

1 **MINUTES OF THE CITY OF ORANGE CITY TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**, held on  
2 Tuesday July 17, 2018 at 9:00 a.m. in the Development Services Conference Room, 205 E. Graves Avenue,  
3 Orange City, Florida.

4  
5 **1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

6  
7 Development Services Director Becky Mendez called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., and roll call  
8 was taken.

9  
10 **PRESENT:** TRC Staff: Glenn Pereno, Chief Building Official; Becky Mendez, Development  
11 Services Director; Sgt. Greg Lariscy, OCPD; Carol McFarlane, City Planner; Joe Ruiz, Senior  
12 Planner; Michael Watson, Public Works Construction Manager; Robert Scott, Fire Marshal; Mikal  
13 Hale, Engineering Consultant

14  
15 **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

16  
17 Sgt. Lariscy made a motion to approve the minutes from July 3, 2018. Mr. Pereno seconded the  
18 motion. Motion passed.

19  
20 **3. OLD BUSINESS**

21  
22 **A. Miracle Car Wash Site Plan Application (SITE-12-17-1302)**

23  
24 **PRESENT:** Jason Jones, Miracle Car Wash; Jay Calvert, Calvert Construction; Peter Franzese,  
25 Miracle Car Wash; Larry Poliner, RCE Consultants; Scott Arent, Calvert Construction

26  
27 Mr. Ruiz gave a brief explanation of the project. City Staff and the applicant discussed the comments  
28 made by the TRC and the Engineer. The following items were discussed in more detail:

- 29  
30 1. Per Development Services 2.6.18 review, Comment 12, the applicant clarified that no lights are  
31 being proposed on the vacuums and the plans will be updated.
- 32 2. Regarding 2.6.18 review, Comment 13, the applicant will provide a note on the plans stating the  
33 proposed viburnum hedge will be irrigated with extension of the existing irrigation lines.
- 34 3. The Applicant responded to Development Services 6.30.18 review, Comment 3, and stated the  
35 owner will be advising employees not to park in the stormwater retention area.
- 36 4. Staff stated to the applicant that regarding Comment 4, there are several ways of screening the  
37 vacuum equipment where a 7' foot high wall is being proposed for screening. At no time has  
38 staff required a wall; rather the land development code affords several alternatives for screening  
39 such material. The owner stated the wall was their preference for mounting equipment necessary  
40 to run the vacuums. Staff clarified that the wall shall be finished to match the principal structure  
41 per code.
- 42 5. Staff clarified to the applicant that Comment 5 regarding the property boundaries as shown by  
43 the property appraiser are advisory, and should be taken up with them.
- 44 6. Staff confirmed to the applicant via the plans that there are two (2) trees noted as "to be  
45 removed", thus requiring a tree removal permit. The tree protection barricades only apply to the  
46 trees within the project work area.
- 47 7. The applicant and staff went over the items in the Public Works Memo dated July 3, 2018,  
48 consisting of the following discussion:

- a. Detective warnings will be required along the pedestrian walkway, as required by ADA regulations, in four areas discussed in the meeting.
  - b. The applicant may be required to add a railing on the proposed sidewalk between the pond and the vacuums, if the existing slope requires it. As the spot elevations were not depicted on the plans, once these are added, staff can determine whether the railing is required.
  - c. Per comment 8, the applicant agreed to place a pedestrian sign at the sidewalk nearest to the building.
  - d. Comments 6, 9, and 12 were agreed to be deleted by TRC.
8. The applicant and the City Engineer went over items in the TEDS Memo dated July 5, 2018, consisting of the following discussion:
- a. The Applicant expressed concerns about updating the survey to reflect the FEMA Flood Panel Number. The City Engineer stated that if this becomes an issue, this can be noted within the comments response and noted on the plans.
  - b. The City Engineer clarified Comment 2 of his memo, requesting the applicant remove the “new” note on the plans to just reference the current sign’s location.
  - c. Comment 3 was clarified, as the surface elevations are required on the grading plans to review drainage flow.
9. Staff advised that additional escrow may be required for review of the next resubmittal.

