise relocation permit before any development order will be issued. FFWCC issued a Gopher Tortoise relocation permit GTT-17-00441 on July 10, 2017 for the 16.23 acres of Parc Hill infrastructure site plan, but does not include this portion of the PUD.

7. **No action required.** There are 42 forty-foot wide lots, 123 fifty-foot wide lots, and 20 sixty-five-foot or greater wide lots. This complies with the 35% maximum number of lots that are 40 feet wide standard of the DA.

8. **No action required.** US Fish & Wildlife Service issued Scrub Jay habitat mitigation permit TE39111C-0 on December 27, 2017 and the mitigation fee in the amount of $209,220 was paid on January 23, 2018. This permit applies to the entire Parc Hill PUD property.

9. **No action required at this phase.** Please take note that any proposed Parc Hill development above the Nexcore ALF and this 185-lot residential subdivision may require participation in sewer capacity improvements. In particular, installing a new 12 inch
forcemain on Rhode Island between Leavitt and Veterans Memorial Parkway to complete a missing segment.

Construction Drawings:

10. **Satisfied.** The side setback requirement for the 65-foot wide lots is 7.5 feet, not 5.0 feet. Revise the building envelope for all 65-foot+ wide lots to indicate the minimum 7.5-foot side setback.
11. **Satisfied.** Revise the dimension glitch/typo at the rear property line of Lot 105.
12. **Satisfied.** Revise Lot 54 on Sheet 11 of 58 to depict a lot width dimension along the front property line.
13. **Partially Satisfied.** Provide architectural elevations for the clubhouse, trail signage, mail kiosks and any other common structure proposed.

Are the mailboxes going to be attached to the cabana building as depicted on Sheet A5 of 58? If not, the standalone mail kiosk will need to be depicted on all corresponding construction drawings. Also, provide color elevations upon availability.

14. **Partially Satisfied.** Sheet 58 of 58 indicates a street lamp detail. What color is the lamp post, as three choices are available? Also, please direct staff to the photometric plan that indicates the lamp post locations.

Based on your response dated March 5, 2018, do you intend to request a street lighting district through the City Council?

15. Revise Sheet 7:
   a. **Satisfied.** Call out all perimeter landscape buffer widths.
   b. **Satisfied.** Add entrance sign location.
   c. **Satisfied.** Is Lot 27 a Tract?
   d. **Satisfied.** There is no demarcation between tract D and O (lots 15-20), tract G and E (lots 78-83), tract H and K (lot 71-77), and tract L and B (lot 50-55).
   e. **Satisfied.** Tract O is not listed in the open space table.
   f. **Satisfied.** Label all of the internal and external (including the east/west streets in Breezewood) street names.
   g. **Satisfied.** Add perimeter fence location.
   h. **Satisfied.** The zoning and jurisdiction for adjacent properties along the west property line is not accurate. The most southern first block is city R-1, but then it becomes unincorporated county with two zonings; PUD and R-4. Zoning in a portion along the north property line is city R-2, not R-1 and the County-owned, unincorporated property zoned R-4 is not listed. Please update.
Landscape Plans:

16. **Satisfied.** Sheets L212 and L213. Why are there community mailboxes (H-5) in the middle of a trail?

17. **Satisfied.** On Sheet L214 the dimensions for the Landscape buffer along Joe Street adjacent to Lot 1 depicts a 20’ foot Landscape Buffer with a 19’ foot dimension depicted within it. Clarify and label whether the 19’ foot distance is from the PVC fence.

18. **Partially Satisfied.** Sheets L412-414. How will the street trees be irrigated by the homeowners? How will the City enforce maintenance of the street trees?

   Applicant needs to provide a clause within the covenant and restrictions.

19. **Satisfied.** Sheets L415-418. Orange City Land Development Code section 10.5.1 (E) does not apply. The landscape buffer along Junior Avenue is considered a front perimeter buffer, not a side or rear. Section 10.5.1 (A) applies, which requires 4”DBH every 40 feet, plus four 2”DBH every 100 feet. Revise the plan to include the minimum required plants for a front yard and revise the code reference.

20. **Satisfied.** Sheet L414. Provide a decorative fence and detail around the lift station.

21. **Satisfied.** Paragraph G.4.H of the Developer’s Agreement (DA) requires two (2) species of trees between the streets and the sidewalk (one large, one medium). Starting on Sheet L411, only cabbage palms are shown in the right-of-way of Parc Hill Boulevard. Revise the landscape plan to show a second species planted between the street and the sidewalk. Staff suggests alternating between canopy and understory trees for a formal look, or having groups of trees in odd numbers for an informal look.

   Technically, there are more than one species of street trees provided because each street uses a different species of tree. **New informational comment:** However, staff would like to point out that since street trees will be provided by the home owner at the time of construction, it is likely that some properties will not stick to the theme for their street, due to seasonal availability and home owner’s preference.

22. **Satisfied.** Sheet L421. Canopy trees must be a minimum 4” Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) and understory trees are a minimum of 2”DBH. The proposed plant list indicates 3” caliper trees. These do not meet the minimum size requirements. Convert all measurements to DBH and increase accordingly.

23. **Partially Satisfied.** Section 11.7, LDC requires a minimum of six inches of DBH for every 2,500 square feet of area, or 6,524 inches in this case. You are required to plant one 4 inch DBH tree on each lot at the time it is constructed (this needs to be included in the DRCs too) for a total of 748 inches. We cannot calculate the number of DBH inches indicated on the plans until the caliper measurement is converted. If the proposed landscaping does not make up the difference you may elect to 1) pay into the City’s tree bank; 2) designate a natural vegetation retention area in which all existing 2”DBH trees count; 3) plant more and/or larger trees; or 4) a combination of all of the above.
On Sheet L410 the Applicant has provided the DBH breakdown depicting 6,524 inches are being met. Revise the covenants and restrictions to reflect the requirement that each lot must plant 2 – 4” inch DBH trees, plus the proposed street tree in accordance with the Landscape Plans at the time of construction.

Also, a palm planting minimum inch requirement is required to be stated on Sheet L410 in lieu of the 4” inch tree requirement.

