



City of Zephyrhills

SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Council Chambers – City Hall | 5335 8th Street, Zephyrhills

Tuesday, May 16, 2023 | 9:30 AM

– MINUTES –

Attendance: Todd Vandenberg-Planning Director

Shane Leblanc-Public Works Director

John Bostic-Utilities Director

Bill Burgess- Building Director

Staff Present: Rodney Corriveau- Senior Planner

Carlos Maldonado-Planning Support Specialist

1. Business Items

1.1 SPR-64-23 Re-review of Take 5 Oil Change at the Market at Zephyrhills

Items discussion was led by Rodney Corriveau: This was a re-review we had our engineer on record review this for conformance. And one issue was found which was the stop bar and stop sign at the end of the drive. An email was sent depicting the issue to the applicant. A request from the applicant was to move the signage to the north side where they have four parking spaces abutting Gall Blvd to the South side. The reason was because there were issues with the site immediately north of this project, which is Radiant Car Wash. They need to move their monumental sign a little bit further South. The issue was discussed with the Building Official Bill Burgess and the goal is to keep those spaces evenly spaced as far apart as possible. Applicants will be informed on the issue via email. This is a simple review according to Mr. Corriveau.

John Bostic's Comments: on the water side. The question was if an irrigation meter will be needed? and there needs to be a note that's reads meters and back flows will be installed by the city once payments

have been received for the capacity installation fees. Fees must go to the city's Building Department. And on the sewer side Bostic asked why a double service detail is there, and if needed the one in the detail is incorrect anyway and shouldn't this be a single service connection. The big one is that the location will need any oil water separator grease trap. Burgess commented they have one, Bostic stated it wasn't on the plans. Burgess commented that it will be located on the interior and on the construction plans. Burgess understood after speaking with the applicant that they only hand washed, so it's the oil of the hands and it's not a large oil separator. Bostic concern were regarding the floor drains, and asked how they would clean that and where it is going to go. Burgess commented and said they don't intend on having any floor drains in the bay just a positive flow because they aren't projecting to have a lot of oils spills. Further review on the floor drain will be conducted. Bostic wants to make sure that the oil is kept under control due to possible spills during oil changes.

Rodney Corriveau took over the discussion again and asked for an update on the issue with the sewer lift station at the market area. Bostic mentioned that he gave them temporally permission to use it as a private sewer system for 6 months from what he put in an email. The expectation is that it should be up and running to the city standards by the 6 months due date. The time frame was 6 months from 2 weeks ago, it should end by November 2023. Site plan was brought up on the projector. Bostic asked a question out of curiosity on why Radiant Car Wash and the other businesses use the same sign, Corriveau answered with because we designed some of those individually and that there is a common sign at the entrance as well. The comment made by Vandenberg was that the property isn't very wide so he imagines the sign might not be big and confirmed with Corriveau that a Monument sign is being proposed. On the site plan location that says 21A is the location at question where the sign is being proposed. The monumental sign is proposed to be on the location adjusting to Gall Blvd on the other side of 4 parking spaces to the South. Road frontage determines the size of the monument sign. This project has been platted prior and a replat is going to happen in the future.

Comments by Shane Leblanc; he mentioned that when he reviewed the plans that he noticed they had our dumpster enclosure specification listed. The project must build the enclosure to the city's specification. The details were in the plans according to Leblanc.

Recommendation was for approval of the revised site plan and with the conditions noted. All departments approved with noted conditions of the changes mentioned in the discussion.

No online representatives or in person were present for this item.

1.2 SPR-63-23 Calumet Townhomes-CR 54 .3 Miles east of 12th St.

Discussion was led by Rodney Corriveau, the item had been previously reviewed for an annexation and rezoning and future land amendment a year ago. It went through the Planning Commission and the City Council. It was approved by the City Council and some conditions were inserted into the annexation. Just a reminder to the applicant that they must begin working with the right of way use permits for Calumet and County Road 54. The last time that Corriveau spoke with the county he was informed that they have not received any communication with the applicant, the reason why is because as you remember they committed to put in a left turn-lane on County Road 54 which was part of the condition to annex that

