



**CITY OF WINTER GARDEN  
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
JANUARY 28, 2026**

The Development Review Committee (DRC) of the City of Winter Garden, Florida, met in session on Wednesday, January 28, 2026 in the City Hall Commission Chambers.

**Agenda Item #1: CALL TO ORDER**

Chairperson/Planning Director Kelly Carson called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. The roll was called and a quorum was declared present.

**PRESENT**

**Voting Members:** Chairperson/Planning Director Kelly Carson, Building Official Jimmy Appoloney, Economic Development Director Marc Hutchinson, City Engineer Jim Monahan and Assistant City Manager for Public Services Steve Pash.

**Others:** Art Miller, City Engineering Consultant; Shane Friedman, Planning Supervisor; Yvonne Conatser, Senior Planner; Amber McDonald, Planner II and Ellen King, Recording Secretary.

**Other Attendees:** Antonio Gibson of Lake Apopka Natural Gas District.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Agenda Item #2.A:**

Approval of minutes from regular meeting held on January 14, 2026.

***Motion by Assistant City Manager for Public Services Pash, to approve the above minutes. Seconded by Building Official Appoloney; the motion carried unanimously 5-0.***

**DRC BUSINESS**

**Agenda Item #3.A: Dragonfly Reserve - CONSTRUCTION PLANS**

Fullers Cross Road E - 1908 & 1106  
Dragonfly Developers LLC

Jozef Mergan and Peter Palermo of Dragonfly Developers LLC and Thomas Skelton of American Civil Engineering Co; representatives for the project, attended for discussion.

The following items were reviewed and discussed:

## **ENGINEERING COMMENTS**

### **5. Sheet C2 – General Notes:**

- a. **Revise pavement section and paving notes to reflect City standard pavement requirements. To apply to Tract A alley and West Crown Point Road.**

Applicants requested clarification about depth of the asphalt pavement rather than the width? City staff stated comment refers to the depth and should match the typical section on the pre-plat; any road crossings along West Crown Point Road need to follow the City's pavement standard details. Applicants understood.

### **6. Sheet C7 – Utility Plan:**

- b. **Dead end manholes shall be a minimum of 5 feet deep from top to invert. If participation by the City of Winter Garden is requested for the lift station, the dead-end manhole on West Crown Point Road shall be deeper to accommodate future connections from the south.**

Applicants requested clarification of this sanitary comment. City staff stated there is very little remaining to be developed in this area and would not need to expand into any additional areas. No Joint Agreement would be needed but the applicants do need to follow the code (no need to build a generator) and add extra storage depth. Applicants understood.

### **7. Sheet C8 – Grading & Drainage Plan:**

- a. **The outfall between Lots 3 & 4 is not acceptable as a direct discharge and shall replicate the existing sheet flow condition.**
- Applicants inquired about the spreader swale on the south section of this site and if it would be acceptable to create a spread into a wider weir. City staff agreed if applicants replicate what is currently on this site. Applicants will research the site and make sure the pond continues to function.

## **PLANNING COMMENTS**

### **18. Since this proposed subdivision is ten (10) lots please beware of Section 110-332. –**

**Procedure. Where the city commission has determined that fees shall be paid in lieu of or in addition to the dedication of land, the developer shall pay fees in accordance with the following schedule: (1) For any residential development consisting of ten or more parcels or lots, the fees shall be paid, in their entirety, prior to the issuance of any building permit for any building or structure to be located upon any parcel or lot in the residential development. A parks & recreation fee payment agreement will have to be executed prior to the issuance of any building permit for any building or structure to be located upon any parcel or lot in the residential development.**

Applicants inquired about the possibility of the 10 foot strip along the trail being dedicated to the city instead of the 10 foot landscape strip? City staff stated the 10 foot strip along the trail does not meet the recreational purposes for the city. The developer would need to either donate usable recreation space or pay into a city recreational fund. Applicants understood.

### **19. The recreation and park area required is 1 acre per 200 residents. Per Section 110-325, the city presumes 2.64 persons per unit. At 10 units, that is 26.4 persons total for this**

subdivision. Therefore  $26.40/200 = 0.13$  acres is required for recreational park space. Per Section 110-326, the developer shall pay a fee equal to the land value of the portion of the city park required to serve the needs of the residents.

According to the Orange County Property Appraiser the fair market value is \$228,000 (1106 E Fullers Cross Road) and \$126,000 (1098 E Fullers Cross Rd). That is a total of \$354,000. The total acreage of the subdivision is 3.42 acres. This is \$103,508.77 per acre in fair market value. Therefore, the amount owed for the fee, in lieu of providing 0.13 acres in recreational park space, is equal to \$13,456.14. Same as Item #18.

