



5555 E. Michigan Street, Suite 200  
Orlando, Florida 32822  
Phone: (407) 599-1122  
Fax: (407) 599-1133  
[www.avconinc.com](http://www.avconinc.com)

April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Ms. Bea L. Meeks  
City Clerk  
City of Edgewood

Reference: Holden Ave. PD  
Development Plan

Dear Bea:

AVCON, INC. is in receipt of your comments dated March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2022, which outlined information you require to complete your review of the above referenced project. For your convenience, we have included the comments below, immediately followed by our response typed in **bold**.

#### Development Plan (ENG)

- A. The DA states that a maximum of 3 lots shall be allowed to have a minimum lot width of 50 feet, unless specific conditions are met and approved by the City at Development Plan review and if the Developer shows evidence that the reduction of lot sizes allows for historic tree preservation. The plans show 20 50-foot lots. That is an increase of 17 lots. **The Developer will need to provide additional justification in written form for the increase in the number of 50 foot lots.** The written response letter only notes that a change in the number of lots is allowable and the Developer needs to show by competent, substantial evidence that the reduction of lot sizes allows for preservation of historic or specimen trees.

**Response: The reduction in the number of 60 foot lots allowed for more of the lots to be moved to the back of the subdivision, and provide a larger, centralized recreation area near the entrance which preserves a number of historic trees. Notably, this allowed for the preservation of trees 37,38,39,52,53,65,72,73,74 and 77 which comprise a total of 282". In addition, since the lot size reduction allows the street to be shortened and the cul-de-sac to be moved north, it creates an additional larger recreation area in the south-west corner, which preserves trees 13 and 21, for an additional 75".**

- B. The DA also states there shall be a minimum of 36 60-foot lots. The plans show a total of 19 60-foot lots. That is a reduction of 17 lots. As noted in comment 1 above, this needs to be justified by the Developer. Is the Developer proposing to amend the DA or request a waiver of this DA requirement? Once resolved, please review and correct note #9 on sheet C-300.

**Response: See A. Note #9 has been revised on sheet C-300.**

1. Sheet C-000 – the legal description does not match the one shown on the Boundary Survey. There are six parcel ID numbers listed in the title area, but the legal description only lists two parcels.

**Response: The legal description on the Cover Sheet has been revised for consistency with the latest boundary survey.**

2. Sheet C100 – Sheet 1 of Boundary Survey – the survey datum is not stated.

**Response: The Boundary Survey is based off of the north line of the northwest quarter of S14**



**T23S R29E as stated in the “Surveyor’s Notes”. There is no vertical Datum as the topographic survey was done separately.**

3. Sheet C101 – what is the developer’s position on the gap between the parcels and what is being done to resolve?

**Response: The portion of the gap located between the owned parcels has been included in the overall project site. The portion of the gap which is located to the south and borders a parcel with different ownership has not been included in these plans.**

4. Sheet C300 – with the configuration for the parking lot on the southern end of the site. Will there be sufficient room for lush landscaping and a fence between the sidewalk and the lot line for Lot 21? Will there need to be some sort of “soft” buffer between the home and the parking lot and sidewalk?.

**Response: There is a total of 15’ from the proposed lot building pad to the parking spaces. This 15’ will consist of the 5’ sidewalk, 5’ side setback, and a 5’ open area in the roadway tract. This will leave 10’ of room for landscaping to screen the home and parking lot.**

5. Sheet C300 - The tot lot and the covered pavilion are not in the same tract and are on opposite ends of the development. These two features should be adjacent with each other. As an example, if a resident wishes to hold a birthday party for their child, will it be at the tot lot or the pavilion? At either location, they will not have the advantage of the other feature.

**Response: The Developer prefers to keep these features at their current locations.**

6. Sheet C301 – arrows to be provided per the requirements of OCPW review for proposed bi-directional turn lane.

**Response: The striping shown on sheet C-301 is conceptual and the final striping and roadway design will be in accordance with the requirements of Orange County Public Works.**

7. Sheet C301 - A swale will now be collecting all the runoff from the south half of Holden Avenue and conveying the runoff into the on-site storm water pond. Is that the intent? We will need to see the storm water calculations with the construction plans as part of the review of the pond design and discharge.

