

PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
JULY 1, 2011

The Plan Review Committee met in regular session on Friday, July 1, 2011, at City Hall in the City Commission Chambers, 210 Sams Avenue, New Smyrna Beach, Florida. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Gail Henrikson

The following members were present and introduced themselves for the record:

Mike Bosse  
Gail Henrikson  
Randy Walter  
Marissa Moore  
Bill Drossman  
Mike Knotek  
Kyle Fegley

Khalid Resheidat, Public Works Director were absent.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting held June 3, 2011

**A motion was made by Marissa Moore to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held June 3, 2011; seconded by Randy Walter. Motion passed unanimously.**

Gail Henrikson swore in the staff and the applicant.

Parker Mychenberg and Steve Buswell, Parker Mynchenberg and Associates, 1729 Ridgewood Avenue  
Holly Hill, FL 32117

and

J. Pendergast, 124 Canal Street, New Smyrna Beach, Florida, 32168

addressed the board.

**SP -3-11: 501 ESTHER STREET/ ESTHER STREET BEACHFRONT PARK**

PLAN REVIEW  
JULY 1, 2011  
MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Buswell stated that there were still some issues that needed to be sorted out. For example, who would be responsible for ordering and installing the playground equipment or the sand volleyball court equipment.

Mr. Fegley addressed Mr. Buswell's concerns.

Mr. Buswell asked about signage for the park. He stated that there wasn't space available on North Atlantic Avenue.

Ms. Henrikson stated that a location for the sign had not yet been finalized by staff. She also stated that the PRC members realized that a site plan change order would likely be required to address some of the outstanding issues. She stated that because of the tight schedule to bid out this project, it would not be feasible to address every issue up front.

Mr. Knotek asked about details for the picnic pavilions.

Mr. Mynchenberg stated that these were now prepared and would be included with the resubmittal.

Mr. Buswell proposed alternative locations for a possible sign. Staff agreed that the consultants should propose a location for the sign.

Mr. Buswell discussed the existing light pole that is shown to be relocated. Mr. Buswell stated that it would likely be better to relocate the light instead of removing it completely, as the light is already approved and is turtle compliant.

Ms. Henrikson stated that staff has not yet determined whether the light should just be relocated or whether it should be removed completely.

Mr. Buswell discussed the status of the proposed easement on the south side of Esther Street. He stated that if this easement is not obtained, it would have significant impacts for the site plan.

Mr. Mynchenberg asked whether it would be okay to place the utilities under the pavement in that nine-foot wide area if the easement is obtained. Mr. Fegley stated that would be acceptable. There was additional discussion about the changes that would be required with regard to utilities if the easement is not obtained.

Mr. Buswell stated that most of the comments seemed fairly straight forward. He discussed the pump type that would be recommended and stated that additional detail would be provided on the resubmittal.

Mr. Walter asked whether staff would be able to comment on the additional information provided on the stormwater pump. He asked whether staff would see this new information before the site plan is approved or after the site plan is approved.

PLAN REVIEW  
JULY 1, 2011  
MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Henrikson stated that because of the project schedule, not all information might be available at the time of approval. However, as information was obtained, site plan change orders would be required.

Mr. Fegley stated that staff would not be required to approve something that did not meet Utilities Commission requirements.

There was discussion about the UC's water main improvement project on Lincoln and Esther Streets and how these two projects could be tied together.

Mr. Buswell discussed the drainage calculations and stated that he had forwarded a copy to the City Engineer.

Mr. Buswell asked the use of pressure treated wood for the walkover versus a composite material. Mr. Mynchenberg stated that generally, the composite material does not hold up as well as the pressure treated wood in this type of environment. He also talked about the durability of stainless steel cable versus wood for use in the railings. He recommended the use of wood but stated that he would specify whatever material the City preferred.

Mr. Buswell asked about the use of plant materials to stabilize the side slopes of the retention pond where the sand volleyball court is proposed. He stated that geoweb would not be appropriate for this situation. He stated that they were considering a layer of dune plantings along with sod.

Mr. Mynchenberg stated that they were also considering some dune restoration work on top of the sea wall. He stated that in order to maximize the pond volume, the side slopes were 3:1. He stated that he was concerned about stabilization once the pond was in use. He stated that is why they recommended Bahia sod. He stated that he did not believe that dune vegetation would not be sufficient to stabilize the slopes long-term.

