

PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
AUGUST 5, 2011

The Plan Review Committee met in regular session on Friday, August 5, 2011, at City Hall in the City Commission Chambers, 210 Sams Avenue, New Smyrna Beach, Florida. The meeting was called to order at 9:08 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 was absent.

Ursula Moccia, Recording Secretary, was also present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting held July 1, 2011

**A motion was made by Bill Drossman to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held July 1, 2011; seconded by Randy Walter. Motion passed unanimously.**

Gail Henrikson swore in the staff and the applicants.

Robert Dahl, 820 Magnolia Street, New Smyrna Beach, Florida, 32168, and Daniel Johns, 3869 S. Nova Road, Suite #4, Port Orange, Florida, 32127, addressed the board.

**SP-4-11: LAKEVIEW EAST APARTMENTS**

Ms. Henrikson, Planning Manager, addressed the applicant for the case and reviewed the Planning Department comments. She stated that no major issues were identified by planning. The first four comments were procedural or advisory comments. She advised that they are still processing the future land use and zoning applications. She stated that the street vacation request is scheduled for two readings in August by the City Commission, and because the site plan is over 25 units, it will be addressed by the Planning and Zoning Board for approval. She addressed the areas on the site plan that need to be corrected or revised.

PLAN REVIEW  
AUGUST 5, 2011  
MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Johns asked whether the shell drive from the parking lot to the shop could be left unpaved.

Ms. Henrikson stated that it needs to be paved.

Mr. Johns asked if recycled concrete or asphalt can be used.

Ms. Henrikson stated that would be fine. She asked if the shop can be moved closer to the parking lot.

Mr. Johns stated that they wanted it away from the residential building.

Mr. Dahl agreed and also stated that tree preservation was another reason.

Ms. Henrikson stated that they need to apply for a parking variance.

Mr. Dahl addressed the parking and asked if it can be scaled back.

Ms. Henrikson stated that it could be, provided the variance request was approved.

Mr. Fegley commented on the handicapped parking spaces and advised there are more than required.

Ms. Henrikson stated that the 5-foot sidewalk needs to be continued along the north side of the property and advised that they may be able to contribute to a sidewalk fund in lieu of constructing a sidewalk.

Mr. Fegley addressed the applicant and stated his comments. He stated a concern with the survey showing a one-half acre difference.

Mr. Johns stated that he took the area off the survey himself and is unaware of the difference.

Mr. Fegley advised the applicant to review the plans and revise accordingly. He continued to address the remaining comments. He addressed building finished floor elevations and asked if stem wall construction would be used.

Mr. Dahl stated yes.

Mr. Bosse addressed a concern regarding the elevations and flooding.

Mr. Fegley stated the elevations would be high enough to avoid flooding.

Mr. Fegley continued to address the remaining comments.

Ms. Moore addressed the applicant and stated her comments concerning the accuracy of the tree survey and advised that every tree she measured was significantly off. She made a

PLAN REVIEW  
AUGUST 5, 2011  
MEETING MINUTES

request to meet on site to look at the trees to verify whether the survey needed to be redone and to look at the subsurface earthen burrows in question on the site as well.

Mr. Johns asked what number three on the Landscaping comments list meant.

Ms. Moore stated that the site is close to the Sugar Mill Ruins and recommended that an archaeological study may need to be done.

Mr. Johns stated a concern about the cost for the study.

Mr. Fegley stated it may be possible to find someone like Dot Moore to do the observations. She does it on a volunteer basis.

Ms. Moore continued to address the remaining comments.

Mr. Drossman addressed the applicant and stated his comments. He asked what type of traffic control would be used to stop residents.

Mr. Johns stated that stop signs would be used.

Mr. Walter addressed the applicant and stated his comments. He asked if the project would be phased because it will affect the proposed padmount transformer.

Mr. Johns stated yes.

Mr. Walter stated two transformers would be necessary. He asked if covered parking would be installed in the future.

Mr. Dahl asked why that would be a concern.

Mr. Walter stated that access would be blocked in an emergency situation. He advised the applicant to locate the pad so this will not be an issue. He addressed his concern regarding the twenty-five foot utility easement along Paige Avenue. He stated that a fifteen-foot easement would be sufficient instead due to a ten-foot dedication of a right-of-way

There was further discussion amongst the Committee Members and the applicant with regards to options of the easement.

Mr. Walter continued to address the remaining comments.

Mr. Bosse addressed the applicant and stated his main concern was that the turns in all drives need allow for a large vehicle. He then continued to address the remaining comments.

Mr. Knotek addressed the applicant and stated his comments. His main concerns were handicapped accessibility and tenant separation both vertically and horizontally.

PLAN REVIEW  
AUGUST 5, 2011  
MEETING MINUTES

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 10:02 a.m.