

**ORMOND BEACH  
SITE PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE (SPRC) MEETING**

**9:00 A.M., August 25, 2021**

The SPRC Meeting commenced at 9:00 a.m. on August 25, 2021.

**Attendance**

**I. Applicants:**

Andy Clark, Property Owner  
Robert Bolwerk, Coleman Goodmote

**Staff:**

Steven Spraker, Planning Director  
Robin Gawel, Senior Planner  
Noel Eaton, Senior Planner  
David Allen, Planning Civil Engineer  
Cara Culliver, Landscape Architect

**II. Meeting Re: Development Order and site issues for buffer wall at 321 Hand Avenue**

Mr. Steven Spraker, Planning Director, started the conversation and introductions of the City staff and applicants.

Andy Clark, property owner, and Robert Bolwerk, contractor, came in to discuss site issues preventing the installation of the buffer wall as approved in the development order. Large existing trees in the west corner that were not identified on the survey used in the development order are in the proposed path of the buffer wall. The area in front of the wall between the existing parking lot and Hand Avenue is very wet and often retains water. The owner and contractor are concerned with the plantings suggested in the development order and the ability of them to survive the wet conditions.

Members of the SPRC Committee, Mr. Steven Spraker, Planning Director; Ms. Robin Gawel, Senior Planner; Ms. Noel Eaton, Senior Planner, Mr. David Allen, Planning Civil Engineer, and Ms. Cara Culliver, Landscape Architect, determined the following:

- I. The committee administratively approved the deletion of the portion of the buffer wall in the west corner due to the existing trees and vegetation, leaving only the wall in front of the parking areas to be installed (see exhibit).
- II. Prior to final inspection and approval of the wall construction, Tim Cone, project landscaper, will contact Ms. Culliver to determine what type of hedges and 5 trees would be appropriate to be installed.

**III. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

The SPRC Meeting commenced at 10:30 a.m. on August 25, 2021.

**I. Attendance**

**Applicants:**

Hassan Saboungi, Saboungi Construction  
Ahmed Tildi, Saboungi Construction  
Kris Rowley, Zev Cohen and Associates  
Ryan Johnston, RCJ site construction  
Dana Smith, DJ Design, Inc.

**Staff:**

Steven Spraker, Planning Director  
Robin Gawel, Senior Planner  
Noel Eaton, Senior Planner  
Lynn Carter, Utilities Engineer  
David Allen, Planning Civil Engineer  
Cara Culliver, Landscape Architect  
Shawn Finley, Public Works Director  
Cole Buck, Civil Engineer  
Donnie Vick, Engineering Inspector  
Jason Weidenmiller, Engineer Inspector

**II. Pre-construction meeting**

Mr. Spraker, Planning Director, started the conversation and introductions of the City staff and applicants. The pre-construction meeting agenda was led by Mr. Allen and the following items were discussed:

- I. Introductions. Mr. Allen introduced the site inspector, Jason Weidenmiller and the Engineering inspector, Donnie Vick.
- II. Development Order has been approved.
- III. Engineering Permit has not been submitted. Mr. Saboungi provided the application to Mr. Spraker.
- IV. Introduction of Jason Weidenmiller as Engineering Inspector.
- V. Permits- Engineer of Record will provide copies of all permits. Mr. Rowley confirmed that all state permits had been issued (St. Johns).
- VI. Building Department. There has been no building department submittal to date. Mr. Saboungi indicated that they were waiting on a signed contract which was provided at the meeting.
- VII. Tentative Project Schedule: Mr. Saboungi indicated that every contractor is at the mercy of the supplier for steel structures. The building will not arrive until March 2022. The site work would not start until January. Mr. Allen asked for the project schedule in the form of a letter/e-mail. Mr. Saboungi stated that

there must be a mindset of flexibility because this is what is being stated to him today and this may change. Mr. Allen asked for two weeks notice prior to any work starting on the project.

A discussion occurred regarding the project timing. The notice to proceed has not been issued and Mr. Finley stated that there was an understanding of the supplier issues.

Hours of Construction: Monday thru Saturday from 7am to 7pm with no Sunday construction hours.

VIII. Utilities – 24-48-hour notice required prior to connections to public utilities.

- a. Epoxy Coated Bends, Valves, Tees, Etc.

IX. Testing Requirements

- a. All density tests are to be submitted to Donnie Vick.
- b. Video all storm sewer. City representative must be present. No video is required for sanitary sewer connections.
- c. As-built requirements.
  - i. Submit digital file for review.
  - ii. Final – Submit three paper copies, mylar, disk.
  - iii. Engineer certify and submit.

X. Inspections / Project Process

- a. Erosion Control; silt fence and required tree protection required prior to construction.
- b. Designation of Construction Entrance.

XI. Final Inspection Procedures

- a. 95% Punch list.
- b. Final Inspection. Clarification was made that Mr. Vick was acting similar to a city representative and Mr. Weidenmiller is the site inspector. A discussion occurred of project contacts and the appropriate individuals to contact on project correspondence.

XII. Any Changes / outstanding items to make contractors / inspectors aware of?  
None identified

XIII. SPRC Comments. No additional discussions.

**III. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

The SPRC Meeting commenced at 11:05 a.m. on August 25, 2021.

**I. Attendance**

**Applicants:**

John Cattano, Portage Real Estate, LLC (ZOOM)

Eric Conkright, Piedmont Private Equity (ZOOM)

**Staff:**

Steven Spraker, Planning Director

Robin Gawel, Senior Planner

Noel Eaton, Senior Planner

Lynn Carter, Utilities Engineer

David Allen, Planning Civil Engineer

Cara Culliver, Landscape Architect

Tim Heyrend, Utilities Manager

**II. Pre-application meeting**

Mr. Spraker, Planning Director, started the conversation and introductions of the City staff and applicants.

The applicants stated that they are multi-family developers and are currently working on a project in Flagler Beach. Mr. Cattano stated that there is a demand for housing within this area and they have identified the property at 1648 to 1718 Old Tomoka Road. Mr. Cattano stated that they are seeking guidance/feedback on the subject property and if the city would consider (1) annexation and (2) city's attitude for multi-family development. There was discussion of the commercial nature of this area and the availability for services close to the site. From a site development perspective having two (2) access points at Booth Road and Interchange Boulevard is a positive. Mr. Cattano stated that they would not get involved in a property where the city is not supportive of the use.

Mr. Conkright added that they love this area and see a need for residential development. Mr. Conkright stated that their development has diverse tenants. One goal of his company is to provide housing near commercial and industrial areas.

Mr. Spraker went over the annexation process. Mr. Spraker continued that the city policy has been to assign annexed properties similar land use and zoning as existing in Volusia County. If applicants desire more intensity or density, then the applicants would need to apply for those entitlements. One concern noted by staff was that there is no other multi-family development within this corridor. Mr. Spraker states that the compatibility with existing development needs to be reviewed.

Ms. Carter stated that there is water availability and that the waterline should be looped between Booth Road and Interchange Boulevard. Ms. Carter continued that sewer is generally available, but that it would include some design.

Mr. Spraker stated that another concern is the sub-standard roadway of Old Tomoka Road, which is a Volusia County roadway. There would be an expectation that the roadway deficiency would be addressed.

Mr. Conkright stated that the concept was between 240 and 270 multifamily units. Mr. Conkright understood that there were some homes in the area, but there were also commercial uses and that they were open to site design.

Mr. Spraker asked if they could discuss the concept internally and provide a response in a week or so. The applicant agreed and stated that they were looking for feedback on the concept.

### **III. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.