

1 City of Minneola
2 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
3 Minneola Council Chambers
4 800 North US Hwy 27, Minneola, FL
5

April 7, 2008

6 Debbie Veit called to order the Minneola Planning and Zoning Meeting.
7

<i>Seat #</i>	<i>Present</i>	<i>Absent</i>	<i>Others Present</i>
1.	<i>Pam Waldron</i>		<i>Amber Dickerson, Consulting Planner, Green Consulting Group</i>
2.	<i>(Vacant)</i>		<i>Katrina Thomas, Assistant City Attorney</i>
3.	<i>Debbie Veit</i>		<i>Sue Niswonder, Assistant Planner</i>
4.	<i>Jim Frana</i>		<i>Rose Folan, Admin.Asst., Planning Dept.</i>
5.		<i>Jennifer Varhol</i>	
		<i>City Council Representative, Ed Earl</i>	

8
9 *A moment of Silence and Pledge of Allegiance*

10
11 **Agenda Review:**

12 During Agenda Review, Debbie Veit asked the board members to take note of Joe Emanuele's resignation, which was included in their meeting materials. Debbie also asked Sue Niswonder for an update on filling the vacancy. Sue indicated that the City Clerk will post the opening on the City Hall bulletin boards.

16
17 **Review of Planning and Zoning Meeting Minutes for March 3, 2008**

18 Debbie Veit thanked the Planning Department staff for changing the minutes to include the names and concerns of audience speakers. She also asked that all audience speakers give their names and addresses clearly and complete the sign-in sheet legibly for the record.

22
23 **MOTION by Jim Frana to approve the minutes.**

24 **SECONDED by Pam Waldron.**

25 **Debbie Veit called for a vote.**

26 **APPROVED 3- 0. Absent Jennifer Varhol and one vacant seat.**

27
28 **Khadra Medical Center, Site Plan Review:**

29 **Applicant: J. Brian Denham, P.E. – Denham Summitt Engineering**

30 **Owner: Rajab K. Abukhadrah, M.E. – Arwa Investments**

31
32 Amber Dickerson opened the discussion by explaining the site and giving some background on the review process so far. Amber pointed out that she felt a Class B landscape buffer should be included on the south side of the site. She added that the applicant interpreted the code differently and did not agree. Amber also pointed out that according to Section 110-6 "the city council may waive or reduce the required

1 landscaping if the requirements are shown to be excessive or unreasonable due to
2 unusual site restrictions.”

3
4 *Katrina Thomas swore in the applicant, Brian Denham.*

5
6 Brian Denham, Denham Summitt Engineering, explained that meetings regarding this
7 site began when Peter Brandt was the City’s consulting planner. Mr. Denham pointed
8 out that Mr. Brandt was not of the opinion that the buffer was required on the south side
9 of the site. He also stated that Mr. Brandt indicated, at the first DRC meeting, that he
10 did not have any issues with the buffers. Mr. Denham added that the site was fully
11 designed and the architectural designs were completed based on those discussions. He
12 added that Dr. Khadra, who is having the building constructed, is hoping to move
13 forward in a timely manner in order to meet his schedule with having the building
14 complete and meeting the lease requirements where he is currently located.

15
16 Pam Waldron indicated that her only issue is with the buffer on the south side. She
17 asked if the applicant would consider being a good neighbor to the subdivision and put
18 some landscaping in that area. Mr. Denham responded that some landscaping was not a
19 problem; the issue is with adding a 20-foot buffer that would start taking parking space
20 and would mean that the site must be redesigned.

21
22 Debbie Veit asked that Brian Denham and Amber Dickerson help the board orient
23 themselves to the areas being referenced. Both parties came to the dais and assisted the
24 board.

25
26 Debbie Veit continued asking about: the number of parking spaces, monument signs,
27 building zoning, and building design standards. Amber Dickerson responded to each
28 item in turn indicating that all were addressed appropriately. Sue Niswonder clarified
29 the building design issue by stating that, at this time, we can only request the applicant
30 provide this information because it is not a requirement.

31
32 Debbie Veit finished with comments on the sewer situation. She expressed that projects
33 in this situation, where the City’s sewer system is not yet available, should be allowed
34 to move forward with temporary service being provided by another municipality.
35 Debbie asked for comments from the other board members and both Pam Waldron and
36 Jim Frana were in agreement. Debbie indicated that she would prefer this as a viable
37 alternative to having an applicant be required to put in a septic system.