24. **Satisfied.** Please explain the street tree planting concept. Rather than creating formal or informal groupings of trees, each street has a different species of tree planted at different intervals. For instance, Parc Hill Boulevard has cabbage palms planted every 20 feet; another street has bottlebrush planted at 30’ foot intervals; another street has live oaks planted at 40’ foot intervals; another street has crepe myrtles at 30’ foot intervals; another street has Palatka holly planted at 40’ foot intervals; and yet another street has dahoon holly planted at 26’ foot intervals (Lot 52 street tree is planted at 33’ feet from Lots 51 & 53). City staff fails to see how this provides a cohesive look and feel of a community.

The DRCCs need to mandate the street tree.

25. **Satisfied.** A note on sheet L418 and L419 states that supplemental plantings will be chosen from the approved plant palette. However, there is no approved plant palette at this time. Previous comments on Parc Hill Phase 1 requested a plant palette that explains the design aesthetic of the development. Staff suggests that a plant palette be submitted and approved prior to submitting any more landscape plans for review.

26. **Satisfied.** A note on the landscape plans starting on sheet L412 state that street trees will be planted at the time of construction for each lot, and will be irrigated by the home owner. However, many street trees are not bounded by a lot. Find a way to designate which trees will be installed when the roads are constructed, and which trees will be installed during home construction such as showing the tree symbols in a lighter grey or dashed line versus solid black lines. This will reduce conflict over ambiguity during inspections. **Informational:** It must be clear in the Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions for the homeowner association that all street trees must be preserved and maintained, or replaced if necessary. It must be clear to the city which entity will be served with notices of violations in case the street trees are neglected.

Additional comments on the HOA documents are provided separately.

27. **Not Satisfied.** There are callouts on sheets L415 and L416 for section 10.5 which states a visual screen is required along Junior Street, and that preserved trees may account for the required plantings. However, on sheet 29 and 31 of the construction drawings, grading will occur up to and past the property line, which would destroy any existing vegetation. The only plantings shown are bald cypress located every 40 linear feet,
which will not achieve a full visual screen. Revise the plans to clearly show what plants will be used to create a visual screen.

Sheet 6 of the construction plans shows that silt fencing will be placed along the property boundary and protecting outparcels only. Sheets 27 and 29 show the extent of grading going up to and, in some cases, beyond the property line. This means that no native vegetation will be preserved on the property line (vegetation in the right-of-way does not count). Therefore, the callouts on sheets L415 to L419 that reference existing vegetation are inaccurate because there will be no native vegetation after construction. Any area that is not protected will either be graded or used to stack materials or for parking of vehicles and equipment during construction. There are two options:

a. Revise sheet 6 of the construction plans to show silt fencing or tree preservation barricades around areas that are identified on the plans as “Natural Vegetation to Remain”; or

b. Revise sheets L415 to L419 to remove the references to native vegetation and plant to meet the minimum requirements in the LDC.

28. Satisfied. There is a callout on sheet L418 that shows existing vegetation will be used around the connection to Junior Street. However, when you compare that sheet to the grading plan in the construction drawings, sheet 27, the property will be graded in most of that area. Revise the landscape plan to clearly show what plants will be installed to achieve required buffers.

29. Not Satisfied. Sheets L415, 416, 417, 418 and 419 indicate that existing vegetation will be preserved and used to count towards landscaping requirements. Revise the erosion control plan, sheet 6 of the construction plans, so that those areas of natural vegetation that will be preserved will be outside of the silt fence.

The silt fence on Sheet 6 is still depicted up to the property line. Staff’s response above for previous comment #27 applies to this comment as well. Areas of vegetation that you wish to keep must be physically protected during construction or they will be destroyed by construction activities. Resolve this comment by using one of the two solutions indicated in the previous comments.

30. Satisfied. On sheet L421, the plant list shows a clear preference for non-native shrubs and groundcovers. This is not consistent with the development agreement, which encourages “heavy use of native species” (paragraph G.4.e).

31. Satisfied. The perimeter landscape buffers are shown on the layout plans but not to the full extent on the landscape plans, which is inadequate because the layout plans do not show the full extent of the project perimeter. Revise sheets L415, 416, 417, 418 and 419 to show landscape buffers and widths on Junior Street and the project’s southern boundary.
32. Satisfied. Sheet L310. Provide a detail for the 6’ high opaque fence (H2), community mailbox (H5), pool pavers (H 9/10/11), and trail signage (H14). These all will require separate building permits. The concrete walkway (H3) detail should be moved to the construction drawings?

Update the HOA documents to require community maintenance of common fences.

New Comments – 3.6.18 Submittal, Development Services, 3.22.18

Preliminary Plat

1. The Tract labels depicted on the preliminary plat do not match those of the Construction Drawings. Revise plans accordingly for consistency.
2. Revise the typo in the Dedication Block from “Strrets” to “Streets”.
3. Update the City Council Signature Block year to 2018, and add Mayor to the Chairman Title.

Construction Drawings

4. Label Junior Street on Sheet 7 of 58 Overall Site Plan.
5. Revise the Additional Notes #3 on Sheet 7 of 58 to state “All common areas to be maintained by the Homeowners Association”, and #4 to state, “Utilities will be owned and maintained by Volusia County”.
6. On Sheet 7 of 58, revise the Tract Table for Tract M – Lift Station to be dedicated to Volusia County.
7. Provide a typical lot layout for the 65’ foot wide lots on Sheet 55 of 58 General Details 2. Also, revise all lot layouts to depict a minimum of 110’ foot lot depth as required in the Development Agreement.
8. Staff has previously discussed with the Applicant regarding seeding/sodding certain portions of Junior Street as improvements to the sandy swales within the Right-of-Way adjacent to the proposed buffer. None of the plans depict improvements along this area. Please revise plans to include seeding/sodding improvements.

Landscape Plans

9. Include Sheet L310 on the Cover Page’s Sheet Index.
10. Revise Lot 54 on Sheet L213 to depict a lot width dimension along the front property line.
11. On Sheet L412, the street tree proposed between Lots 164 & 165 seems to be conflicting with the stormwater inlet. Add a note on the plans that “trees shall be field verified and adjusted as necessary” and verify any other trees with the same conflicts.
12. The 20’ buffer to the south is missing nine – 4” inch DBH oak trees, as required to be planted by code. Revise Sheets L418 & L419 to include the required trees.
13. Revise Sheet 7 of 58 to delineate the required 15% of Tree Preservation Area, as required by Section 11.8 – Area tree protection requirements.

