

August 19, 2022

Mr. Steven Spraker, AICP  
Planning Director  
Planning Department  
City of Ormond Beach  
22 S Beach St.  
Ormond Beach, FL. 32174

Submitted via ProjectDox

**Re: ORMOND BEACH HOLDINGS, LLC – HOTEL  
Project No. PZ-22-018 – Site Plan  
Response to Comments dated April 4, 2022**

Dear Steven:

Please find enclosed the following in connection with the above referenced project:

1. One (1) signed and sealed copy of the Revised Final Site Plan.
2. One (1) copy of the Architectural Floorplans and Elevations.
3. One (1) signed and sealed copy of the revised Stormwater Calculations.
4. One (1) copy of the Dimension Plan.
5. One (1) copy of the Water and Sewer Demand Calculations.

The following are my responses to the April 4, 2022, SPRC Comments:

**CIVIL ENGINEER – David Allen**

**Markup: #08 – Stormwater Calculations**

1. **Comment:** The void ration of 0.5 seems high. Please provide documentation on the determination of the void ratio.  
**Response:** Void ratio revised to 0.4, see updated Stormwater Calculations.

**Markup: C003-Site**

2. **Comment:** Note: The stairs/ramps will require separate building permits. The dumpster enclosure will also require a separate building permit.  
**Response:** Comment understood.

**Markup: C018-Details**

3. **Comment:** Does the ramp end at the grade of the sand. The profile view does not indicate that.  
**Response:** Section revised to reflect existing grade. Stairs are proposed to end below grade.

**Markup: C014-Details**

4. **Comment:** Please review this sheet. The last few inches did not come through in the PDF.  
**Response:** See revised Site Plan.

**Markup: C005 – Utility**

5. **Comment:** The use of a lesser degree bend would help with the flow characteristics and the restrained joints.

**Response:** See revised Utility Plan.

**Markup:** C-002 EC

6. It appears that the demolition of the sidewalk and curbing in A1A may require MOT approved by the FDOT. Please add a note that a copy of this MOT is to be submitted to the City Engineering Department at least 2 weeks prior to any lane closure. The Engineering Department is responsible for public notice and notification to the emergency services for the City.

**Response:** MOT lane closure details added to plan set.

**Markup:** C-002 EC

7. Please add a note to the plans that the wind screen is requested to be a color other than white.

**Response:** Requested note has been added.

**Markup:** Civil-HC Accessible

8. Identify the accessible route. Note the doorway that opens out adjacent to the sidewalk at Elev of 12.73. The FFE is almost a foot above the S/W, please review these elevations.

**Response:** See revised Civil Plan with additional grading and accessible path.

**Markup:** Civil-Peak Stage

9. The City Standards indicates that a 0.5 foot freeboard should be available for dry retention. Please provide documentation that the rock trench will comply with this standard. In addition, please provide an exhibit that reflects the hydraulic grade line for the pipe/peak stage/top of the trench.

**Response:** Hotel site peak water level is 9.31 for the 100-year storm and tc of structures is 11.30. Remote parking peak water level is 8.91 for the 100-year storm and tc of structures is 10.50. Both sites have more that 0.5 ft pf freeboard. The water levels are provided on the trench cross sections on Sheet 13.

**Markup:** C003-Site

10. General Comment:

This project must meet the requirements of Sections 3-15 Coastal Management and 3-17 Sea Turtle Protection of the Land Development Code.

**Response:** Comment understood. Project is currently under review by FDEP and FWC.

### **FIRE PLANS EXAMINER – MLG Municipal Services**

**Markup:** C003 – Site

11. **Comment:** Please identify emergency vehicle access route for the building. If you could reduce some layers so we can fully comprehend the access route that would be great.

**Response:** See revised Site Plan.

**Markup:** C001 – Cover

12. **Comment:** Please provide building elevation views to allow us to better comprehend the building elements and overall access.

**Response:** See enclosed Architectural Elevations.

---

**LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT – Cara Culliver**

**Markup: C006 – Landscape**

13. **Comment:** Please provide a site data charts for the east & west, showing trees 1/1500 and 1/400 of landscape area. East Hotel Site:  $95,396.4 \text{ sf}/1500 = 54$  Required Trees or  $37,686 \text{ sf}/400 = 94$  Required Trees, the greater number applies. West Parking:  $33,003 \text{ sf}/1500 = 22$  Required Trees or  $9,783 \text{ sf}/400 = 24$  Required Trees, the greater number applies. Please show how these requirements are being met.  
**Response:** See revised Landscape Plan.

WEST PARKING LOT COMMENTS

14. **Comment:** Please show the buffer requirements for all sides of the property and how they are being met. A1A buffer is 20' & requires 4 trees, 40 shrubs and 40 ground covers per 100 lineal feet. Ormond Parkway is a 10' buffer, West & South buffers are 6' foot.  
**Response:** See revised Landscape Plan.
15. **Comment:** Live Oaks will not survive this close to the ocean. Please consider Seagrape, Oleander, or Silver Buttonwood standards.  
**Response:** See revised Landscape Plan.
16. **Comment:** To increase the palm count so you can meet the 24 required trees, please consider the Cabbage palms in three's.  
**Response:** See revised Landscape Plan.
17. **Comment:** The botanical name for the Ligustrum japonicum. Also, the tree height needs to be 10' height, 6" combined caliper and (5) Trunks minimum.  
**Response:** See revised Landscape Plan.
18. **Comment:** The minimum height for trees is 10' height and 2.5" caliper.  
**Response:** See revised Landscape Plan.
19. **Comment:** All ground covers will be 1 gallon plants.  
**Response:** See revised Landscape Plan.