38
39 Jim Frana commented on the distance from the back of the building to the neighboring
40 subdivision, and that the setback would be appropriate for a single-story building rather
41 than the proposed two-story. Brian Denham responded that it does meet the setback
42 requirement. Amber Dickerson confirmed. Jim asked about access to the building. Mr.
43 Denham responded that access to the building is only from the front. He also asked
44 about the use of a city retention area by the building. Mr. Denham pointed out that this
45 was acceptable in St. Johns’ standards.

46
47 Brian Denham addressed the issue of this being a neighbor-friendly site. He mentioned
48 that, short of the City purchasing the property and making it a park, the building with

1 landscaping around it should cut down on some of the noise and disturbance from the
2 roadway.

3
4 Debbie Veit announced a 10-minute break to allow audience members time to look at
5 the plans that the board had reviewed in preparation for the meeting.

6
7 Debbie Veit called the meeting back to order and asked that everyone in the audience,
8 who wished to speak, stand and be sworn in as a group.

9
10 *Katrina Thomas swore in, as a group, those audience members who indicated they*
11 *wanted to speak.*

12
13 The following audience members came forward with concerns regarding this matter:
14 James Paul Grech, 1146 Chelsea Parc Drive

- 15 • Height of building
- 16 • Access to upper floor of building
- 17 • Lighting
- 18 • Effect on property values
- 19 • Noise

20 Joyce McGrath, 1142 Chelsea Parc Drive

- 21 • Lighting
- 22 • Safety of children in the neighborhood
- 23 • Traffic particularly on the corner
- 24 • Property values
- 25 • Vacant professional offices currently on Citrus Tower Blvd.

26 Selenia Quinones, 1158 Chelsea Parc Drive

- 27 • Traffic
- 28 • Mischief and vandalism
- 29 • Overflow parking
- 30 • Privacy

31 Laurie Noboa, 1154 Chelsea Parc Drive

- 32 • Height of building
- 33 • Privacy
- 34 • Proximity to subdivision

35 Bill Pratt, 1162 Chelsea Parc Drive

- 36 • Size of parking spaces
- 37 • Traffic and traffic flow through subdivision
- 38 • Overflow parking on pond swale
- 39 • Property values

40 Gola Price, 1103 Chelsea Parc Drive

- 41 • Traffic

42 Bill Pratt, 1162 Chelsea Parc Drive (returned to the podium)

- 43 • Question: Is a traffic study going to be required to determine the need for a
44 traffic signal?

45
46 Amber Dickerson responded to the question regarding a traffic study stating that, per
47 our concurrency management, we can require a traffic study.

1
2 Debbie Veit asked about the date when the parcel was zoned as B-1. Amber Dickerson
3 responded that she recalled a previous conversation where it was stated that the zoning
4 took place prior to, or as part of, the subdivision. Jim Frana, later in the discussion,
5 advised that, according to his records, it was zoned B-1 in 1996.

6
7 Debbie Veit asked if Brian Denham wanted to address any of the comments. He
8 responded in the affirmative.

9
10 Mr. Denham expressed that he did understand the neighbors' concerns, and continued:
11 Privacy: Grading and topography show that the elevation difference is only
12 approximately 4.5-ft. with the house floor elevation being slightly higher than the
13 proposed building floor elevation and over 100-ft. of separation.

14 Access to building: Public access/egress is through the main lobby with elevators to the
15 second floor. Rear access is for emergency purposes only.

16 Noise: In that it is 100-ft away and access is from Citrus Tower, even with windows
17 that open and close, noise should be less than that generated by a neighboring house.

18 Parking spaces: These are standard spaces according to Minneola standards (10'x20').

19 Access thru site and parking on pond berm: Landscaping and 6" high curbs and wheel
20 stops will inhibit this activity.

21 Property values: Can't really address it but, hopefully, having a nice building on the site
22 will take attention away from the industrial site.

23 Traffic study: Site may not exceed number of trips that require a traffic study.

24
25 Debbie Veit recommended that Mr. Denham prepare a picture to scale for review at the
26 City Council meeting to help address the concern.

