



PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

City Hall – Council Chamber
405 Bagshaw Way, Edgewood, Florida
Monday, April 10, 2023 at 6:30 PM

Ryan Santurri
Chair

David Nelson
Vice-Chair

Melissa Gibson
Board Member

David Gragg
Board Member

Todd Nolan
Board Member

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Santurri called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Administrative and Permitting Manager Sollazzo confirmed there was a quorum with four board members present; Board Member Gibson was absent.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Chair Ryan Santurri
Vice Chair David Nelson
Board Member David Gragg
Board Member Todd Nolan

STAFF PRESENT

Brett Sollazzo, Administrative & Permitting Manager
Michael Fraticelli, Police Sergeant
Drew Smith, City Attorney
Allen Lane, City Engineer
Ellen Hardgrove, City Planner

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Board Member Melissa Gibson

Galen Pugh, City Landscape Architect

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 13, 2023 Planning & Zoning Meeting Minutes

Chair Santurri made a motion to approve the March 13, 2023 Planning and Zoning meeting minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Nelson. Approved (4/0).

NEW BUSINESS

1. Ordinance 2023-04: County to City Rezoning (PO District)

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF EDGEWOOD, FLORIDA, REZONING AND CHANGING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP CLASSIFICATION OF PROPERTIES GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF HANSEL AVENUE NORTH EAST OF CITY HALL AND WHICH WERE PREVIOUSLY ANNEXED INTO THE CITY OF EDGEWOOD BUT WHICH HAVE NOT YET BEEN ASSIGNED A CITY OF EDGEWOOD ZONING DISTRICT DESIGNATION; REPLACING THE ORANGE COUNTY ZONING DESIGNATION FOR SUCH PROPERTIES WITH THE MOST CONSISTENT EXISTING CITY OF EDGEWOOD ZONING DESIGNATION; REPEALING ALL CONFLICTING ORDINANCES; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Planner Hardgrove began by giving a brief overview of the proposed Ordinance, explaining that this is an administrative process, and the beginning of the proposed rezoning's for all properties annexed into the City still retaining a County zoning designation. For this specific zoning district, there is only one property that needs to be changed from County to City zoning: 5517 Hansel Avenue. A brief discussion ensued between Board Members and Planner Hardgrove. There were no public comments.

Chair Santurri made a motion to recommend approval of Ordinance 2023-04 to rezone the property at 5517 Hansel Avenue from County PO zoning to a City PO zoning; seconded by Vice-Chair Nelson.

The motion was approved with a roll call vote.

Chair Santurri	Favor
Vice Chair Nelson	Favor
Board Member Gragg	Favor
Board Member Nolan	Favor
Board Member Gibson	Absent

2. Variance 2023-01: 485 Mandalay Road Boat Dock

Engineer Lane began by giving a brief overview of the proposed Variance request, stating that the Variance is for Sec. 14-11(b)(2) of the City’s Code to allow a boat dock to be constructed 28.88% into the navigable corridor of the canal in lieu of the allowed 25%. He explained that to be at the 25% range, the dock would need to be 13ft wide, but the proposed dock is 16ft wide, only a three-foot difference. He confirmed that the width of the navigable water between docks is 30ft, more than the required 25ft, providing ample room for boats to pass through.

Engineer Lane went on to explain that the dock has to be built wider than code because of the normal high water level being four feet lower than the existing seawall. Per code, a boat dock is not allowed to be four feet taller than NHWE. Engineer Lane confirmed the applicant provided answers to all six variance requirements, and believes that they justified the request, showing they indeed have a hardship.

Board Member Gragg expressed some concerns regarding if this proposed dock would leave enough room for the properties across the canal to build a dock.

Applicant Sheila Cichra of Streamline Permitting, representing the homeowner, came up and said that everything Engineer Lane explained was correct. She also confirmed that the properties across the canal already have docks, so there should not be any issues in the future regarding navigability.

There were no public comments.

Board Member Gragg made a motion to recommend approval of Variance 2023-01 as presented; seconded by Chair Santurri.

The motion was approved with a roll call vote.

Chair Santurri	Favor
Vice Chair Nelson	Favor
Board Member Gragg	Favor
Board Member Nolan	Favor
Board Member Gibson	Absent

3. Special Exception 2023-02: Suncoast Building Materials 2016 SE Amendment

Planner Hardgrove began by giving an overview of the proposed Special Exception, explaining that it is an amendment to the approved 2016 Special Exception. The Special Exception that was approved in 2016 was for outdoor storage of merchandise, parts or other equipment; building material storage and sales (new, no junk or used material), and a storage and wholesale distribution warehouse adjacent to a residential zoning/residential future land use. As is required for an application for a Special Exception, a site plan was submitted with the 2016 request. That plan included five buildings on the north side of the railroad spur ranging from 1,800 to 18,000 square feet, with the proposed access via across the existing access spur.

