

SEMINOLE COUNTY GOVERNMENT
 1101 EAST FIRST STREET, 2ND FLOOR, WEST WING
 SANFORD, FLORIDA 32771

Comment Document – Initial Resubmittal

PROJECT NAME:	TRI STATE TOWING - PD REZONE & MDP	PROJ #: 23-20500010
APPLICATION FOR:	PZ - PD	
APPLICATION DATE:	6/7/24	
RELATED NAMES:	Z2023-010	
PROJECT MANAGER:	ANNE SILLAWAY (407) 665-7936	
PARCEL ID NO.:	29-21-31-300-0030-0000	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED PD REZONE FROM A-1 FOR A TOW YARD	
NO OF ACRES	0.80	
BCC DISTRICT	1-BOB DALLARI	
LOCATION	ON THE WEST SIDE OF W SR 426, NORTH OF CONNECTION PT	
FUTURE LAND USE-	IND	
APPLICANT:	CONSULTANT:	
BRIAN TAYLOR TRI STATE TOWING (407) 788-6161 BMTAYLOR76@GMAIL.COM	KIM FISCHER CYCORP ENGINEERING INC 1614 WHITE DOVE DR WINTER SPRINGS FL 32708 (407) 405-7819 KIM@CYCORPENGINEERS.COM	

County staff members have reviewed the subject development project and offer the following comments. The comments below are a compilation of comments and markups from the ePlan review system. These items need responses with further information, data, explanation or revision of plans and documents before project approval.

Please itemize any and all revisions made to the development plan in addition to those made in response to staff comments; include a statement in your response to comments that no additional revisions have been made to the site plan beyond those stated.

See comments within the comment document for any fees due, as fees may be due for different aspects of your development project. Fees showing in ePlan reflect Planning & Development review or revision fees only.

Agency / Department Comments

NO.	DEPARTMENT	COMMENT	STATUS
1.	Buffers and CPTED	The 0.1 opacity buffer now requires 1.0 plant units per 100 linear feet. Please revise the table and callout.	Unresolved
2.	Buffers and CPTED	PD CRITERIA: If a PD is proposed: Per Sec. 30.8.5.3 - Review criteria. of the Land Development Code: "In addition, PD zoning may be approved only when the Board determines that the proposed development cannot be reasonably implemented though existing provisions of this Code, and that a PD would result in greater benefits to the County than development under conventional zoning district regulations." Please indicate with the rezone application if alternative landscaping is proposed that will result in greater benefits to the County.	Unresolved
3.	Buffers and CPTED	Please clarify what screening measures will be used to shield the storage area from view of neighboring properties and the right of way.	Unresolved
4.	Buffers and CPTED	Please show the proposed fence in either a different color or change more legible linework. It is difficult to tell where the fence is proposed.	Unresolved
5.	Buffers and CPTED	Please clarify what type of fence is proposed. Staff recommends privacy fencing.	
6.	Environmental Services	On Sheet 1: MDP Plan, please update the water & sewer utility contact information to the following: SEMINOLE COUNTY UTILITIES 407-665-2024.	Unresolved
7.	Environmental Services	On Sheet 1: MDP Plan, please correct the alignment and pipe size of the existing force main. The existing force main should be shown running along the southeast side of SR 426 and the pipe size should be 16 in. See the "SR 426 Utility Relocation Plans 2000" file in the Resources folder on eplan for reference. Please note that the water main and force main pipe sizes are shown in millimeters so 400 mm is roughly equal to 16 in.	Unresolved
8.	Environmental Services	On Sheet 1: MDP Plan, please clarify if this project is proposed to be serviced by Seminole County sewer or if it is proposed to be serviced by septic. The plan view calls out a point of connection off of the existing Seminole County force main, but the site data calls out the sewer service as being septic. If this development is going to be serviced by Seminole County sewer, please correct the site date from septic to Seminole County. If this development is going to be serviced by septic, please exclude "point of connection" from the existing force main callout.	Unresolved
9.	Natural Resources	In the case of any development which requires site plan approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission, the Board of County Commissioners, or both; permits for removal, relocation or replacement of trees covered under this Chapter 60 shall be obtained by making application at	Info Only