14. On sheet L214, the mulch trail is located in an area where grading for a stormwater pond will cause a 4 foot drop over 16 foot distance (or 1:4 slope), as well as a full 8 foot drop from the edge of pavement of the cul-de-sac sidewalk. It is steeper than the “grass play hill” identified on sheet L212. Are you sure this is your intent for the trail?

15. On sheet L412, the plans say that street trees will be installed at time of home construction and irrigated by the home owner, and those trees are shown as a lighter grey than the trees that will be constructed with the pool enclosure and infrastructure. But then on sheet L512, it shows reclaimed water being provided on the south side of Parc Hill Boulevard, for lots 35-39, and on the north side for lot 40. Does that mean that all homes except lots 35-40 provide irrigation for street trees? If so, the DCRs will need to be revised to exclude those lots from this requirement. Are the trees on lots 35-40 not going to be planted at the time of infrastructure construction, but the irrigation will? Revise the plans and HOA docs to provide clarification.

HOA Documents

16. Revise the documents to include page numbers consistent with the Table of Contents.

17. The definition of “Association Property” lists decorative street lights, but per definition of street lights, the HOA appears to be responsible for all street light operation and maintenance. Revise the definition to include all street lights, not only decorative.

18. The definition of “Community” references property in the County multiple times. Revise this to City and provide a definition of City which shall mean the City of Orange City, Florida.

19. The definition of “Drainage Permit” must be revised to reference the City, not the County.

20. The definition of “Public Records” should be revised to also include the City of Orange City.

21. The Easement referenced in Section 4.02 must be revised to reference the City, not the County.

22. Section 4.08 must be revised to state “the Declarant and the local government must agree upon an MSTU”. Taxing districts are required to be approved by the City Council.

23. Section 4.11(5) should mention that the individual home owners are responsible for the irrigation of street trees in front of their house.

24. The last sentence in Section 8.01.C is too broad. Please revise.

25. Section 8.02 is a location to consider adding in the street tree and irrigation requirement.

26. Section 10.04 must reference City ordinances, not County. The City requires a building permit to erect flag poles.

27. Section 10.20, revise to include that subdivision of lots must also abide by the local government’s subdivision regulations.

28. Section 10.28, revise to add language that references the approved landscape plans on record with the City for common areas and rights-of-way.

29. The provided HOA documents do not provide a development standard to avoid a homogenous community with monotonous architecture. Revise documents to include

30. There is no clause in the documents which specifically callout or address the required street trees and the irrigation responsibilities as was previously discussed as a requirement. Revise documents to include such clause.

**Building Review Comments, Glenn Pereno, Chief Building Official, 3.22.18**

1. No further comments at this time.

**Fire Department, Robert Scott, Fire Marshal, 3.22.18**

1. Provide details of Fire Lane markings for in front of fire hydrants and shall meet The Florida Fire Prevention Code 6th ED Chapter 18 Section 18.2.3.5.3

**Police Department, Greg Lariscy, Community Improvement Sergeant**

1. No comments at this time.

**Public Works and Utility, Mikal Hal, TEDS 3.23.18.**

1. Memo is attached.

**Volusia County Water & Utility Services, Scott Mays, P.E., Utility Engineer, 3.21.18**

Sheet 4

1. Note #33 conflicts with the Trench Details provided on Sheet 49.

Sheet 5

2. References to the utility provider need to be revised to reference the county.
3. Note #18 - eliminate boltless restrained joints and gripper gaskets as a pipe restraint options.
4. Note #36 - revise to indicate that ductile iron fittings are required for the potable and reclaimed water mains.
5. Eliminate Note # 23.

Sheet 5a

6. References to the utility provider need to be revised to reference the county.
7. Note #1 – All residential service laterals shall be 6” in diameter consistent with the Sanitary Service Lateral Detail on Sheet 51.

**General**

8. The potable water mains and reclaimed mains need to be depicted under the sidewalk within two (2) feet of the rights of way lines.
9. All valves must be located outside of the roadway.
10. Master meters are required on the potable water main, reclaimed main and force main.
11. The note at the bottom of the construction plan sheets that refers to the city’s design and construction standards needs to be revised to refer to the county’s standards available at volusia.org.
12. A utilization permit may be needed for the off-site force main proposed within the powerline corridor.
13. The gravity sewer mains need to be designed at a slope of 1.50% or less. The use of inside drops is allowable as specified in the detail on Sheet 51 for drops of 24” or more above the manhole invert.

14. Design the gravity sewer collection system shallower where possible.

15. The off-site force main depicted on Sheets 47 and 48 is proposed as much as ten (10) feet below existing grade. It needs to more closely follow existing grade.

16. Provide the county’s record drawing requirements on the plans, available online at volusia.org.

17. Provide the county’s riser pipe support bracket detail on the plans, available online at volusia.org.

18. Revise the lift station site plan, Sheet 53, consistent with the county’s Pump Station Site Plan Detail, located on the same sheet.

Plat

19. The lift station tract, Tract D, needs to be dedicated to Volusia County.

20. The road rights of way are currently dedicated to Orange City. They also need to be dedicated to the county or at minimum, an access and utilities easement needs to be provided over the road rights of way, dedicated to the public and/or Volusia County.

21. A utilities easement is needed over the force main extending beyond the cul de sac at the north end of Big Bend Avenue where it will cross Tract B.

City Attorney Comments, Catherine D. Reischmann, Esquire, 3.15.18

1. Memo is attached.

PEC Surveyor Comments, David White, PSM, 3.23.18

1. Memo is attached.

Attachments:

TEDS Comments Memo 3.23.18
City Attorney’s Comments 3.15.18
PEC Comments Memo 3.23.18
Map Series
City of Orange City - TRC Review Comments

Date: March 23, 2018
Review Completed by: Mikal Reed Hale, P.E. / (386) 753-0558 office / (386) 547-4535 mobile
Subject: Parc Hill Phase 2 Residential (PPLT-12-17-1306)
Materials Reviewed: Site Development Plans (Received by City 03/06/2018 & 03/12/2018)