MOTION: Staff recommended that the TRC vote to approve the site plan with the following condition:

- a. Revise the final site plan seal dated February 21, 2018, to comply with the TRC comments as discussed.

Sgt. Lariscy made a motion to approve the above-referenced site plan with the mentioned conditions. Mr. Pereno seconded the motion. Motion passed.

**4. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Dale’s Ales II Conditional Use Application (COND-5-18-1330)**

**PRESENT:** Richard Hudson, Dale’s Ales; Stephanie Perras, Dale’s Ales, Larry Poliner, RCE Consultants

Ms. McFarlane gave a brief explanation of the project. City Staff and the applicant discussed the comments made by the TRC and the Engineer. The following items were discussed in more detail:

- 1. The applicant clarified that the structures labeled as “antennae” on the site are actually light poles. Staff clarified that light poles are limited to 20 feet in height per the LDC. It is unknown at this time if the owners will use the lights for security lighting or during special events.
- 2. The applicant’s engineer stated that they will remove the “event area” labels from the site plan. Special events require review via a separate permit application.
- 3. City staff was not given enough information on the proposed decks and customer seating to provide comments regarding that improvement. Additional comments may be generated after a revised site plan is provided.

- 1 4. Any "Phase 2" improvements that increase impervious surfaces and/or outdoor seating and  
2 structures will require a site plan application that includes stormwater retention review.  
3 5. Staff is willing to consider a waiver to allow motorcycle parking to count towards a portion of  
4 the minimum parking requirements (section 8.7.7 of the LDC). Such a waiver would be  
5 considered by the TRC at the time of site plan review.  
6

7 MOTION: Staff recommended that the TRC vote to forward the application to the Planning  
8 Commission with a recommendation to approve the application with the following conditions:  
9

- 10 A. The site plan and project narrative must be revised to satisfy TRC's comments prior to  
11 scheduling a public hearing.  
12 B. The primary structure is a nonconforming structure per section 8.2.4 of the Land Development  
13 Code (LDC) and the building cannot be extended any further into the front yard abutting US 17-  
14 92.  
15 C. The TRC established the following minimum improvements necessary to allow the bar to reopen  
16 to the public:  
17 1. The handicapped parking space must be paved and must have the appropriate signage. A  
18 building permit is required for this work.  
19 2. Provide certification or similar documentation from the Department of Health  
20 demonstrating that the septic tank is approved for use, and the maximum number of seats  
21 or patrons that can be allowed.  
22 3. A life safety plan must be submitted and reviewed by the Fire Department before  
23 opening. This shall be reviewed as part of a building permit prior to opening the property  
24 to the public.  
25 4. The fencing on the site must be repaired and/or replaced where necessary. A fence permit  
26 submitted to Development Services Department is required.  
27 5. Landscaping must be provided along the front buffer and may be irrigated by hand or  
28 watering bag. The number and type of landscaping will be shown on the conditional use  
29 site plan or provided in narrative form.  
30 6. The deck and all other areas accessible to the public must be repaired prior to opening.  
31 This work requires building permits.  
32 7. A dumpster pad and enclosure must be constructed on the site to accommodate solid  
33 waste, in accordance with section 10.6.6 of the LDC. This work requires a building  
34 permit.  
35 8. The applicant must submit an after the fact sign review permit for the new canvas that  
36 was placed on the existing awning.  
37

38 Sgt. Lariscy made a motion to forward the application to the Planning commission with  
39 recommendation to approve with the mentioned conditions. Mr. Pereno seconded the motion.  
40 Motion passed.  
41

42 **B. Valencia Landing Site Plan Application (SITE-6-18-1337)**  
43

44 **PRESENT:** Joseph Trainor; John Knox Village; Chris Blurton, Interplan LLC; Andrea Cardo,  
45 Interplan LLC  
46

