

Commercial Pre-Application Meetings February 3, 2021

Note: These are PRELIMINARY inquiries, many of which do not move forward. Public participation is welcomed at both the Planning & Zoning Board meetings and the City Commission meetings where variances and development agreements must be approved.

1. 645 Oliver (1.8 acres). The owner inquired about annexation into the city, which would not be an issue, and then subdividing the property into three .6 acre lots for single-family housing. The following issues/concerns were discussed by City staff:

Utilities

- The existing structure is on septic as is the surrounding area. In NSB a subdivision consists of three residences or more. The owner would have to abide by subdivision regulations which would be costly especially regarding sewer and water.
- The closest availability of a sewer line is Limestone Ranch as there are none in Oliver Estates.

Fire

- New hydrants would be needed; suggested that the owner might want to get with other residents close by and split the cost.
- Driveways would need to be compacted and wide enough to accommodate fire trucks.

Engineering

- Unique situation as roads are both city and county, but with an annexation, they could transfer to the city.
- Paving ends at Lydia and will have to look closer as to what would be needed if plan moves forward.

Planning

- Will need topographical, tree, and wetland surveys.

City Staff suggested due to a myriad of problem and the cost, the owner may just want to investigate dividing the parcel in half as then it could stay septic, which would cut down on cost.

2. Lot 1 Village Square (6.42 acres off SR 44 and Timberlane by ABC Liquors). An inquiry was made by the owner and Project Manager about the Master Development Agreement (MDA) of this parcel that was made in 2009. The owner now wants to develop it and has several interested parties but not sure of the direction in which to go. They have an approved conceptual plan from that year that could accommodate a bank, medical facility, or perhaps a fast-food restaurant, etc. but wanted to know of any pitfalls before deciding. The following issues/concerns were discussed by City staff:

Planning

- MDA prohibits drive-thru's for restaurants; however, they are allowed for a bank, but it would need to close by 9pm. It was noted that there had been neighborhood input about this back in 2009 as to what they would allow to go there, so a new plan would have to go before the CC if the developer wanted to amend it.
- Key parts of landscaping, buffers, and conservation areas have different widths now so that would have to be kept in mind.
- Minor modifications from the original conceptual plan would be ok, but a change of use would have to go before the CC.
-

Engineering

- MDA's have a 10-year expiration date if nothing had been done, but this may be able to be renewed with a 5 year extension. City attorney will have to look at it as it was thought there had been some action.

- Would need a new concept plan as now each site must have its own stormwater.
- Will need a new tree survey as we have updated our regulations.
- Will need an updated traffic study based on proposed use.

Utilities

- During ABC construction, everything was upgraded so no water, sewer, or electrical problems could be seen. However, if a restaurant were to go in, a grease trap would need to be made.
- Potable water for irrigation only as ABC didn't put in any wells due to staining.

Fire

- Outside is ok; building plan needed before stating needed requirements.

Economic Development

- The director wanted to give his perspective in that he wanted the owner to keep in mind when deciding which business to bring in. Sustainable, diversified, and higher wage jobs would help our economy.

3. [Westside Apartments](#) (located south of Martin, east of Oleander and partially west of Roper, in the area of Chisholm Elementary). The Housing Authority of NSB presented its apartment proposal for Phase I which includes the following:

- Building will be a three-story, 80-unit senior living (62+ and not assisted living) apartment complex with an elevator. It will be 76 one-bedroom and 4 two-bedroom apartments.
- There will be 130 parking spaces on the front side of the building with a retention pond on the east side.
- Garbage pick-up would be on the NE corner behind the building so that garbage trucks would not have to drive through the parking lot.

It should be noted that before discussion, a re-development partner, stated that the traffic circulation was different than the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, but their priority was to obtain funding first and then address the details.

Discussion followed with the following issues/concerns by City staff:

Planning

- There was concern about changes to the approved Comp Plan, for the site and architectural rendering seems to be a downgrade from the original architectural design which was more resort style and did not look like affordable housing.
- Current code requires 160 parking spaces. The re-developer responded that in the senior units they've developed, the average is less than one utilized parking space per unit and the engineer responded that the one-bedroom average is 1.5 parking spaces per unit.
- According to R4 zoning, this building appears to exceed the 150' in length fronting on the street that is currently allowed. It also looks long, linear and institutional looking and asked about the existence of a landscape plan.

Utilities

- The developers would need to determine if there would be a master meter or individual meters. If it's a master meter, they would do a loop system for maximum water pressure. Sewer capacity and electrical source needed also must be vetted.

Fire

- There was concern about water capacity off a 6" line, and that they would need to test to make sure the fire department has the necessary water pressure. Also, there might need to be additional accommodations for access to the building for emergency services due to the length of the building. The engineer countered that there would be 8" water lines within the property and 3 fire hydrants.

Engineering

- Volusia County may have restrictions on Enterprise, which borders the south end of the property. May need to be researched.
- The entrance off Oleander and are both private roads which require investigation.
- A traffic study might be needed.

Mr. Fields reiterated that the city supports the project, but it must follow the same process as any other project. His concerns are the following, with some reiterations:

1. The change in the architectural plan from the original proposal presented to the commission. They need to either match or get closer to the original plan or run the new plan by the City Commission before moving forward.
2. The length of the building. The current length exceeds code.
3. The number of parking spaces does not meet code requirements.

The re-developer stated that they need to move forward ASAP because of funding. To which Mr. Fields stated that their options are to either start the variance process or go back and tweak the plan and move forward without variances. He suggested that the developers may want to go before the commission as an information item before moving forward with changes to the originally presented architectural plan.