

## Commercial Pre-Application Meeting January 3, 2024

*Note: These are PRELIMINARY inquiries which are of interest to the Coalition, but 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.*

**547 Sinnka St. ( the corner parcel continues onto the westside of Roper).** Habitat for Humanity, the applicant, inquired about the feasibility of developing this parcel that they own. It is comprised of five platted lots. They would like to build either a small subdivision with five homes or two duplexes. They stated that if they go with a subdivision, the smaller lots will have 30' wide homes with either 1 or 2 bedrooms and 1 bath. They added that in the past, Habitat constructed 5-6 homes per year, but they now want to build 12, and this parcel would make an ideal start to reach that goal. Some comments/concerns that were discussed follow:

### Planning:

- If the original platting is kept, there will be no problems. It won't be considered a subdivision, so no HOA would be needed. They would need to file a subdivision application using the original property lines.
- Setbacks will need to be 5' except for the larger lot which will need 7.5'. The corner lot will need a 25' visibility buffer.

### Utilities:

- There seems to have been one house there at one time, and if it can be found on an old map, and shown it was hooked up to City water, they will have a credit to tap back into it.
- Electric will not be a problem, but it will have to go underground.
- The most expensive part will be the gravity sewer. The UC will have to clarify if the lines on Sinnka and Roper are good, and if they are, the five laterals can just be hooked into them. Work will try to be done in-house, and doing all five at once would be the most cost effective as it would be between \$15-20,000 per sewer hook-up. As soon as the UC is paid, they will stake out the sewer laterals going to each lot. It was suggested to wait for this to happen before submitting building plans.
- The applicant will email staff the digital surveys that they have.

**Next Steps:** The applicant needs to follow through with the above suggestions, and then check with the County Appraiser's Office to see if individual pins with surveys are recorded showing five taxable lots. If not, that will have to be done before permits/building plans can be submitted for Staff review and approval.

**2641 Paige Ave and Glencoe Rd. (lot adjacent to the Dog Park).** The City, who is the applicant and owner of the property, presented plans for six Pickleball courts to be in two separate enclosures, a concrete pad for a rest area with restroom, a compact shell parking lot that will be shared with the Dog Park and have a total of 24 regular spaces and two ADA. This will be the first phase of the design with the second possibly having covered courts and seating. It will not have lights to play at night. Some comments/concerns that were discussed follow:

### Planning:

- Parking will be more than adequate since they are using the 1-spot per 2-player formula.
- Staff also asked if there had been any Public Meetings/input since there are homes in back of the courts to which the response was there was a Public Meeting and there were no concerns.
- The City plans to keep the existing natural buffer between the courts and the residents in the back.
- Since there is no sewer available the proposed septic tank for the restrooms will meet the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) separation requirements between that and water wells.
- One Staff member asked if the Humane Society was apprised of the plans as their kennels are close to the courts and wondered if the dogs would be affected by the noise. The applicant replied that their department will speak with them about this and maybe an extra buffer can be put in if they suspect there may be a problem.

- Staff asked about tree preservation to which the applicant responded that they are preserving the westside as the retention areas will be between the as well as the southside due to residents.

**Engineering:**

- Staff had met separately with the applicant about the stormwater dry swells.

**Fire:**

- The Fire Inspector had no questions.

**Utilities:**

- With no sewer, water main will have to run to one of the three public drinking wells. The one well site being used for the Dog Park is between both projects, but Staff wasn't sure where its meter was and will research as it could be off Paige before the tennis courts.
- Staff asked if the sidewalk is over any of the water mains as they need a soft area for repairs. Applicant stated he will pay attention to this when the Site Plan is resubmitted.
- Staff asked if electric will be needed for the parking lot or for security but wasn't sure if even the Dog Park had a pole. The applicant responded that the City may want to put in security lighting and will bring it up.
- Staff asked to see the plans when they are redone before they go for review.

**Next Steps:** Applicant is to submit a Class II Site Plan addressing issues mentioned by Staff which will be reviewed and approved by City Staff. No other Public Meetings are required, and the City Commission has already approved the funding for this project via the City Budget process.