ENGINEERING / STORMWATER / UTILITIES

GENERAL

1. The following discrepancies related to land areas were noted within the revised construction plans, surveys, and re-plat that were submitted for review:
   a. The construction plans suggest the developer has acquired Out Parcel F, Out Parcel G, a portion of Out Parcel I, and a portion of Out Parcel N. The proposed re-plat suggests that Outparcel J has may have also been acquired since last submittal.
   b. The boundary survey, topo survey, and plat that were submitted for the project address 91.94 acres of property within Lots 3 & 4 of the recent Parc Hill A Replat (PB 58, pgs 109-118), but the legal description appears to contain Out Parcel areas that have since been acquired by the developer.
   c. The ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey (designated as Sheets 3 and 3a within the construction plans) appears to have been revised, as it now reflect 61.86 acres of property (in lieu of 61.60 acres previously), but the legal description still less and excepts Out Parcel areas that appear to have since been acquired by the developer.
   d. The construction plans designate a “Residential Phase 2 Property Boundary” in several locations, but they do not label the proposed Tract 3 (Future Development) adjacent to the east side of the project boundary, as shown within the Parc Hill – Phase 2 re-plat.
   e. The SITE DATA on Sheet 7 of the construction plans indicates the Gross Land Area of this project is 62.81 acres, with 0.41 acres of Internal Out Parcels, resulting in a Net Developable Area of 62.40 acres, which is slightly more than any of the total areas reported on the various versions of the survey.
   f. The tract labels within the proposed re-plat do not match the tract labels within the construction plans. In addition, the land areas encompassed within corresponding tracts do not exactly match one another. For instance, Tract G is proposed on the north side of Lot 78 in the construction plans, but in the proposed re-plat, Lot 78 is directly adjacent to the Big Bend Avenue (Street F) right of way. In addition, the response to previous Comment #51 indicated the pond tracts coincide with the outside top of bank contours for each facility, but the geometry shown on the re-plat does not match the tops of bank shown on the plans.

Provide a boundary survey for just the areas within the “Phase 2 Residential Property Boundary”, which contains the appropriate legal description for just this project. In addition, revise the legal descriptions on the proposed Parc Hill - Phase 2 re-plat and supporting boundary survey, taking into account all current acquisitions by Orange Dale Venture, LLC. Ensure that all tracts appear EXACTLY the same within the re-plat and construction plans (size, shape, and names), and adjust ALL areas reported within legal descriptions, surveyor notes, site data, drainage calculations, utility calculations, etc., as appropriate.

2. The responses to comments indicated that construction plans for the amenity center on Tract B would be submitted separately. Provide labeling, shading, and/or clouding that clarifies exactly which improvements are to be constructed in the future, subject to separate site plan and building permit reviews and approvals. Prior to acceptance of the subdivision infrastructure, the parking lot with 15 parking spaces will need to be constructed such that residents can access the community mailboxes within, and at a minimum, the trail
system shall be fully constructed down to the south side of Lot 41 until such time the amenity center is constructed.

3. There are a few occurrences where “Phase 1” labels were not edited to properly refer to “Phase 2” instead. Refer to Sheet 34 (plan view - boundary label near Lot 27), as well as Sheet 47 (plan view - lift station label and the boundary label on the southern side of Davis Ave. right of way).

4. At this time, the City has not yet approved Phase I infrastructure. The applicant shall ensure that any revisions made to Phase I infrastructure is incorporated within this plan set.

5. Any comments below related to utilities are subject to ultimate determination by Volusia County Utilities (VCU), as the utility provider for this project at this time.

**SUBDIVISION CONSTRUCTION PLANS**

Sheets 3-3a – ALTA/NSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY

6. As previously requested, update Surveyor Note 10 to reflect the recently updated FIRM (12127C062K, dated 09/29/2017).

Sheet 4 – GENERAL NOTES

7. As previously requested, revise Note 15 to reflect the appropriate revision date of the survey, once it has been updated.

Sheet 6 – EROSION CONTROL PLAN

8. A 40’x40’ temporary construction entrance was specified on Parc Hill Blvd. with reference to Detail 404 provided on Sheet 57 as requested, but this detail specifies a 50’ length x 30’ width (for 2-lane travel). Revise for consistency.

9. On the west side of WRA-2 near Fairlawn Drive, extend proposed silt-fencing westerly to include grading proposed within the Junior Street right of way.

Sheet 7 – OVERALL SITE PLAN

10. In the top left corner, revise the label that reads “Leavitt Ave. S.” to instead reflect “Junior Street”.

Sheets 9-14 (DETAILED SITE PLANS)

General

11. Provide horizontal geometry for the baselines of construction for each roadway, which enable the surveyor to stakeout the proposed sanitary sewer and storm collection systems with the station/offsets provided.

Sheet 9

12. Revise the sidewalk transitions on the north and south sides of Street F / Grand Plaza Drive to occur over a length of only 10’ (in lieu of the ±75’ and ±105’ proposed), beginning at the points where the existing sidewalks are presently terminated.

Sheet 11

13. Depict the additional cross-walks for the trail system that are specified in the landscape plans and specify additional pedestrian crossing warning signage and/or stop signs as necessary. Refer to MUTCD Se. 2B.12 and FDM Ch. 230.

Sheet 13

14. Provide a construction detail for the lift station driveway proposed near sta. 28+50.

Sheets 15-20 (UTILITY PLANS)

General

15. In previous comments, the City requested that the size of all blow-off valves at EACH of the termini of both potable water AND reclaimed water mains be specified as 2”. The blow-off valves on Sheet 15 were addressed, but not those located on all other sheets.
16. The City recommends graphically depicting each of the reducers specified at junctions within the potable water and reclaimed water mains.

Sheet 16

17. Specify an additional fire hydrant near sta. 18+00 on Parc Hill Blvd. to meet the required 500’ spacing.

18. The Utilities Report states that the 6” force main will allow for some additional connections from the north in the future, but to date no information has been provided as to how sewer service will be provided to the undeveloped commercial and multi-family tracts within the southern portions of the PUD. Ensure that sewer service to these areas can be provided without requiring disruption of the improvements within the Parc Hill Blvd right of way, or add the appropriate gravity sewer stub-outs, dry-line force main components, sleeves, etc.

Sheet 17

19. As previously requested, replace the single reclaimed water services to Lots 52 & 53 with a double reclaimed water service.

Sheet 19

20. Add the following note: The proposed lift station will be owned and maintained by Volusia County Utilities.

21. On the south side of the existing Davis Ave. right of way, 6” force main is proposed outside of the Street F right of way. Provide an easement that benefits Volusia County Utilities (and successors) for maintenance purposes, or dedicate additional road rights of way in this area. Adjust all site area calculations accordingly.

22. At the intersection of Street F and Street H, the potable water main equipment at the junction is still specified differently on this sheet in comparison to that specified on Sheet 17 and Sheet 41. Recommend revising for consistency.