**Response: As the southern half of Holden Avenue is flowing onto the property site in the current condition, the pond has been designed to collect the runoff from the southern half Holden Avenue in addition to the project site. The construction plans and stormwater report will include this area as a part of the pond design.**

8. Sheet C302 – cul-de-sac will need to be larger to ensure that the fire trucks can maneuver without having to climb the curb.

**Response: The current cul-de-sac has a pavement radius of 40’, which is larger than the minimum required by the City of Edgewood (34’), and allows the full turn by the largest fire truck. The vehicle tracking path on sheet C-302 “Vehicle Tracking Plan” has been revised to show the difference between the vehicle overhang (green) and the wheel path (red).**

9. Sheet C302 – the corner at the exit will need to be softened to allow the fire truck to exit without climbing the “pointed” curb and the median curb.



**Response: The vehicle tracking plan has been revised to show the vehicle overhang in green, and the wheel path in red. In addition, the roadway is proposed with type 'F' curbs which allow the trucks an additional 1.5' of space on either side before the truck would begin to climb the curb**

10. Sheet C305 - The first lot at the entrance is a 50-foot wide lot. This lot will be considered a corner lot and will need to meet the setback requirements on two sides. Will this lot be large enough for a home to fit? The corner lot, side setback is 15 feet. That leaves 30 feet of width upon which to build.

**Response: Lot 1 has a total width of 60' which will leave 40' to build upon with 5' and 15' side setbacks. The lot is counted as a 50' lot due to the area lost to the increased side setback.**

11. Sheet C400 – where do the stormwater ponds discharge or do they retain the 100- year storm event?

**Response: Stormwater Ponds 1 and 2 will discharge offsite through 100' wide spreader swales. Pond 3 will discharge to Pond 1 for large storm events only, and Pond 4 has been proposed to contain the 100-year and 25-year 96-hour storms. Detailed calculations will be provided with the final construction plans.**

12. Sheet C500 – recommend that the water main be extended farther around the cul-de-sac to eliminate all the water service lines crossing the cul-de-sac.

**Response: The water main has been extended around the cul-de-sac. Final layouts for potable water will be designed in accordance with OUC standards and will be subject to OUC review.**

### **Development Plan (Landscape)**

1. RECREATION AREA – REPEAT COMMENT: In over 40 years of park and recreation planning, I have learned from public meeting input, that the number 1 thing parents want at the playground, beyond the play equipment is shade and shelter. Based on my experience, I continue to highly recommend that the tot lot be near the pavilion.

**Response: The Developer prefers to keep these features at their current locations.**

2. REPEAT COMMENT: The previously identified swales in the Holden Avenue Tract H and Tract I north of the buffer wall has been removed from the civil and landscape drawings, so conformance with the previous request to move the west swale (in Tract I) to the north cannot be determined.

**Response: The swales have been revised to have positive drainage flow towards the collection structures. Structure locations are shown on sheet C-400 "Drainage Plan".**

3. The 4' sidewalk into the playground approaches the playground at a bench location. Please relocate the bench or change the alignment of the walk.

**Response: The bench location has been adjusted.**

### **Landscape Plan**

1. Tree Removal Permit, Condition of Approval – As per Development Agreement 5.0., the tree removal application per Chapter 130 is required to be submitted concurrently with the Development /



Subdivision plan. This has yet to be submitted and staff recommends that if P&Z recommends approval at the March hearing, that a condition of moving forward to City Council be that the tree removal permit be submitted at least two weeks prior to the Council public hearing submittal deadline, where the DP/PSP approval will be considered to ensure staff has adequate time for review.

**Response: Included in the submittal is the updated arbor permit plans and calculations.**

2. Provide sidewalk protection where oaks are provided at the entrance or propose evergreen understory trees.

**Response: Ellen Hargrove insisted that we plan the oak trees at the entrance. Root protection barrier details will be provided with the submittal of final construction drawings.**

Please do not hesitate to call should you require any additional information.

Sincerely,

**AVCON, INC.**

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "RV Baldocchi", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Rick V. Baldocchi, P.E.  
Vice President