

Community Meeting – Tatra Residential Project

2050 Tatra St, Oviedo, FL 32765

Seminole County, Florida

St. Luke's Church & School

2021 W. State Rd. 426, Oviedo, FL 32765

February 27, 2026

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Meeting

Attendees: Chris Leppert (Kimley-Horn and Associates)
Michael Ghobrial (Kimley-Horn and Associates)
Ana De Stefano (Kimley-Horn and Associates)
Jeffrey Wyckoff (Altman Development) – Attended remotely
Patricia Sidlik (Community Member)
Matt Roberts (Community Member)
AJ Leupold (Community Member)
Larry Jordan (Community Member)
Clay Archey (Community Member)
Kelly Coyle (Community Member)
LaDonna Rossow (Community Member)

Michael: Purpose of Meeting

- Rezoning of an existing (A-1) ±11.97 AC site to (R-3A) consistent with Seminole County Comprehensive Plan (MDR - medium density residential).
- Community meeting held as part of Seminole County rezoning process (described as a required step prior to BCC).
- The purpose was to present early project details, explain the rezoning request, and gather community questions and concerns to be documented for the county submission and meeting minutes.

Michael: Presented Project Overview

- Site: Parcel on Tatra St (access currently via Chapman Road).

- Requested Rezoning: from A-1 Agricultural to R-3A Residential (Medium Density Residential / MDR).
- Kimley-Horn identified as the current consultant team at this stage; additional consultants expected after rezoning approval.

Jeffrey: Stakeholder and Roles Clarified

- Developer company identified: Altman Development (spelled out A-L-T-M-A-N).
- Jeff Wyckoff offered to provide direct contact information via the engineering team.

Open Floor/Questions & Comments

1. What does A-1 mean?

Response: A community participant suggested "1 unit per acre," but this was not confirmed in-meeting.

2. Community raised questions about R-3A density, stormwater plan, including potential unit counts and whether the request could allow greater density (including discussion about clustering and higher density concepts).

Response: Kimley-Horn stated stormwater and other site constraints typically consume ~15–20% of land area (general experience statement) and that appropriate on-site stormwater management facilities will be developed to avoid affecting adjacent parcels.

3. Clarification of the entitlement process requested (community described steps such as DRC, Community Meeting, Planning & Zoning, Board of County Commissioners adoption).

Response: Community meetings are required prior to DRC per county checklist/code (as described).

4. Request to reschedule or hold another meeting with better audio and/or with county staff present.

Response: County staff are generally present at public hearings (BCC), not typically at community meetings. Kimley-Horn added that while an additional meeting could be held, this meeting would still be submitted to the county.

5. DRC Timing and next steps?

Response: Kimley-Horn stated process will follow county requirements as set forth in code. Submittal of community meeting minutes and next meeting targeted for early March was discussed.

6. How will residents be notified of future meetings?

Response: Next major public input occurs at Board of County Commissioners meeting; additional notices will occur per county process.

7. How many people were notified about this meeting?

Response: The notification radius is determined by Seminole County requirements based on the size of the subject property. For this site, the required radius was 1,500 feet, and notices were sent accordingly.

8. Product Type: Townhomes vs Apartments vs Single-Family?

Response: Altman stated that the project most likely will be townhomes.

Is there any possibility in the future for the rezoning to be changed to allow low-income apartments?

Response: Altman will follow what the market dictates.

9. Community asked whether R-3A implies townhomes, apartments, or single-family, and if this will be for rent or for sale.

Response: Rent versus for-sale has not yet been determined; the project could proceed as either option, but not a mix. The final decision will be based on market conditions at the time of development.

10. What is the primary project that Altman develops?

Response: Developer noted Altman has built a variety of products historically, with the last few years being mostly multi-family/apartments projects.

11. Why townhomes instead of single-family homes?

Response: Current market conditions indicate stronger demand for townhomes compared to single-family homes Townhomes provide good quality housing for the community.

12. Why is the project proposing townhomes when there are already many in the area, some of which appear slow-selling? Residents expressed concerns about oversaturation, possible impacts on property values, and that rental townhomes could function like a multi-family community.