47 Mr. Ruiz gave a brief explanation of the project. City Staff and the applicant discussed the comments  
48 made by the TRC and the Engineer. The following items were discussed in more detail:

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47
1. City staff is waiting on comments from Volusia County Utilities for wastewater review. The City and Volusia County are currently in negotiations to amend the Utility Service Boundary (USB), which includes this property, so that the City becomes the retail wastewater provider. The USB also provides for assignment of the 1984 Sewer Service Agreement between the County and the John Knox Village (JKV), to the City. Staff cannot issue a development order at this time until Volusia County provides a “no objection” letter or transfers over the agreement. It was noted that all of John Knox Village’s utilities are private owned and maintained.
2. The applicant requested clarification on the survey comments in the TEDS comments memo. The City Engineer explained that there are various, previously platted Rights-of-Way (ROW) that arose from researching title documentation. These did not appear on the survey of the property. He advised the applicant to conduct a title search to verify what encumbrances may be on the property, which may require a replat or vacate. The applicant will conduct a title search and move forward appropriately with their findings. Replat and/or vacates require one City Council approval by Resolution.
3. Staff questioned the demarcated dash lines on the western portion of the property at both the northern and southern sides. The applicant clarified that these are two (2) future driveway cross access connections to the adjacent properties, if future acquisition occurs. The applicant will note this on the plan.
4. The applicant raised question to Development Services 6.29.18 review, Comment 8, regarding the guard gate/house at Rose Avenue. The applicant explained that the Rose Avenue entrance will be closed off and the roadway dead-end will be designed to meet Fire Code standards. Staff stated that the Rose Avenue Public Right-of Way (ROW) shall be restored to City standards beyond the dead-end.
5. JKV intends to relocate the existing guard house to the north, on Trafford Avenue, for better access control into the community. Staff required that the applicant provide the limits of public ROW, as a segment of Trafford is owned and maintained by JKV. Staff stated that the new location cannot create stacking into the Rose and Trafford Avenues intersection. The City Engineer noted that this may require Trafford Avenue road widening for vehicular bypass. The details will be provided on the plans.
6. The applicant clarified intent to install a perimeter fence in the same style as Holly Branch.
7. The applicant questioned whether a front buffer would be required per Comment 18. There is an existing 20’ foot tall hedge along the eastern property line (front). Staff will waive the front landscape buffer requirement, if the hedge remains. If the hedge is removed, a front landscape buffer is required in accordance with the Land Development Code.
8. Staff will provide the applicant with Detail W-10:1 Water Service Connection Detail.
9. A question regarding TEDS Comment 50 arose, regarding a dumpster floor drain. Staff stated this is upon the owner’s discretion. The purpose is to avoid dumpster waste water to flow into stormwater areas.
10. Staff noted that the proposed building height appears to exceed the maximum 35’ foot height requirement. The applicant will provide scaled height measurements at the certain location on the roof, which was determined at the meeting. If the building height (cupolas and other architectural treatments do not count towards building height) exceeds 35’ feet, the applicant may apply for a variance that requires public hearing with Planning Commission approval.
11. John Knox Village only has 13 mobile homes left to demolish and remove, including pads and replacement of infrastructure. They intend to begin clubhouse construction by the end of 2019.

1 MOTION: Staff recommended that the TRC vote to approve the application with the following  
2 conditions:

- 3  
4 1. Revise the site plan dated June 15, 2018, to comply with the TRC comments as discussed

5  
6 Sgt. Lariscy made a motion to approve the site plan with the above-mentioned conditions. Mr.  
7 Pereno seconded the motion. Motion passed.

8  
9 **4. COMMENTS/DISCUSSION**

10  
11  
12 **5. ADJOURNMENT**

13  
14 Sgt. Lariscy made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Pereno seconded the motion. With there  
15 being no further business, Development Services Director, Becky Mendez adjourned the meeting at  
16 11:19 a.m.

17  
18 **RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:**

**APPROVED ON**

19  
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21  
22 Becky Mendez, Development Services Director  
23 Development Services