27
28 **MOTION by Pam Waldron to recommend approval of the Khadra Medical**
29 **Center Site Plan contingent on review of the following: traffic study, lighting, B-1**
30 **buffer on the south side of the site, and building height.**

31 **SECONDED by Jim Frana.**

32 **Debbie Veit called for a vote.**

33 **APPROVED 3- 0. Absent Jennifer Varhol and one vacant seat.**

34
35 **Minneola Emergency Communications Tower, Site Plan Review,**
36 **Resolution 2008-04 Variances 1) Setbacks & 2) Height, and**
37 **Resolution 2008-05 Special Exception Application:**

38 **Applicant: Lake County Florida**

39 **Property Owner: City of Minneola**

40
41 Amber Dickerson opened the discussion by reviewing the site plan as well as
42 requirements for the variances and special exception. She pointed out that a denial
43 could cause unnecessary hardship because without it they would not be able to have the
44 tower.

45
46 Debbie Veit asked if anyone from Lake County was present to speak as the applicant.
47 No one was present.

1 Pam Waldron asked about the extra 50 feet. Amber Dickerson responded that the
2 design was prepared based on Lake County Code. Katrina Thomas clarified the history
3 on this and pointed out that when the process for this tower began it was on county
4 property. The applicant began this process with Lake County permitting, and was
5 satisfying those requirements; but during that process, the property became contiguous
6 and was annexed. The City Council required that this request go back through the
7 normal city process. Katrina pointed out that this is an emergency tower for Minneola
8 residents as well as other area residents and Lake County is accepting all the costs
9 associated with building the tower.

10
11 Jim Frana commented on FTC standards regarding placement of the tower and the
12 expressed that the tower is not really necessary. Debbie Veit asked about emergency
13 communications and the tower's expected use. Katrina Thomas responded that it is to
14 facilitate response time for emergency services, and it is for the benefit of all the
15 municipalities of Lake County.

16
17 Debbie Veit questioned why the tower is 250-ft. high. Amber Dickerson responded that
18 it is the way it was designed. Debbie continued regarding: where the tower would fall,
19 if it will be a collapsible tower, and proximity to PUD (approximately 70 ft.). Amber
20 indicated that, at the Council meeting, the applicant mentioned that it would be a
21 collapsible tower. Debbie commented that the issue of a collapsible tower is not
22 adequately addressed particularly related to the closeness to the PUD.

23
24 Debbie Veit asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak on the issue. No one
25 came forward.

26
27 Katrina Thomas added that, as the ordinance was drafted, only maintenance vehicles
28 would be allowed there and only when they are dealing with service issues. She also
29 mentioned that in Sec. 130-5 an exception is referenced for city-owned
30 communications towers for emergency purposes and, though this tower is not city-
31 owned, the purpose is the same.

32
33 Jim Frana asked if the tower will be used solely for emergency communications and not
34 private cell phone use. Katrina Thomas responded that it is not proposed for other than
35 emergency use at this time, but there is a provision that the City Council must approve
36 any use changes in the future.

37
38 **MOTION by Pam Waldron to recommend approval of the Emergency**
39 **Communication Tower Site Plan, Resolution 2008-04 and Resolution 2008-05**
40 **contingent on the City Council looking at the following: collapsible tower,**
41 **property line and tower location in proximity to the PUD, and additional use of**
42 **tower other than emergency communications.**

43 Debbie Veit stepped down from the chair.

44 **SECONDED by Debbie Veit.**


45 **Jim Frana called for a vote.**


46 **APPROVED 2-- 1. Opposed Jim Frana. Absent Jennifer Varhol and one vacant**
47 **seat.**

48

1 Debbie Veit resumed the chair. She recommended that the Discussion Items be tabled
2 until at least four members are present.

3
4 **MOTION by Jim Frana to adjourn.**
5 **SECONDED by Pam Waldron.**
6 **Meeting adjourned 9:00 p.m.**

7
8
9
10 
11 **JAMES R FRANA**
12 **Debbie Veit CO-CHAIR**
13 **Chairperson, Planning and Zoning**

14 **Minutes Written by:**
15 
16 **Rose LaQuaglia Folan**
17 **Administrative Assistant, Planning Dept.**

19
20
21 **Attest:**
22 
23 **Janet McDaniel**
24 **City Clerk**