into the city. Also mentioned was a right-of-way dedication to County Rd 54. And a potential right of way dedication on Calumet and improvement installation of sidewalks. Any other requirements for the county for Calumet as well, this isn't reflected on the site plan. Corriveau asked for the attention of any online applicants; Erin Lykins was present online. She was informed about the required update on the site plan and stated she is still working on it. Corriveau reminded her that ordinance number 1450-2020 for the restrictions. The comment made by Vandenberg was regarding the left turn lane with the resolution for the CU (condition use). What were the other things they were required to do? Corriveau responded with; there is a potential dedication on Calumet, and then an installation of a sidewalk on Calumet with other improvements required by the County. From a site visit there is infrastructure along Calumet apparently a large water pipe adjusting to Calumet and in-between Calumet Ave and the subject then the property. Shane Leblanc answered by stating the pipe is a back flow preventer it was looked at, also Bostic mentioned it's probably for Florida Trailer Estates (community within the area). Suggestion by Corriveau was that the applicant must be mindful of that when they engineer with what's required with the county. All parties believe that the in-question Pipe/back flow preventer is in the right of way. Online applicant Erin was asked if anybody has been out there to ground truth the infrastructure, she stated she was unsure and referred the engineer who is online Atef Hanna with Beacon engineering to answer the question. He stated that no one has been out to the site but can have someone conduct a site visit. Comment made by Vandenberg; question for Corriveau or the applicant online Per our townhome ordinance what are the recreation elements that are required how many of them and what is the proposal to meet that requirement? Atef Hanna stated the area between the 2 side roads behind the townhomes is really used for a park. The common area in question in that space is where the amenities will need to go according to Corriveau. Comments made by Vandenberg regarding the in-question area was that it needs to be more than just an open field, the code for recreation elements will need to be further reviewed. Code has been coordinated with the applicant according to Corriveau. The other requirement per Vandenberg were for proof from the applicant that their meeting the Architectural elements. The purpose of this is for when they get to the permitting process there is no issues, and to make sure the Land development code requirements are met for townhomes requirements. Per online applicant Erin, a huge area along the North, a dog park was added to the plans, and she remembers it being agreed in the rezoning process. Sheets 3.1 for slide presentation being shown were mentioned. Section 7 of 34 was brought up to the projector, and applicant indicated the green section on the plans is for a proposed park. Vandenberg is requesting that there is similar detail to what was presented via the Tyson Townhomes project. Where they spell out the different amenities and point out the special details on the resubmitted plans along with conformance with the code. And because of the unit count it should be 3. Applicant was asked by Vandenberg if they are aware of the Architectural elements of the Land use ordinance and wanted to make sure that it was reviewed. The primary section being concerned was for the townhome element. The applicant answered with yes, the element has been properly reviewed. Before moving forward per Corriveau he wanted to confirm that there was no one living on the premises, due to prior visit he made contact with someone who was on site. Erin informed him that it was her handyman performing work on the property. Also she was asked to please inform anybody onsite working that city employees and consultants could potentially do site visit during the review process. The width of the townhomes lots were mentioned, and they are 20x80 ft. Moving on to the parking aspect. According to the ordinance parking spaces must be 9x20. Also, each townhome has a proposed garage parking. We're going to count one space for the garage, and then the parking space right now is measuring at 9x18 and will be changed to 9x20. So, they're going to have to

set the units back to conform. Another concern after going over the issues with the engineer of record regarding double parking issues within the community, was for ADA (American with Disability Act) people to have a clear path to walk and not go into the turf area. That's the primary reason for 9x20 parking size requirements. Due to limited parking issues for some of these projects that don't accommodate full parking Corriveau used a point 3 multiplier times the number of units so there can be some additional common area parking. Some common area parking is available in the section of the community mailbox area (blue area south of the pond onsite plan being presented). A request to go back to add additional common parking is being requested due to experiencing major issues with the streets and sidewalks. Must be in conformance with the 2 spaces requested. Per applicant on the site plan there is some additional parking spaces being proposed. The requirement for the townhomes is 2 parking spaces. The code requires 9x20 for parking spaces. The proposed driveway is 15x20 not including the sidewalk. The request is to get a full parking space in front of the garage. Also side note on the caliber plans per Corriveau that the landscape plan must be 3" inch minimum, currently they look to be 2" inches. Also, additional issues for improvements will be outlined in the project plans. Due to confusion a request for the applicant is to review everything from the engineer on record and the utility department's records. And after figuring out the issue with the parking bring it back before the site review once it's ready to be approved. If it can't be achieved, they must have additional common area parking. Comment by Shane Leblance; the roads are going to be private, and drainage is going to be private. The turnaround area in the dead-end is concerning for the solid waste truck it's not ideal. The truck will need to make a 3 point turn so the engineer might want to take it into consideration that the front tire of the truck could possibly be causing damage on the roadway. Corriveau mentioned that in a letter from May 5th, 2022, the issue was discussed. Also, they spoke with the building department and were informed that they don't meet the minimum standards for turn around radiance. It will need to be corrected. If they have the T-turn, they must meet the minimum standards. Comment by Bill Burgess; was for the applicant to go online to Pasco County FI Redbook requirement, it will tell them about the turn around radius for the trucks length. Corriveau advised they currently have a list compiled with additional information on the turnaround issue. Vandenberg; asked if they have a known builder on record yet, the applicant informed that no builders on file yet. Main concern by Vandenberg are that they conform with all the city's Architectural standards. Erin the online applicant advised she would be constructing the project herself. A pre-review was mentioned before it goes to permitting, similar process was used for similar projects in the past. The item should be returned for another review by the Site Plan Review Committee after the corrections are completed.

MEETING ADJOURN