Although the site plan was approved for the North side of the railroad spur, Council allowed construction on the southern portion of the property due to legal issues with crossing the spur. Since the layout of the currently proposed use is substantially different than that considered during the 2016 special exception public hearings, the new development proposal requires re-analysis.

The current proposal includes construction of a 42,000 square foot building and the addition of a rail spur terminating into loading/unloading platforms; an existing 3,454 square foot building is proposed to be retained. Planner Hardgrove went on to explain some of the land use impacts. The size and height of the new building will create an imposing mass for the adjacent residential uses. The side facing the residential lots is 300 feet long and 35 feet in height, spanning four houses. Existing trees on the residential properties could soften the mass to some extent, but many views from these houses will have an unobstructed view of the large building and operations and the trees that would be planted on the subject property will take years to provide a visual buffer.

In addition to the potential impacts to the adjacent residents, the proposed use will also directly impact residential uses on the north and west sides of the Rosen Materials property due to the only access to the subject property: a driveway within the easement on the Rosen property. According to the application, 110 additional vehicles will use the driveway on the Rosen Materials property on a daily basis: 55 entering the site and 55 exiting, with 30% of these vehicles being large heavy trucks. During the morning peak hour, 22 vehicles are anticipated to be going into the subject property and 12 will be exiting, with the hours of operation potentially starting at 6 a.m. During the evening peak hour, 7 vehicles are anticipated to be entering the subject property and 20 exiting. This increased truck/vehicle use on the Rosen driveway will also impact the neighborhoods on the south side of Mary Jess Road including those along Chenault Avenue and Lake Mary Jess Shores Court, and potentially the neighborhoods to the west along and off of Rockwood Drive/Defiance Avenue since Rockwood/Defiance provides a direct connection to Oak Ridge Road and the lack of ability to enforce all vehicles going east toward Orange Avenue.

Another access impact will result from a contemplated railroad spur entering at the northeast corner of the site, directly abutting residential lots. While these impacted residents currently abut the railroad track, there will be increased noise from the switching activity from mainline to spur; plus, the existing vegetation adjacent to the railroad that currently provides some buffering for these residents will be eliminated. The connection of the spur and off-loading of the freight will also impact the ability to screen the use from the tracks, which was a condition of the 2016 approval: "A continuous hedge at least three feet high and 50 percent opaque at planting, of a species capable of growing to at least five feet in

height and 75 percent opaqueness within 18 months shall be planted and maintained along the east property line south of the existing wall.” This hedge was intended to provide aesthetic buffering to the site as the commuter train passes this site several times a day. If the request is approved, this hedge needs to be required or have a decorative wall or Green screen substitute, with evergreen trees or palms to soften the height and size of the building and the loading/unloading areas.

Per Code Section 134-405(a), approval of special exceptions must be in consideration of the character of and impact to the surrounding land use. As stated in Code Section 134-104, a special exception shall not be approved by the City Council unless and until the City Council makes a finding that the granting of the special exception shall not adversely affect the public interest. This has not been proven. Staff recommends denial.

Discussion ensued between Board Members and City Staff. Board Member Gragg questioned the easement on Rosen’s property, and if there would be a gate when Rosen is closed. Engineer Lane confirmed that there is a gate, and if Rosen is closed, the gate will be closed. Attorney Smith stated that is part of the ongoing litigation, and a resolution will come out of that. Vice-Chair Nelson questioned if trucks can make the turn at the northwest corner of the Rosen easement since the easement is only 24 feet wide; City Staff were unsure.

Applicant Sam Seballi of Florida Engineering Group approached the dais and stated that he understands the sensitivity of developing on this parcel. He said that he feels the new proposal of a 42,000 sqft building as compared to previously approved multiple buildings totaling 65,000 sqft is an improvement and better for the community. Suncoast Materials will use the proposed new building to move the outdoor storage indoors. Mr. Saballi then explained back in 2016, they planned to develop, but there have been legal issues with neighboring property (Rosen Materials) regarding the easement. Mr. Seballi then stated that if the Special Exception is denied, that he would like to sit with Staff and work with them on a plan the City would approve. Discussion ensued between Board Members and Mr. Saballi.

Chair Santurri asked what the maximum height of the original plans and new proposal are. Mr. Seballi stated that both plans would be 35 feet tall, but the new proposed design is not finished yet. The new proposal would not deviate from prior conditions of approval, and would reduce the overall square footage and change the access point.

Board Member Gragg asked if the 2016 approval granted access over the spur, with Mr. Saballi stating the previous approval did in fact show a driveway across the spur that connected to Mary Jess Road. Chair Santurri then asked if the proposed spur is essential for the new design, to which Mr. Seballi said the property owner can answer that.