Sheets 21-26 (PAVING & DRAINAGE PLANS)

General

23. In response to previous Comment #129, structure identification nomenclature and elevation information (i.e. tops & inverts) for ALL of the proposed storm structures has been removed from these PAVING & DRAINAGE PLANS, and instead this information is shown only on the plan & profile drawings. The City strongly recommends reviewing the plan & profile drawings to ensure that this information is provided for each and every structure. Note that in these revised plans, structure nomenclature and inverts are not provided anywhere in the plans for the MES’s in WRA-1 or WRA-3.

24. The labels for the valley gutters should reference Detail 300V on Sheet 57, not Detail 402. Adjust accordingly.

Sheet 23

25. Move the legend to the left side of the sheet so that it does not overlap with the plan view.

Sheets 27-32 (GRADING PLANS)

Sheet 27

26. Within Out Parcel N, one (1) party owns Lots 20 - 22, while a separate party owns Lots 37 & 38, and the City will not permit retaining walls to be constructed within the right of way along the entire frontages of these lots along Street A and Street E respectively. As discussed previously, it appears that raising the profile of Street E and lowering the profile of Street A in the vicinity of these lots would allow for a solution which would possibly eliminate the need for any retaining walls, possibly reduce earthwork required, and require only minimal adjustment to the proposed infrastructure design. In the event that retaining wall is still incorporated in the revised design, place a note on the plans stating that proposed retaining walls will be perpetually owned and maintained by the developer and/or homeowner’s association.

27. The flow arrow near sta. 19+60 on Street A still appears to be incorrect based on the associated profile.

28. It appears that spot grading for Lots 35 - 39 was not adjusted to reflect the lot line shift, as previously requested.

Sheets 33-46 (PLAN & PROFILES)

General

29. Within the key maps provided on these sheets, freeze future phases of development shown on some of the sheets, as previously requested.
30. Several Points of Vertical Intersection (PVI's) were not labeled, including locations new PVI's were recently inserted to reflect cross-slope of side streets at begin/end of profile, as well as at the cul-de-sac crowns. Label all PVI's within the profile.

Sheet 33

31. In profile view, label the pipe between STS STR #STS 3 and STS STR #STS 4 with associated slope.

Sheet 36

32. Provide a statement as to the purpose of filling the depressional area (Depres-2) up to elevation 31.25'.

Sheet 37

33. This sheet shows a different configuration of lots, roadways, drainage, utilities, etc., and it will therefore not be included in any approvals. Clarify why this sheet is still being included in the plan set or remove as applicable.

Sheet 41

34. Consider adjusting the profile of Street F at the cul-de-sac to contain a positive slope on its northern end to reduce cut and removal of pavement required for future roadway connections.

Sheets 48a through 48d (JUNIOR STREET / HARLEY STRICKLAND BLVD ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS)

General

35. In front of the VOTRAN bus-stop, the proposed paved shoulder should be extended continuously along roadway, parallel to the travel lanes, without interruption, and the new concrete sidewalk with detectable warning surface shall abut the outside edge of the paved shoulder. Note that the associated bus stop sign will need to be relocated to accomplish this.

36. At intersecting driveways, the paved shoulders should be extended straight into the radius returns, parallel with the traveled ways, instead of being “boxed-off” as shown. At intersecting side streets (i.e. Junior Street), the paved shoulder shall wrap around the radius return at uniform width, as shown.

Sheet 48a – JUNIOR HARLEY DEMO PLAN

37. At the tie-in to the roadway improvements being constructed in the adjacent Target project, show removal of the skip striping through the transition across the intersection via hydro-blasting or grinding.

38. As previously requested, specify each of the existing signs that will need to be removed and replaced as a result of the widening, with MUTCD references.

39. The response to previous Comment #174 referenced as-builts from Lochrane Engineering which demonstrated paved shoulders were constructed of full-depth pavement along the original 2-lane roadway. Please e-mail a copy of those as-builts to mhale@teds-fl.com for the City’s records to justify that existing shoulder pavement does not need to be removed and reconstructed.

Sheet 48b – JUNIOR HARLEY GEOMETRY PLAN

40. After further review, the City would prefer that the left turn lane between Junior Street and the eastern-most Target driveway be striped as a 2-way left turn lane in accordance with FDOT Index No. 17346 (see sheet 6 of 17), rather than it being striped as dedicated left turn lanes in accordance with FDOT Index No. 301, as directed in previous comments. New striping should commence at the point where striping was terminated in the Target project near sta. 8+25, and should extend continuously to sta. 13+60, without breaks in the lane striping at intersecting driveways.

41. Revise the sidewalk landings/ramps an associated crosswalk striping, stop bar, and stop sign that was added to the south leg of the Junior Street intersection, such that the landings are oriented to better direct pedestrians easterly across the driveway, instead of northerly out into the Harley Strickland Blvd. traveled way.

Sheet 48c – JUNIOR HARLEY GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN

42. The response to formerComment #180 indicates that the basin area contributing runoff to the Harley Strickland Blvd. right of way has been significantly reduced due to development of adjacent property. Please e-mail a copy of the supporting information to mhale@teds-fl.com for the City’s records. Regarding the proposed collection system improvements that result in the existing bubble up device being
reconstructed further east, further discussion is warranted to identify alternative solutions which do not present perpetual maintenance issues.

Sheet 48e – JUNIOR HARLEY SECTIONS

43. Based on the response to previous Comment #184, it appears that 2:1 slopes are proposed for the front slopes of the ditch, but as previously stated, front slope of ditches shall be 4:1 max, and back slopes of ditches shall be 3:1 max (2:1 slopes are not permitted). Revise the plans accordingly and label the proposed ditch slopes within the revised cross-sections.

Sheet 48f – JUNIOR HARLEY DETAILS

44. Within the typical sections, specify sodding for the roadside swales in all areas where it will be disturbed as a result of required earthwork.

DRAINAGE REPORT

45. The response to previous Comment #219 indicated that the secondary system analysis referenced in Appendix 11 will be provided under separate cover for review. Calculations demonstrating the requirements of DSSM§3.3.1 have been met will need to be provided prior to final approval.