***Motion by City Engineer Monahan to have the applicant revise and resubmit the Construction Plans for staff review only. Building Official Appoloney, seconded; the motion carried unanimously 5-0.***

### **Agenda Item #3.B: Oakland Arms PUD - ANNEX, REZONING & FLU**

State Road 438 - 15373 & 15359 E Oakland Ave  
Oakland Arms Partners LLC

Jerry Miller, Kelly Miller and James Costello of J&J Building; Michael Miller of Lukas/Oakland Arms Partners; representatives for the project, attended for discussion. The following items were reviewed and discussed:

#### **ENGINEERING COMMENTS**

##### **2. Several items need clarification/discussion as listed below:**

##### **a. The Site Geometry Plan, C-200 has no dimensions – pavement width, radii, etc.**

- i. There is a large unlabeled tract containing RET-2, SWL-3 and SWL-4 that also provides access for Lots 4 thru 9. Provide more explanation including proposed easement language, garbage collection area, etc.** Applicants acknowledged comments regarding the retention, swale and the trash pickup would be at each driveway. City staff stated the city trucks would not clear the corner and would need a designated common area for trash can pick up for anyone without direct access to the road. Applicants understood.
- ii. Explain why the access to Lots 2 and 3 is rear loaded.** Applicants clarified this is intended to be a paved alleyway to provide access for these two lots. The alley will terminate at the boundary of the property and be a utility easement for the sewer tie-in that will continue across from the McKinnon Square project.
- iv. Will the driveway for Lot 12 be private or is it intended to be a public cross-over (see Roadway Plan)?** Applicants stated this driveway will be private and will not be a cross-over.

##### **b. The western easement between Lots 2 & 3 needs discussion regarding the width (multiple pipes) and coordination with the McKinnon Square project.** Applicants inquired if anything specific was needed or just clarify of how they are spaced out? City staff stated the formula is in the City Code and the concern is when multiple pipes

are laid, if the easement is paved to the boundary of the property and will it be connected on the commercial side? Applicants explained the easement will be a paved alleyway going to the boundary of the property and will not be connected on the commercial side. Discussion continued regarding cross connection of subdivision and managing traffic.

- d. Provide a second feed for the water system (possibly from Needle Palm or extend on Oakland Ave).** Applicants explained originally it was intended to be connected but a few issues were considered that changed this fact: topography change, existing parking by homeowners and it is a one-way road. Applicants stated there is an 8" main at the corner of Oakland and would be more viable for them and would provide for a loop system with two connections. City staff suggested applicants search for options for some type of a connection such as a pedestrian access or a golf cart trail to the commercial piece since the grading is not as drastic or a sidewalk connection which would allow for a pedestrian connection inside.
- 8. All existing wells shall be plugged/capped per SJRWMD requirements – well closure permit required.** Applicants asked if this is required at a future date once another source of water is established as currently a well is for construction and renovation work. City staff agreed to work with applicants on the timing.
- 17. Streetlighting plan is acknowledged and will be reviewed by Planning for adherence to Section 2.09 of Appendix A. Lighting on Oakland Ave. is also required if not existing; all lighting shall meet dark skies requirements per City Code. Please certify the proposed fixtures meet this requirement.** Applicants acknowledged need to address lighting along Oakland Avenue. City Staff stated this lighting is needed internally. Applicants acknowledged.
- 18. Minimum 5' wide concrete sidewalks shall be constructed along all street frontages pursuant to City Code. Existing sidewalks, curbs, & pavement will be checked at completion and any damaged sections shall be replaced.** Applicants will provide. City staff stated easements will be required along the front of the lots. Applicants understood.

## **PLANNING COMMENTS**

- 19. The applicant has proposed to rezone the property from Not Zoned (NZ) to Planned Unit Development (PUD). The applicant has provided a subdivision plan, not the required Concept Plan, for review. A subdivision plan should be in conformance with the approved PUD. There is no approved PUD. Therefore, staff cannot support the subdivision plan as proposed at this time.**  
**That stated, staff believes the concept of the proposed development is compatible with the surrounding Oakland Park and Oakland Hill developments with further design work.** Applicants requested to have an off-line meeting with staff to discuss their Concept plan. City staff agreed and will be coordinated by Planning.
- 20. Please provide a complete Concept Plan to include but not limited to a proposed lot layout, setbacks, street layout, access connection with Oakland Park, required minimum common recreation and open space, tree save, landscaping and streetscape. The following comments are based on the subdivision plan. Please address the**

**comments with the proposed Concept Plan.**

9:57 am Assistant City Manager for Public Services Pash left the meeting.

