



Interoffice Memorandum

Minutes

Village F Cross Section

Special Roadway Agreement Committee

September 4, 2008

Members Present: Diana Almodovar – Development Engineering Division
John Smogor – Planning Division

County Staff Present: Brian Sanders – Transportation Planning Division
Heather Brownlie – Transportation Planning Division
Robin Hammel - Public Works Engineering Division
Ghulam Qadir - Public Works Engineering Division
Frank Yokiel - Public Works Engineering Division
Juan Curi - Public Works Engineering Division
Dann McKee - Public Works Engineering Division
John Klimovitch – Traffic Engineering Division
Krista Barber - Traffic Engineering Division
David Pearce – Development Engineering Division
Rita Gonzalez – Transportation Planning Division

For Applicant: Olan Hill – MSCW, Inc.
Eric Warren - MSCW Inc.
Juli James - Shutts & Bowen
Joe Tramell -Tramell Webb Partners, Inc.

Village F Cross Section

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m.

Mr. Olan Hill opened the discussion stating that they revised the cross sections, not the alignment, to reflect the last meeting but that there were two issues:

1. Which roads are eligible for road impact fee credits?
2. How to approach the APF Agreements at the Roadway Agreement Committee.

Information was sent to Mr. Kunkel to review to determine which roads will be impact fee eligible.

The revised cross-sections presented for review were changed based on comments from the last meeting.

There are no HOA tracts and there is still 10 ft of Right-of-Way on one side for a multi-purpose path.

Mr. Sanders stated the need to establish the relationship between back-of-curb to Right-of-Way and to show this dimension on the typical section.

Mr. Nastasi, at the Roadway Agreement Committee, had suggested a 10 foot multi-use path on both sides.

Mr. Warren met with Orange County Fire Rescue (OCFR) to make sure OCFR accepts the typical section. Gean Olin accepted the typical section.

Ms. Hammel asked for confirmed minutes from OCFR.

Mr. Sanders asked Mr. Klimovitch if the alternative one-way typical section would be acceptable.

Mr. Klimovitch stated that Ms. Almodovar has the comments on Independence Right-of-Way, and as long as it meets all safety requirements and clear zone requirements it should be okay.

Ms. James stated that there are 10 APF Agreement Agreements to be submitted of two types, some surplus and deficit.

Impact fee eligible vs. APF acreage – the only items which change are which are impact fee eligible.

No APF Agreement for owners who do not dedicate any property.

Mr. Smogor suggested having one overall agreement including ten owners.

Ms. James spoke to Ms. Alfonso and Ms. Alfonso was okay with having 10 separate agreements.

Mr. Trammel stated that the numbers firm up at the PSP stage and not all of the developers are on the same development timeline.

Ms. James stated that property owners with a deficit can purchase surplus APF Agreement credits from other Village F owners who dedicate a surplus.

Ms. James said that the burden would be on the Village F owners to do the accounting and notify the County as to who has a deficit and who has a surplus and who bought whose credits.

The applicants Escrow Agent (Shutts & Bowen) would be the point of contact.

Mr. Pearce asked how the property owners would interact.

Ms. James responded through the Escrow Agent.

Ms. James will send Mr. Smogor the proposed changes to the APF Ordinance to address non-participating owners.

Ms. Hammel asked a question regarding lane widths for parking and the standards for parking widths.

Mr. Klimovitch expressed concerns regarding streets being too narrow for school bus access.

Mr. Warren stated that residential areas are residential roadways and follow PRG guidelines.

Ms. Almodovar stated that staff and legal have revised the PRG guidelines which may be changing and will need to go to the Board of County Commissioners to formalize and this will probably necessitate additional changes to the cross sections.

Mr. Klimovitch stated that sight distance is a problem. 5.5 feet is not a parking standard, and gutters cannot be used for parking. Even at 6.5 feet there is still a problem.

Mr. Klimovitch stated that Developers cannot keep retrofitting subdivisions if not properly designed in the first place; on paper it looks good, but in reality it does not work. It may work on residential streets, but not collectors or arterial streets.

Mr. Warren said that they are willing to do whatever is needed, just let them know what the revised PRG guidelines are.

Mr. Tramell stated that Roads A, B, and C are APF Roads and serve as Collector Roads.

Mr. Klimovitch stated that if the proposed cross-section has enough Right-of-Way then to please modify it to better match what is needed for Collector Road.

Mr. Klimovitch was okay with the Seidel cross-section as presented.

Mr. Smogor suggested two types of agreements for the Roadway Agreement Committee and then once the Committee has come to a final decision; bring all 10 for sign-off review and approval.

Mr. Tramell needs information from Mr. Nastasi to determine if a path is needed on both sides. Mr. Tramell asked if they can do 10 and 5, or do they have to do 2 – 10's, or one 10 and one 8, or two 8 foot paths even.

Mr. Sanders was concerned about proximity to the curb since they need room for signage, the overall dimensions needed along the corridor, and a percentage of the maximum for grading.

Mr. Curi stated that super elevations will require additional Right-of-Way and/or fill slope easements or a multipurpose easement to accommodate super elevations.

Mr. Pearce stated that Mr. Kunkel would be very sensitive to 110 feet. There is a problem, if 110 feet is too narrow and cannot get additional Right-of-Way later on; the County is experiencing issues now with wing walls.

Mr. Klimovitch stated that there is no connection to Seidel.

Mr. Sanders stated that it is an issue that needs to be discussed.

Mr. Tramell responded that the County should obtain the Right-of-Way from the current owner.

Mr. Sanders stated that the County is looking to the Consultants to obtain that Right-of-Way to tie-in with Seidel Road.

Mr. Tramell stated that would have to be part of the Seidel Road Agreement and would not be an issue until at least 2025.

Mr. Sanders discussed additional easements and/or Right-of-Way needed for super elevation sections.

Mr. Tramell stated that the PD approval will true-up the details. The utility easements will also be needed adjacent to the roadways to run utility lines for the developments. Utility and slope easements could coexist so maybe we look at adding easements.

Mr. Tramell asked “Where is PRG going to come in for parking widths?”

Ms. Almodovar stated that one of the issues is that the guidelines do not comply with the code.

Mr. Pearce stated that the gutter needs to be additional and not counted as part of the parking or the road.

Mr. Klimovitch stated that on street-parking is being used for parking requirements and cannot be substandard.

Mr. Tramell stated that the typical interior cross-sections are internal roads, then it changes to upgraded APF roads cross-section for the road impact fee eligible roads.

Mr. Klimovitch expressed the need for sight distance at the intersections and suggested eliminating parking spaces up to the corner to provide for better sight distances.

Ms. Almodovar asked Mr. Warren how the proposed circle is going to function from a traffic engineering perspective.

Mr. Warren responded that it is a very big circle and that the Consultants would draw it up, and provide the County with this information.

Ms. Almodovar requested language in the agreement stating all necessary easements needed would be provided.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:12 p.m.