INFORMATIONAL COMMENT (no responses or revisions necessary)

46. There were still several minor inconsistencies noted in the revised plans and drainage calculations, which have been summarized below for the City’s records. However, as submitted, the calculations provide sufficient assurance that the performance standards required in code have been met, and there is therefore no need to revise and resubmit the calculations.

a. The revised drainage report corrected the inconsistencies in rainfall depths for the 100yr/24hr storm, but there were still multiple inconsistencies in the rainfall depths used in the pre and post ICPR Hydrology Simulations for other events, as included in Appendix 7 and 9, as well as the rainfall depths reported in the design storm criteria on page 6 of the report. The remaining rainfall depth inconsistencies are summarized below:
   i. The rainfall depth of the 25yr/24hr storm was listed as 8.4” on page 6 of the report, while the pre and post-development ICPR model uses a rainfall depth of 8.6”.
   ii. The rainfall depth of the 25yr/96hr storm was listed as 11.2” on page 6 of the report, while the pre-development ICPR model uses a rainfall depth of 11.8”, and the post-development ICPR model uses a rainfall depth of 11.2”.
   iii. The rainfall depth of the 10yr/24hr storm is listed as 7.4” on page 6 of the report and the pre-development ICPR model, while the post-development ICPR model uses 7.6”.
   iv. The mean annual rainfall depth is listed as 4.5” in the pre-development ICPR model, and 4.6” in the post-development ICPR model.

b. The CN values were corrected for basins PRE-1 through PRE-7 per previous Comment #209, but the adjusted values were not revised on the pre-development basin map included in Appendix 6. The pre-development curve number calculation for basin PRE-3 does not appear to have been updated per Comment #209, and still shows a CN value of 39, but the pre-development ICPR model correctly used a CN of 39 for this basin.

c. The pre-development basin map included in Appendix 6 depicts EXWEIR-2 between DEPRES-6 and DEPRES-7, but the ICPR weir input report included in Appendix 7 for the pre-development model does not include anything for EXWEIR-2.

d. The post-development basin map included in Appendix 8 depicts WEIR-EX2 between DEPRES-6 and DEPRES-7, but the ICPR weir input included in Appendix 9 indicates that this weir is between DEPRES-1 and DEPRES-6.

e. Grading Plan 4 (Sheet 30 of 58) indicates that node DEPRES-2 will be filled to elevation 31.25 feet, but in post-development conditions, the stage/storage (Appendix 8) and the ICPR input report (Appendix 9) are still accounting for storage between elevations 23.00’ to 31.25’, as modeled in the existing conditions. It is noted that the volume below elevation 31.25’ amounts to a little over 2.64 acre-feet, and that displacing this volume would only result in increasing the ICPR peak stage results for the 100yr/24hr storm from 47.13 feet up to ±47.80 feet, which is still well below warning stage of 56.00 feet.
47. It is noted that the 25 psi operating pressure within the existing force main at the point of connection used in the lift station calculations was an assumed value due to lack of information, and that the applicant is currently in the process of performing pressure testing on this force main. The City recommends providing documentation of the existing force main pressure and revised lift station calculations (if necessary) to Volusia County Utilities prior to final plat approval.

Please provide a response letter with copies of the comment, followed by a written response for each comment. Please feel free to contact Mike Hale, PE at 386-547-4535 / mhale@teds-fl.com with any questions.
MEMORANDUM

To: Joe Ruiz, Senior Planner  
    Via email to: jruiz@ourorangecity.com and  
    emillwater@ourorangecity.com

Elisa Millwater

From: Catherine D. Reischmann, Esquire, Asst. City Attorney

Date: March 15, 2018

Re: Parc Hill Phase 2 – Residential Preliminary Plat (PPLT-12-17-1306) submittal 3.5.18.

I provide the following comments relating to Parc Hill Phase 2 – Residential Preliminary Plat (PPLT-12-17-1306) submittal 3.5.18:

**PLAT COMMENTS**

1. The Dedication clause states that the stormwater tracts (WRA-1,-2,-3) are dedicated “to the Parc Hill Homeowners Association and the City of Orange City for stormwater emergencies.” I suggest this be reworded as follows: “to the Parc Hill Homeowners Association, Inc., and must be maintained by the Association. The stormwater tracts are also dedicated to the City of Orange City for stormwater emergencies.”

2. The Dedication clause also states that the Drainage easements are dedicated to the HOA and the City. Who is to maintain them? This needs to be stated.

3. The Certificate of Approval by the City should reflect a signature by the Mayor rather than the Chairman.

4. There is a typo in the statutory reference under the Certificate of Approval by the City Surveyor. The reference should be to “Fla. Stat. 177.081”.

5. I suggest the general notes now on page 2 be provided on page 1.
6. Note 3 refers to a temporary access easement. Please indicate who the grantee is.

7. In note 10, please indicate that the fence easement and the pedestrian access easement are blanket easements over the entire tracts. The last sentence in Note 10 should be revised a bit to be clearer: “All Tracts and Easements listed in this Note 10 are to be owned and maintained by the Parc Hill Homeowners Association, Inc.”

8. I am confused about Note 15. Why can’t these utility lines be dedicated on this plat? We definitely need all utility easements to be shown on this plat. I agree that it’s always a good idea to have separate easement documents rather than just plat dedications, to further define the scope of the easements and the maintenance obligations, but the utility easements need to be shown on the plat.

9. In the small boxes with the outparcels, please add “Not included in this replat”. I know that note is in all the details, but I think it would help to also have it in the smaller boxes.

10. On Sheet 4, I think it is confusing to show plat detail for property not included in this plat. I suggest that only the plat recording information be referenced, but no lot lines shown. Same comment applies to Sheet 8.