- a. **The location of RET-2 is too close the existing residential lots in Oakland Park. Explore relocating the pond to the front of the property, make it a feature/amenity and include with required open space.** Applicants noted the pond is located at the proposed location due to the topography and will provide a 10 foot beautified buffer around this pond. City staff stated the main concern is how the ponds would impact the existing oaks especially along the frontage and throughout the neighborhood, and how these trees will be saved? Applicants stated they have been working with an arborist to save as many trees as possible and the trees along East Oakland Avenue will be saved. They will continue to investigate more on excavation process.
  - e. **Is there an existing cross access easement on Oakland Park with Needle Palm Lane? The site should account for the easement and show the connections.** Applicants will address.
  - g. **Per code a minimum 25-foot yard shall be maintained along any PUD perimeter adjacent to a public right of way. Please revise the 20 foot side yard along E. Oakland Avenue to the required 25 foot side yard.** Applicants inquired about possibility of a waiver for two lots along East Oakland Avenue to reduce the front yard from required 25' to 20-foot minimum side yard? City staff stated it could be requested as part of the PUD documents and details need to be spelled out. Applicants understood.
- 24. Please provide a letter from the Orange County Public Schools indicating capacity is available for the proposed development.** Applicants have this form to submit to planning staff. City staff will accept.
- 28. Staff is available to meet to discuss the Concept Plan and design for the proposed development in more detail.** See Item #19.

***Motion by City Engineer Monahan to have the applicant revise and resubmit the Planned Unit Development for another full DRC review cycle pending an off-line meeting for discussion. Building Official Appoloney, seconded; the motion carried unanimously 4-0. (Assistant City Manager for Public Services Pash was not present for the vote.)***

**Agenda Item #3.C: Heller Bros. Outside Storage - SPECIAL EXCEPTION**

9th Street – 306

SK Consortium, Inc. (Consultant)

Zach Heller and Alex Heller of Heller Bros Packing Corp; and Cas Suvongse of SK Consortium, Inc representatives for the project attended for discussion. The following items were reviewed and discussed:

Applicants stated the Heller family has operated this property for close to 85 years and owned by the family for more than 50 years. They are requesting to formalize a pre-existing use on the property for decades and the family would like to work together with the city to address all comments. The applicants requested a copy of a utility map; City staff will provide.

#### **ENGINEERING COMMENTS**

**14. Internal sidewalks shall connect to the public sidewalks in the right-of-way per ADA.**

Applicants inquired about sidewalks being required. City staff stated this is a standard comment regarding ADA compliance and currently there are not any internal sidewalks proposed; therefore, no exterior sidewalks will be required.

#### **PLANNING COMMENTS**

Staff has reviewed the special exception permit application. The following comments must be addressed before the application can be presented to the Planning and Zoning Board.

**15. Regarding the plan -**

**A. Sheet C101 of the plan is incomplete. Please provide a complete layout of the site.**

**Show the entire property with the complete outside storage area.**

- i. **Include parking spaces for the proposed vehicle storage, show the designated area for the building material storage and show the designated area for the construction equipment storage.** Applicants asked for clarification of this comment? City staff stated the proposed plans need to be clear on location of outside storage, construction vehicle sizes and parking location, restrictions, what materials could be stored and the look of the buffer, etc. Applicants will provide these details as part of the resubmittal.

**B. Sheet L101 of the plan is incomplete and does not meet code. Please provide the required landscaping adjacent to public rights-of way per Section 114-34. (1).**

- i. **The proposed landscape buffer is not sufficient. Show the additional required landscaping to provide the required opaque screening along E Smith and 9<sup>th</sup> Street.** Applicants propose a new 6' fence but expressed concerns with moving the fence other than where it is currently located. City staff will accept the clustering of trees and allow a 3'- 4' buffer when the required 5' buffer cannot be met. Applicants will resubmit enlarged landscape plans for easier viewing and consideration with the next resubmittal. Discussion continued regarding utilities in the area in relation to the new plantings of trees/shrubs. Applicants understood.
- ii. **Relocate the proposed fence northward to provide the required 5 foot width landscape yard along the entirety of E Smith Street.** See Item #15.B.I.

Applicants questioned the timing of the Variance for the 6' front fence along with the Minor Site Plan showing the storage location. City staff stated the Special Exception and the Variance will go to the Planning & Zoning Board at the same time.

***Motion by City Engineer Monahan to have the applicant revise and resubmit the Special Exception for staff review only. Building Official Appoloney, seconded; the motion carried unanimously 4-0.***

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no more business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:23 a.m. by Chairperson/Planning Director Kelly Carson.

**ATTEST:**

**APPROVED:**

*/S/*

*/S/*

\_\_\_\_\_  
***DRC Recording Secretary, Ellen King***

\_\_\_\_\_  
***Chairperson, Kelly Carson***

**DISCUSSION ITEM ONLY**

**Agenda Item #4.A: Story Road Subdivision - PROJECT FEASIBILITY**

Story Road W - 905 & 925 and 538 Blankenship Lane  
Burkett Engineering

Dan Hayes of Burkett Engineering; Kayig and Mason Barnes; and Britton Barnes; representatives for the project, attended for discussion only.