Response: Seminole County's Future Land Use (FLU) Map designates this area as MDR, which allows for R-3A residential development such as townhomes. This designation reflects the County's long-term land-use planning for the area.

13. What is a Future Land Use Map?

Response: the County's comprehensive plan for development and anticipated capital improvement projects for infrastructure.

14. Is there a feasibility study that demonstrates market demand for townhomes, and confirms that the area can support the number of units? If so, can the community access it?

Response: Kimley-Horn does not prepare market feasibility studies and is not a requirement for the rezoning process; this analysis may be part of the developer's internal due diligence process in deciding where and what to develop/construct.

15. A community member requested access to any such documentation and clarification on how the public could obtain it.

Response: Comprehensive plan is public record and can be found on the county's website. Can these documents be provided directly? As the community has to pay to access them.

Response: Kimley-Horn stated can provide the rezoning submittal package.

16. Did the project request any variances as part of this application?

Response: None requested at this stage; rezoning only. Team stated that future design will comply with county requirements.

17. Residents raised concerns about the potential need to import fill and how this could impact drainage on neighboring properties. They also noted existing low-lying areas and the cumulative effects of nearby fill activities. How will these issues be addressed?

Response: The development team acknowledged these concerns and explained that drainage, fill requirements, and downstream impacts will be fully evaluated during the site development and permitting process. Stormwater systems will be designed to prevent adverse effects on adjacent properties.

18. Will a traffic study be required for the project, and what potential improvements or impacts will be required?

Response: A traffic study may be required, depending on county review, to evaluate methodology, the intersections to be analyzed, and any necessary off-site improvements. Examples of potential improvements discussed included adjustments to signal timing and possible turn-lane extensions.

19. Will the project impact the nearby county trail, and what will be the access point for the site?

Response: Any potential impacts to the nearby county trail will be reviewed as part of the transportation and site-planning process; however, no impacts to the trail are anticipated at this time. It was also clarified that the site currently has only one access point, which is via Tatra Street connecting to Chapman Road.

20. Does Tatra St connect to another street, or does it only connect to Chapman Rd?

Response: The only access is through Chapman Rd, but there are some right of ways that could be improved in the future by other developers.

21. Where will the project's sewer service be directed?

Response: The project will connect directly to the existing sanitary sewer pipe located on Chapman Road. From there, flows will be conveyed through the existing utility network to the Iron Bridge Water Reclamation Facility in accordance with established interlocal arrangements.

22. What would happen to the existing powerline?

Response: Existing powerline is not within the project limits and no changes are anticipated.

23. Can the community access the full application materials, submittals, and comment rounds for this project, rather than only a generic checklist?

Response: The application has already been submitted and has gone through multiple rounds of county comments. All project documents are public record, and the team offered to provide these materials by email.

24. Can an updated aerial picture of the project site be provided to the county?

Response: Seminole County already maintains updated aerials and all up-to-date information for all parcels within the county.

25. Will attendees receive a follow-up email summarizing the meeting?

Response: Yes. Kimley-Horn will send a follow-up email containing the list of questions captured during the meeting along with responses and next steps.

26. Can the community receive copies of the project's county submittals and comment rounds?

Response: Yes. Kimley-Horn will provide the available county submittals and comment rounds/responses.

27. Will meeting minutes be included in the county submission and shared with residents?

Response: Yes. Kimley-Horn will include the minutes in the package submitted to the county and will share them with the community as appropriate.

28. Can Altman Development provide information on recent product types?

Response: Altman Development may be able to provide additional information on similar development types.

29. Consider holding a second community meeting with improved audio and key stakeholders physically present, and/or request county participation (not guaranteed).

Response: A second community meeting is anticipated and will be coordinated based on Church schedule; however, county participation cannot be guaranteed.

30. Provide an explanation/response regarding market justification for townhomes and how rental vs for-sale will be determined.

Response: Additional clarification on market conditions and how the rental versus for-sale determination will be made as more information becomes available.

Meeting conclusion – Closing statements thanking residents for attending and providing input.