Please feel free to call or email me should you have any questions.
FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAT REVIEW
ORANGE CITY, VOLUSIA
COUNTY, FLORIDA

NAME OF PLAT: PARK HILL – PHASE 2
DATE: MARCH 23, 2018

Plat review for the above reference Plat

LEGEND

(C) Denotes information is correct
(X) Denotes additional information or revision is required
(#) Refer to “Additional Comments” and corresponding note
(N/A) Not Applicable to this plat review

TITLE (Primary Name)

[C] The "primary name" of the plat must be different from any other recorded plat in Volusia County except when the subdivision is further divided as an additional unit or section. (177.051.1)

[C] Title appears in bold legible letters. (177.091.5)

[N/A] Words such as "THE", "REPLAT" or "A" are not the first word used in the title. (177.051.1)

[X] If the plat is a replat all prior platted streets, alleys and easements will be vacated at recording. All such parcels occurring with the replat must be included in the dedication or noted as private with appropriate language on the plat. (F.S.177.101)

YOU NEED TO INCLUDE WHAT LOTS OF ORANGEDALE PLAT, YOU ARE REPLATTING. ALSO DELETE THE OUT PARCELS PORTION OF THE TITLE, BECAUSE THEY WERE NEVER CREATED BY THE PLAT OF PARC HILL

[C] If replat is a part of the primary name all text is the same size and type. (177.051.1)

[C] Title and sub-title (if any), Section, Township, Range, County, City and State are included in heading and appears on all sheets. (177.091)

SCALE

[C] Is both stated and graphically illustrated by a graphic scale and appears on all sheets showing any portion of the lands subdivided. (177.091.4)
NORTH ARROW

[C] A north arrow is prominent and appears on every sheet showing any portion of the lands subdivided. (177.091.6)

INDEX/KEY MAP

[X] Must be depicted if more than one graphic sheet is used to portray subdivided lands. (177.091.3)

SEE SHEET 4 OF 8 KEY MAP, HAS SHEET 6 LABEL TWICE

[C] Each sheet is labeled with sheet number, total number of sheets and match lines are clearly depicted. (177.091.3)

PROFESSIONAL SURVEYOR AND MAPPER

[C] The name of the professional surveyor and mapper or legal entity, along with the street and mailing address must be shown on each sheet included. (177.091.5)

VICINITY MAP

[C] Shows the proposed subdivision in relation to the surrounding streets.

PLAT NOTICE

[C] Notice is exactly how it appears in Statute and appears in a prominent place on front sheet of plat. (177.091.27)

"NOTICE: This plat, as recorded in its graphic form, is the official depiction of the subdivided lands described herein and will in no circumstances be supplanted in authority by any other graphic or digital form of the plat. There may be additional restrictions that are not recorded on this plat that may be found in the public records of this county."

[C] Ink, media type and marginal lines are as noted in statutes. (177.091.1)

TEXT SIZE

[X] Is of a size sufficient to show all detail clearly.

TEXT SIZE IS TOO SMALL IN SOME AREAS
LABEL SHOULD NOT BE SMALLER THAN L80 (0.08 X SCALE)
BEARING REFERENCE

[C] Is clearly stated on the face of the plat in the notes and is referenced to a well-established and monumented line. (177.091.6)

ABBREVIATIONS

[C] A legend of all symbols and abbreviations occurring on the plat is shown. 
(177.091.29) Check Legend Missing abbreviations.

DEDICATION & ACKNOWLEDGMENT

[C] The "primary name" of the subdivision is shown in the dedication and coincides exactly with the subdivision name. Shows and is executed by all persons, corporations, or entities having record interest in the lands. (177.051.1)

[X] Dedications and approvals required by 177.071 and 177.081 are included. 
(177.091.12) SEE SURVEYORS COMMENTS

DESCRIPTION

[X] Is metes & bounds and describes the lands subdivided and is so complete, that without reference to the plat, the starting point and boundary can be determined and agrees with plat. (177.091)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION NEEDS TO REFLECT THE OUT PARCELS PLAT OF RECORD (EX. YOU ARE NOT REPLATTING OUT PARCEL “N”, BUT YOU ARE REPLATTING LOTS 39 AND 40 BLK. 37, ORANGEDALE…)

[X] Description agrees with title opinion. 
NO TITLE OPINION WAS PROVIDED IN THIS SUBMITTAL

POINT OF BEGINNING

[X] Point of Beginning and all information called for, such as Point of Commencement, bearings and distances are shown. (177.091.14)

ALL INFORMATION SHOWN ON THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION NEEDS TO BE SHOWN ON THE PLAT, INCLUDING POB TO THE LESS OUTS
DIMENSIONS

[X] Sufficient survey data is shown to positively describe the bounds of every lot, block, street, easement and all other areas shown on the plat. (177.091.19)  
MISSING ALL BEARING ALONG THE R/W AND MISSING DISTANCES IN LOTS 135-139

[N/A] A witness line showing complete data is provided for subdivisions bounded by an irregular line (e.g. water bodies, etc.) (177.091.19)

[X] All dimensions shown except irregular lines are shown to the one-hundredth of a foot. (177.091.19)  
MISSING DISTANCES IN LOTS 135-139

[C] The centerlines of all streets shall be shown as follows: tangent lines: distances together with angles, bearings or azimuths; curved lines: arc distances, central angles, and radii, together with chord and chord bearing or azimuths. (177.091.22)

[X] All Centerlines, P.C.'s, P.T.'s & P..l.'s are labeled.  
ACROSS FROM LOT 61, YOU HAVE A PCC, BUT SHOULD BE PRC, ALSO MISSING PC AND PT LABELS ALONG THE BOUNDARY

[C] Curvilinear lot lines show the radii, arc distances, and central angles. (177.091.20)

[X] All radial lines are labeled as such. (177.091.20)

[X] Directions of non-radial lines are indicated. (177.091.20)  
WEST LINE OF LOT 3, SHOULD BE LABEL NR, VERIFY ALL YOUR LABELS

TABLES

[C] When it is not possible to label line or curve information on the map, a tabular form may be used. (177.091.26)

[C] Tabular data, if shown, appears on the sheet to which it applies. (177.091.26)

CUL-DE-SAC DIAMETERS

[C] All cul-de-sac diameters are shown. (177.091.15)
The location, widths, names, recording information of all streets, waterways and other rights of way are shown. (177.091.15)

All names are different from any other in the city, if not an extension.