Chair Santurri asked if there was a way to control the railroad use, to which Mr. Saballi replied that it would be difficult. Board Member Gragg then stated that his biggest concern is the proposed new access point, going in an L shaped driveway, behind residences instead of over the spur. Chair Santurri asked if Rosen uses the easement for loading/unloading, to which Mr. Seballi replied that he was not sure. Vice-Chair Nelson then asked if the peak of the building will be 35 feet, then what will the sides be? Mr. Seballi stated that the sides will probably be low depending on the pitch of the roof; possibly starting at 18 feet.

Suncoast Materials owner Mr. William Johns approached the dais to explain some details of the project. He said that the reason the property was purchased was because of the rail access. Right now, they can

live without it, but using the railroad brings in more product from different areas. Regarding the easement, it is currently undergoing litigation. The hope is that once resolved, the easement will be used as an ingress/egress only, and not as an area for loading/unloading, which should lead to less daily activity along the easement. As far as the proposed building height, the intent is to make it as large as allowable for greater inside storage, but it can be discussed.

Public Comment

Mary Woznack, an Edgewood resident, stated that she agrees with all of the concerns Staff referenced in their report. She questioned if any traffic studies have been done, and stated that the size of the proposed building does not fit the character of Edgewood. Ms. Woznack also brought up concerns regarding the storm water pond wall, and the current litigation regarding access to the easement.

Public Comment

Cliff Rathbun, an Edgewood resident, stated that there are currently 40 trucks a day, but with the proposed site plan, there could be up to 110 trucks a day. He then described how the traffic light at the railroad has an issue with timing, and more trucks would cause greater timing issues. Mr. Rathbun then stated he wanted the applicant to provide an exact number of how many additional trucks there would be.

Public Comment

Richard Yates, an Edgewood resident, stated that Rosen currently parks trucks along the easement. If they continue to park trucks, he is not sure how Suncoast can use it as an ingress/egress. He also stated that the train cars along the spur come in from midnight to 4am, which causes noise throughout the night.

Public Comment

Ed Rice, an Edgewood resident, stated that he hears the banging railroad from midnight to 4am. He then stated that between 5am-7am, the semi-trucks can be seen idling, and the backup horns can be heard. Mr. Rice then went on to explain that a building of the proposed size would be seen by the neighbors, but the noise is his greatest concern. He then explained that there could be 55 or more trucks, and that a semi-truck would not be able to make the turn in the easement. He also stated concerns regarding runoff issues near the Jessamine wall along the North side of the property.

Public Comment

Virginia Rice, an Edgewood resident, stated that she would like to see traffic studies, and that current traffic leaving her house is bad due to the trucks and the light sensor near railroad.

Public Comment

Jim Muzynski, an Edgewood resident, stated that the Board should agree with the Staff recommendation, and recommend denial. He also stated that the City should wait until all litigation is complete.

Public Comment

Doug Spencer, an Edgewood resident, stated that when he purchased his home, he knew it was located behind warehouses. But the difference between now and then is the traffic. He then went on to state that the issues regarding the traffic light sensor on the West side of the rail road tracks of Mary Jess Road.

Mr. Seballi came back up to answer some of the concerns the residents had from public comments. He stated that the trucks are there early in the morning, but they do not go West. He then stated that the City has not received any complaints regarding Suncoast in quite some time. Mr. Seballi then went on to explain that the Suncoast team operates within the hours of operation approved by the previous Special Exception.

Chair Santurri asked if they plan to produce any traffic studies? Mr. Seballi stated that there seems to be a misconception on how many trucks there will be. The trip generation used for this type of building is based on numbers from a transportation engineer. The estimate is 110 total, with 44 entering, and 55 leaving; but stated realistically, it will be more like 8 trucks coming and going three times a day, leading to 24 total trips. Chair Santurri then asked if Mr. Seballi’s team will conduct a railroad study with CSX, with Mr. Seballi saying yes.

Mr. Seballi then asked the Board Members for a continuance on this Special Exception request so they can discuss different ideas with City Staff, and provide flexibility. A brief discussion ensued.

Chair Santurri made a motion to table discussions until the applicant decides to return with updated information on proposal; seconded by Board Member Gragg.

The motion was approved with a roll call vote.

Chair Santurri	Favor
Vice Chair Nelson	Favor
Board Member Gragg	Favor
Board Member Nolan	Favor
Board Member Gibson	Absent

4. Discussion Item- Digital Projected Signs

Attorney Smith began by giving a brief overview of why this topic is up for discussion, explain that he recently saw projected signage on a building in the City of Orlando, and discussed with Planner Hardgrove on how to deal with this potentially being implemented in the City.

Planner Hardgrove presented three videos to the Board Members to provide examples of what this projected signage would look like. She then asked the Board for their opinion on if this is something they would allow, possibly regulate, or outright prohibit in the City. After a brief discussion ensued between Board Members, Planner Hardgrove, and Attorney Smith, the Board recommended that City Staff propose an ordinance to prohibit any type of projection signage in the City. This was just a discussion item for a future ordinance. No motion or roll call vote was made.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 PM.

Ryan Santurri, Chair

Brett Sollazzo, Administrative and Permitting Manager