		the time of site plan submittal. SCLDC 60.10(a)(2)	
10.	Planning and Development	Please place a note on the Master Development Plan stating the following: The cross access easement recorded in ORB 4657, PG 1049 and ORB 4135, PG 470 will be vacated prior to Engineered Site Plan approval.	Unresolved
11.	Planning and Development	Please place a note on the plan that states verbatim: "The outdoor storage area will be screened from view".	Unresolved
12.	Planning and Development	Per Sec. 30.8.5 (f)(1-2) - (1) Planned developments shall utilize the buffering standards of Part 14 to maintain compatibility with adjoining properties and uses. However, the Board of County Commissioners may vary these standards as appropriate to meet the unique needs of the proposed PD. (2) Increased setbacks from the PD perimeter may also be imposed to maintain compatibility with adjacent existing uses.	Info Only
13.	Planning and Development	Please provide a narrative addressing the following: (1) How the proposed development addresses the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. (2) Why the proposed development cannot be achieved under an existing conventional or special zoning district. (3) How the proposed development provides an innovative approach to land development. (4) A description of benefits to the County that cannot be achieved under the existing provisions of this Code.	Unresolved
14.	Planning and Development	In the Orange Blossom Business Center PD Documents there is a condition that requires the owner to provide cross access to the adjacent property owner to the south. Based on the MDP, the recorded cross access easement to the north is proposed to be vacated. The property owner to the north would be required to amend the Orange Blossom Business Center PD Documents.	Info Only
15.	Planning and Development	Staff will be using the same Development Order once the project goes to the public hearing.	Info Only
16.	Public Safety - Fire Marshal	Type and use of building may require fire sprinklers and fire alarm.	Info Only
17.	Public Safety - Fire Marshal	Adequate water supply with fire flow calculations for fire protection (hydrants) shall be provided per chapter 18.3 of NFPA 1 (2018).	Info Only
18.	Public Safety - Fire Marshal	This project will require 20 ft. fire department access in accordance with NFPA 1, Chapter 18.2.3.5.1.1 (2018 edition).	Info Only
19.	Public Safety - Fire Marshal	Include turning radius analysis with plans. * Turning radius analysis based on aerial truck Specifications. (Section 18.2.3.4.3. NFPA 1) Fire Truck Parameters: Pierce Arrow XT Chassis Aerial Platform 100 Inside Cramp Angle: 40 Degrees Axle Track: 82.92 inches Wheel Offset: 5.30 inches Tread Width: 17.5 inches Chassis Overhang: 68.99 inches Additional Bumper Depth: 22 inches Front Overhang: 90.99 inches Wheelbase: 270 inches Overall	Info Only

		length: 581.75 inches Calculated Turning Radius: Inside Turn: 25 ft. 7 in. Curb to Curb: 41 ft. 8 in. Wall to Wall: 48 ft. 5 in. Overall length: 48 ft 6in.	
20.	Public Safety - Fire Marshal	Fire department access roads shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus and shall be provided with an all-weather driving surface. NFPA 1, Chapter 18.2.3.4.2 (2018). Verify that stabilized road can hold 39 tons.	Info Only
21.	Public Safety - Fire Marshal	Dead end fire department access roads in excess of 150 ft in length shall be provided with approved provisions for the fire apparatus to turn around per section 18.2.3.5.4 of NFPA 1.	Info Only
22.	Public Works - Engineering	The access easement to SR 426 does not separation requirements of 330'. There is an existing (now) commercial access to the south about 240' to the south. These accesses should be brought to a common access. Please co-ordinate with that owner for a common access.	Unresolved
23.	Public Works - Engineering	There is required to be cross access between properties. The access easement to the south does not line up with the access easement proposed by the site to the south. This access easement is also not aligned well on the property. Please bring the easement to the front of the property or co-ordinate with that owner for the best common location.	Unresolved
24.	Public Works - Engineering	The plan shows vacating the access easement to the north. While staff understands the initial objections from that owner staff believes that a connection to the north should be left for better overall connection of this area. Please leave the access easement intact and ideally provide a connection.	Unresolved
25.	Public Works - Engineering	The drainage for the property seems to go to the west across private property. A drainage easement will be needed or hold up to the entire 25-year storm event onsite. This will have to be addressed at final engineering.	Info Only

Agency / Department Mark Up Comments

Comments within this section of the comdoc are from mark-ups on the individual plan sheets or documents in the ePlan system that correspond with the file identified in column "File Name".

