

**Technical Review Staff Meeting  
December 7, 2018**

Attendee list: Kyle Fegley (city engineer), Randy Walter (UCNSB), and Kenny Ho (UCNSB)

**1. PUD-6-18: 3<sup>rd</sup> Amendment & Restated Venetian Bay Master Development Agreement – This request was made by James Stowers with the owner listed as Geosam Capital US**

This request is to amend and restate the Planned Unit Development Agreement for Venetian Bay. It is the third amendment and provides for a single modification to the Land Use Zone Standards allowing the use of a multi-level, self-storage facility within the Venetian Bay Village Center. The aesthetic would keep with the theme of the development and perhaps use Crepe Myrtle trees within the landscape design. There was some discussion about traffic, which would probably be less, as it would replace planned residential living units. Installation of 24” water pipes instead of the 12 and 16” pipes currently planned was suggested. There was also a reminder that, in a previous public meeting, some of the residents preferred a park to the proposed storage facility. Neither use was in the original plans. The engineering staff had no problem with the request as long as the storage unit keeps the same appearance as originally planned.

**2. S-13-18: Shell Pointe Subdivision Plat – This request is made by Mark S. Dowst, P.E. with the owner listed as BG Agency, LLC/Alex J. Melvin, Mgr.**

This project is a preliminary plat to construct a 745-lot subdivision on 543.53 acres. The project is zoned PUD and is located south of Pioneer Trail and west of I-95. It is currently a sod farm. The lot sizes will be 55’, 65’ and 80’. This project will be broken into four phases. The following points were discussed:

- Traffic will be impacted by this project. There was a lot of discussion about the connection plan particularly to Leonardo Lane. There was a suggestion that the developers consider buying some of the adjacent acreage to help with that connection. There are also negotiations with the developer and Geosam (Venetian Bay) to come up with a comprehensive plan for the connection. The overall goal is to design the subdivision so that major construction vehicles will not travel through residential areas, and the traffic flow will not be dependent on the extension of Williamson Blvd.
- There were several written comments by Jeff Grove about trees. The developers stated that since this is currently a sod farm, it is anticipated that very few trees will be impacted by the planned construction. Jeff was not at this meeting, so the developers agreed to follow up with him. On this matter.
- Water run-off was briefly mentioned. The developer does not anticipate an issue receiving a permit from the St. John’s River Management District as sod farms are thought to produce more nitrogen and phosphate than residential use.
- The landscape plan (buffers, trees, open space, trail plan) criteria were reinforced by the city. The owner’s team feels like there will be no problem meeting those criteria. One of the points is that one of the public parks proposed as part of phase 4 will require that the Williamson roadway be constructed to allow access.

- There was an environmental study which showed there were eight individual wetland areas and two surface water areas. The wetland limits on site were previously approved through a jurisdictional determination and more recently reviewed and agreed upon with St. Johns River Water Management staff.
- Utilities are the major issue with this project. There is not enough water capacity for Phases 3 and 4, and potentially for Phases 1 and 2 unless the Williamson Blvd extension is approved, and new water pipes can be installed. The owner's team was asked to do a computer analysis to determine whether there is adequate capacity for Phases 1 and 2 with the existing infrastructure. Also, the UC needs 15' to lay conduit pipes horizontally with no stacking. Glenn Storch challenged this request for "hard land" utility access. The City will provide details of these requirements to Mark Dowst.

It should be noted that what was reviewed is a preliminary plat and all the details are not worked out. The meeting allowed the developer to have an engineering discussion with the city to understand what needs to be in the final plat. It appears that the biggest issue with this development will be water capacity and traffic flow if the Williamson connector is not approved.

### **3. S-12-18 Turnball Trace Subdivision Plat – This request was made by Mark S Dowst, P.E. with the owner listed as David Aiken**

This is a preliminary plat to develop 293 high-end single family homes on 151.28 acres between Jungle Road and Pioneer Trail on three different lot sizes: 50', 75', 100'. This land is in the 100% flood zone and has 34 individual areas that are considered wetlands. There is only one phase to this project. The following points were discussed:

- Since this is both wetlands and in the flood zone, the property needs to have 5' of fill added. This can create a challenge with the existing trees. The owner, therefore, had three different tree assessments. The one included in the packet was from Environmental Services, Inc. in Port Orange. It stated: "Within the project area, 654 protected (specimen and historic) trees were located, characterized and reviewed for health issues. Forty-nine specimen trees and one historic tree were excluded from mitigation due to health issues." If the remaining 604 healthy trees are removed, over 15,000 trees, having at least a 5 inch trunk diameter, would need to be planted for mitigation. While a developer has not been identified, it is anticipated that there will be only a limited number of trees that will be removed.
- A permit will be prepared for the St. Johns River Water Management District.
- There is intent to have docks in the waterway. If St. Johns agrees, they will have to buy credits to have access to the creek.
- The plan is to have a private road and gated community similar to Sable Lakes.
- The utility commission stated more lift stations will be needed for growth in the future.
- There was no discussion about traffic in this meeting.
- There are no plans for a retaining wall. They are going to leave that to the developer. How the properties are developed (i.e. pool, etc.) will determine if there will be a need for a retaining wall or not.

This plan is VERY preliminary and lacking in detail.