EASEMENTS

The location and width of proposed easements and existing easements identified in the Title Opinion or certification are shown on the plat along with their intended use. Where easements are not coincident with property lines, they are labeled with bearings and distances and are tied to the principal lot, tract or right of way. (177.091.16)

NO TITLE OPINION PROVIDED

Included in notes is reference to Cable TV services (177.091.28)
Should be verbatim

All section or 1/4-section lines occurring within the plat are shown and labeled as such. (177.091.14)

ADJOINING PROPERTY

All contiguous property is identified by subdivision title, plat book and page or if unplatted, labeled as such. (177.091.17)

If the plat is a replat, there are sufficient ties to controlling lines appearing in the earlier plat to permit an overlay of the previous plat. (177.091.17)

NO TIES SHOWN FROM POINT OF COMMENCEMENT TO LESS OUT PARCELS

LOT NUMBERING

All lots are numbered progressively or if phase development consecutively numbered throughout additions. (177.091.18)

All blocks are numbered or lettered progressively. (177.091.18)
PARKS & RECREATION

[X] All parks and recreation parcels are designated as such. (177.091.23)
   TRACT OS-7 IS LABEL OPEN SPACE, BUT IN NOTE 10 IS Labeled
   (RECREATION, DRAINAGE AND ACCESS)

OUT PARCELS

[X] All out parcels are excluded in the legal description and clearly labeled "NOT A PART
   OF THIS PLAT". (177.091.24)
   REVISED “NOT INCLUDED AS PART OF THIS REPLAT” WITH NOT A PART OF
   THIS PLAT

DEDICATED PARCELS

[X] All dedicated parcels are clearly shown and their purposes clearly stated. (177.091.25)
   WHO OWNS AND MAINTAIN TRACT D (LIFT STATION) ??

PERMANENT REFERENCE MONUMENTS

[X] Permanent reference monuments have been placed at each corner or change in
   direction along the boundary of the lands being platted and are no further than 1400 feet
   apart. (177.091.7)
   CERTIFICATE OF SURVEYOR IS NOT SIGNED. THERE IS NO LETTER OF
   MONUMENT PLACEMENT.

[N/A] Where plat corners are not accessible, witness monuments have been set within the
   boundary of the plat and such offsets are noted. (177.091.7)

PERMANENT CONTROL POINTS

[X] Permanent control points have been placed at intersections of centerlines of rights of
   way and at the intersections and termini of all streets. (177.091.8)
   PCP SYMBOLOGY NOT SHOWN

[X] All permanent control points have been placed and are shown on map by appropriate
   symbol or designation. (177.091.8)

LOT CORNERS

[X] Monuments have been placed at all lot corners and intersections not requiring a PRM
   or PCP. (177.091.9)
Orange City Final Subdivision Plat Review
Name of Plat: PARK HILL – PHASE 2
MARCH 23, 2018
Page Seven

[C] All lot corners are shown on map by appropriate symbol or designation. (177.091.9)

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION TO BE FURNISHED BY SUBMITTING FIRM

[C] Copy of Boundary Survey prepared/updated within 1 year of plat submittal.

[X] Copy of 9II report for street name verification, if applicable.

[X] Copy of title opinion.

[X] Statement by Surveyor of completion of all required survey work and installation of PRM's.

REVIEWING SURVEYOR'S COMMENTS

THE CERTIFICATE OF TITLE WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THIS SUBMITTAL.

DEDICATION NEEDS TO BE REVISED WITH THE APPROPRIATE INFORMATION EX.
TRACT “D” (LIFT STATION) IS TO BE DEDICATED TO CITY OR COUNTY?? TRACTS OWNED AND MAINTAINED BY THE H.O.A. DO NOT NEED TO BE IN THE DEDICATION.
MISSPELLED THE WORD STREET YOU EITHER DEDICATE THE STREETS OR THE RIGHTS-OF-WAY (NOT BOTH), ALSO EASEMENTS NEED TO BE IN THE DEDICATION.

THE YEAR IN THE CERTIFICATION OF APPROVAL BY CITY COUNCIL, SHOWS 2017 REVISED LEGAL DESCRIPTION TO INCLUDES THE LOTS FOR ORANGEDALE PLAT, BEING REPLATTED

SHOW GEOMETRY FOR ALL RIGHT-OF-WAY LINES.

VERIFY ALL TRACT LABELS.

DELETE NOTES 7 AND 8. (NOT A MATTER OF SURVEY)
ALL INFORMATION SHOWN ON THE LEGAL NEEDS TO BE SHOWN ON THE PLAT.

EX. POINT OF BEGINNING
SW. CORNER, LOT 4
(P.B. _____, PGS. ______)

NOTE NO. 10 LABELS TRACT “C” (OPEN SPACE, TREE…BUT SHOULD BE ACCESS AND DRAINAGE)

SHEET 2
LINE TABLE L9 AND L10 SHOULD BE SOUTHEAST DIRECTION. ALSO MISSING PC AND PT LABELS ALONG THE BOUNDARY

SHEET 3
MISSING TIES TO CENTERLINE, ALONG THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY
EX. DISTANCES FROM C-13 TO C/L AND DISTANCE FROM C-14 TO C/L
ALSO MISSING DIST. FROM THE BOUNDARY TO THE PC OF C/L OF DENALI DRIVE

MISSING BRG AND DISTANCE ON THE N. LINE LOT 92

SHOW P.O.B. ON DETAILS “A” AND “B”

SHEET 5
MISSING TIES TO CENTERLINE, ALONG THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY
EX. DISTANCES FROM C-24 TO C/L AND DISTANCE FROM C-9 TO C/L
ALSO MISSING DIST. FROM THE BOUNDARY TO THE PI OF C/L OF BIG BEND AVENUE

SHOW DETAIL FOR EASEMENT AT THE SW. CORNER OF LOT 77

SHEET 6
DELETE KATMAI DRIVE LABEL
PARC HILL – PHASE 2 TITLE, SHOULD BE IN THE SAME LOCATION AS OTHER SHEETS

C17 (CLEAN UP)

SHEET 8
ON THE SE. CORNER OF THE SHEET, YOU ARE SHOWN SOME BRG AND DISTANCES ON TRACT 2, PARC HILL, BUT YOUR MISSING THE SOME ANNOTATION.
IN GENERAL THE SUBMITTAL IS INCOMPLETE AND DOES NOT APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN REVIEWED BY THE PLATTING SURVEYOR.

Very truly yours,

PEC-Surveying and Mapping, LLC

Mr. David White, P.S.M.
Parc Hill Residential Preliminary Plat
800 Parc Hill Boulevard
PPLT-12-17-1306
FLU Map

Legend

- Streets
- Parcels
- Parc Hill Residential

- RL - Residential Low
- MX - Mixed Used
- County FLU

1 inch = 400 feet

Date Created 1.17.2018
Parc Hill Residential Preliminary Plat
800 Parc Hill Boulevard
PPLT-12-17-1306
Soils Map

Legend

- Streets
- Parcels
- Parc Hill Residential

37 ORSINO FINE SAND, 0 TO 5 PERCENT SLOPE
42 PAOLA FINE SAND, 0 TO 8 PERCENT SLOPE

Date Created 1.17.2018