26.	Planning and Development	If there is cross access being provided between the owners, why is there a new 30' proposed ingress/egress easement?	001 MDP master dev plan.pdf	Unresolved
27.	Planning and Development	If this easement is to be vacated the adjacent owner is required to amend his developer's commitment agreement since condition e stated that, "At the time of the Certificate of Occupancy for the first building, the applicant shall dedicate to the county cross-access easements to the north and south of the subject property to	001 MDP master dev plan.pdf	Unresolved

		provide access with adjacent properties".		
28.	Planning and Development	The open space requirements based on the updated code is twenty -five (25) percent. Please revise accordingly.	001 MDP master dev plan.pdf	Unresolved
29.	Planning and Development	The proposed Land Use can be removed since the future land use is not being amended.	001 MDP master dev plan.pdf	Unresolved
30.	Planning and Development	The total site area in the F.A.R. calculation is incorrect. Based on the existing property area of 1.83 acres, the total square feet of the site is 79,714.80.	001 MDP master dev plan.pdf	Unresolved
31.	Planning and Development	Please revise the parking calculation based on the updated code: Manufacturing Concerns and Warehouses - Square feet: 1 space / 2 employees, Plus 1 space / company vehicle	001 MDP master dev plan.pdf	Unresolved
32.	Planning and Development	Please revise the office parking requirements to be consistent with the updated code. Office - First 10,000 sq. ft. - 4 spaces / 1,000 sq. ft.	001 MDP master dev plan.pdf	Unresolved
33.	Planning and Development	The total area acres is not adding up to 1.83. It is adding up to 1.84. Please revise accordingly.	001 MDP master dev plan.pdf	Unresolved
34.	Planning and Development	Please place a note on the plan that states verbatim: "The buildings and the outdoor storage area will be screened".	001 MDP master dev plan.pdf	Unresolved
35.	Planning and Development	There is a legend for proposed open space. Please show the areas of where the proposed open space is on site.	001 MDP master dev plan.pdf	Unresolved

Agency / Department eForm Comments and Project Status

This section shows the reviewers of this project from the various County agencies. It may also include additional comments for review and response.

DEPARTMENT	STATUS	REVIEWER
Planning and Development	Corrections Required	Annie Sillaway
Public Works - Impact Analysis	No Review Required	William Wharton
Buffers and CPTED	Corrections Required	Maya Athanas
Environmental Services	Corrections Required	James Van Alstine
Environmental - Impact Analysis	No Review Required	Becky Noggle
Comprehensive Planning	Approved	Maya Athanas
Natural Resources	Approved	Sarah Harttung
Public Safety - Fire Marshal	Approved	Matthew Maywald
Public Works - Engineering	Corrections Required	Jim Potter
Building Division	Review Complete Recommend Approval	Tony Coleman

The next submittal, as required below, will be your:

Initial Review – Started new workflow under old project number since this item was continued to a date uncertain.

DATE	RESUBMITTAL FEE DUE	ROUTE TO THESE STAFF MEMBERS FOR FURTHER REVIEW:
7/11/24	No Fee – New workflow	Annie, James, Maya, Jim

The initial application fee allows for the initial submittal review plus two resubmittal reviews. For the fourth review and each subsequent review, the resubmittal fees are as follows:

Major Review (3+ reviewers remaining) – 50% of original application fee

Minor Review (1-2 reviewers remaining) – 25% of original application fee

Summary of Fees: <http://www.seminolecountyfl.gov/departments-services/development-services/planning-development/fee-information/fee-summary.stml>

NOTE: Other fees may be due. See comments for any additional fees due for your development project. (example: Addressing fee)

Upon completion of your plan review process, Planning & Development staff must authorize and stamp plans for construction use. **UPON RECEIPT OF THE APPROVAL LETTER**, the site contractor must then contact Seminole County Planning & Development Inspections to schedule a pre-construction conference and pay the site inspection fee prior to the start of any site work. Once this meeting as occurred and Planning and Development has been notified by Public Works Development Inspections that a site permit was issued, your approved drawings and/or documents will be released to you through the ePlan System. For questions regarding this process, please consult the Electronic Plan Review Applicant User Guide

Sincerely,
**SEMINOLE COUNTY GOVERNMENT
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT STAFF**