Ms. Moore stated that the firm that would be installing the seawall would also be responsible for the dune restoration work.

Mr. Mynchenberg stated that because everything was to be bid out at once, the seawall plans would be incorporated into his plans and one contractor would be responsible for building everything.

There was general discussion about how the two sets of plans would be integrated.

Mr. Mynchenberg discussed the existing vegetation that would need to be removed. He stated that they were able to save some of the vegetation at the north end.

Mr. Fegley discussed the cross-members on the decking. He stated that at that location, they are only a foot below the dune. There was discussion about the elevation changes on the site and for the various improvements.

PLAN REVIEW  
JULY 1, 2011  
MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Buswell asked about the comment regarding relocating versus replanting palms. He pointed out that relocated palms would not have a warranty.

Ms. Moore stated that she was not sure which would be better in this situation. She stated that staff would discuss this issue internally at their July 8<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Ms. Henrikson stated that the July 8<sup>th</sup> meeting was intended to discuss logistics of combining the seawall and park improvements plans and not to discuss outstanding issues.

Mr. Mynchenberg stated that the costs of relocating trees versus planting new trees is fairly similar. He stated that planting new trees ensures a uniform look and that those trees will come with a warranty. He recommended using new trees.

Mr. Buswell stated that they could add additional native vegetation to the site plan. Mr. Mynchenberg stated that saw palmettos, which were recommended by staff, were rather expensive. He asked for verification from staff as to whether this was the plant they wanted and, if so, how many.

Mr. Buswell asked whether the intent was to specifically use saw palmettos or whether staff was looking for more low-level ground cover.

Ms. Moore stated that the intent was to limit the use of sod. She stated that native vegetation should be used in lieu of resodding disturbed areas. There was additional discussion about the landscaping issues.

There was discussion about whether an irrigation system would be installed. Mr. Mynchenberg discussed the location of the backflow preventer. He stated that a temporary irrigation system could be installed off of the backflow preventer.

Mr. Walter stated that a 2" service could not be extended to that location. He stated that either the UC would have to install a water main in the right-of-way or the meter would need to be moved to the property line. There was discussion about the water line, water meter and backflow preventer.

There was discussion of the comments from the Parks and Recreation Department.

There was discussion about providing a vendor space between the two handicapped parking spaces.

There was discussion about the electrical service to be provided to the site. Mr. Fegley stated that the City had not planned on running power to the site.

Mr. Knotek distributed his comments to the applicant. He stated that the restroom building needed to be four feet above base flood elevation. He stated that meeting this requirement would require significant changes to the proposed grades. He explained that he is creating a variance process that would go before the Building Trades Board. However, he stated that the

PLAN REVIEW  
JULY 1, 2011  
MEETING MINUTES

new process would not be in place until possibly September. There was additional discussion about the elevation of the restroom building.

Mr. Knotek stated that the building also needed to be on pilings.

Mr. Mynchenberg stated that the building would be on pilings.

Mr. Knotek informed the applicant that he would need documentation on the pilings, including the depth of the pilings.

There was discussion about the green certification for the building and about the exterior building materials.

Mr. Knotek also asked about handicapped accessibility on the observation decks.

Mr. Mynchenberg stated that the plans had been revised to provided ADA accessibility.

Mr. Knotek also asked that a note be added to the plans stating that the City would be responsible for inspections on the water and sewer services that are beyond the meter. There was additional discussion about which portions of the utilities the City would and which the UC would inspect.

Mr. Buswell asked about the required fire flow for the project.

Mr. Walter discussed the comments from the Utilities Commission. These comments included comments on the electrical service, water and sewer. Reclaimed water is not available in this area of the City. Mr. Walter also discussed the UC's Developer's Agreement and Addendum.

Mr. Drossman did not have any comments.

Ms. Henrikson advised the applicants of the resubmittal procedures.

There as discussion about how comments from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection might affect the project.

No further questions from the applicant.

No further questions or comments for the applicant from the Board Members.

COMMENTS FROM THE STAFF OR BOARD

There were no comments from staff.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.