EAST HOTEL COMMENTS

20. **Comment:** Please show the buffer requirements for all sides of the property and how they are being met. A1A buffer is 20' & requires 4 trees, 40 shrubs & 40 ground covers per 100 lineal feet. Seminole Avenue is a 10' buffer, South & east buffers are 6' foot.  
**Response:** See revised Irrigation Plan.

**Markup: C008 - IRRIG**

21. **Comment:** Irrigation plan is incomplete, please finish.  
**Response:** See revised Irrigation Plan.
22. **Comment:** Irrigation heads are show in pavement areas, please revise.  
**Response:** See revised Irrigation Plan.
23. **Comment:** The landscape comments will most likely change the layout of some of the irrigated area, please coordinate.  
**Response:** See revised Irrigation Plan.

---

**PLANNER 3 – Becky Weedo**

**Markup:** C004 – Civil  
Crown Road Elevation

24. **Comment:** It looks like the building will be located in a Flood Zone X which is not considered a Special Flood Hazard Area. Per Section 3-18(f)(7) of the City Land Development Code, to prevent increased flood damage outside of special flood hazard areas, the lowest floor of new principal building must be elevated at least 18 inches above the crown of road, unless the city engineer approves a lower height based on site-specific conditions. Per Section 1-22 of the LDC, "Crown of road means the elevation of the highest surface of street pavement within the right-of-way abutting the property or the elevation approved by the city engineer." The elevation numbers on the plan are very hard to read. Please call out the crown of road elevation on the plan.
- Response:** See revised Civil Plan. The highest road crown elevation is 11.6, the proposed building finish floor elevation is 13.70.

**PLANNING DIRECTOR – Steven Spraker**

Please provide a beach and dune assessment report – See Section 3-15(b) of the Land Development Code:

25. **Comment:** Beach and dune assessment report. In conjunction with applications for multifamily, tourist/commercial and subdivision shoreline development, and redevelopment proposals along with Atlantic Ocean, the applicant shall submit a beach and dune assessment report. The following criteria shall apply in preparation and review of the beach and dune assessment report:
- a. Demonstrate the coastal construction control line on a survey certified to the city.
  - b. Describe and map the natural systems on the site and adjacent to the site, including the active beach zone and vegetated dune.
  - c. Determine development impact on hurricane evacuation routes and the level-of-service standard of six (6) hours for clearance time and fourteen (14) hours for total evacuation time.
  - d. Describe methods to prevent and/or mitigate damage to the stabilizing vegetation on the dunes.
  - e. Demonstrate the wind velocity for a one hundred year (100-year) storm even for the site and design the structure to withstand the one hundred year (100-year) storm.
  - f. Describe methods to prevent surface water flow and storm surges from undermining the structure.
  - g. Architecturally design the structure to maximize protection against storms.
- Response:** Previously submitted with PBD.

Building Elevations

26. **Comment:** Please provide the architectural plans for the proposed building. Section 3-69 of the Land Development Code provides a variety of architectural styles that all new structures are required to conform with. Please identify on the plan set which architectural style has been selected and how the proposed building meets the required attributes or conforms to the neo-eclectic architectural style.
- Response:** Proposed building is Florida Cracker architecture style. See enclosed Architectural Plans.
27. **Comment:** Building Height – Please provide the overall building height of the proposed structure. Note that the height cannot exceed 75' in height. Please add a note that the height

---

of the structure once constructed shall need to be verified by a surveyor to ensure that the overall height does not exceed 75' in height.

**Response:** See revised building data section on the Cover Sheet.

28. **Comment:** In accordance with Section 3-47(b)(5) of the LDC – for buildings over three stories, a computer-based model shall be required to show the relationship of the proposed building and surrounding building. The elevations previously submitted will meet this requirement.

**Response:** Comment understood.

#### Neighborhood Meeting

29. **Comment:** Please note a neighborhood meeting is required in accordance with Section 4-03 (d)(6) of the Land Development Code. The meeting shall be advertised by the applicant. See neighborhood meeting criteria uploaded with this project.

The project can schedule a neighborhood meeting when you are ready. Below is information on neighborhood meetings:

- a. Two week notice (14 day minimum) to all property owners within a 600' radius of the site.
- b. Can get a list of property owners from the Volusia County Property Appraiser's office (\$25 fee):  
Jim Durland  
GIS Specialist I  
Volusia County  
Property Appraiser's Office  
386-822-5720  
jdurland@volusia.org
- c. Hold the meeting in close proximity to the site – anywhere but City Hall.
- d. Conducted after first SPRC submittal.
- e. Coordinate date with City staff so that they may be in attendance.
- f. Letters can be sent via U.S. Mail. The sender can get the post office to stamp the property list that they were mailed out.
- g. Provide City staff a copy of the final letter, property owner list, and affidavit that the letters

**Response:** Comment understood.

#### Planned Business Development

30. **Comment:** The project will require a Planned Business Development. Please provide the Planned Business Development fee and application. Please provide a letter that:
- a. Describes the project in text form.
  - b. Describe the needed project flexibility.
  - c. Describe the public benefits.
  - d. Describe how the project meets the Planned Business Development criteria - specifically 2-36(h)(4) of the LDC.

Note that the applicant is responsible for site posting and payment of the recording costs for the development order.

**Response:** See PBD application #PZ-22-018(B).

**Markup: C001 - COVER**

31. **Comment:** A Comprehensive Plan land use map amendment is required. Please provide the required application and fee.  
**Response:** See PBD application #PZ-22-018(B).

**Markup: C003- SITE**

32. **Comment:** For the public hearing - please provide a dimension plan that turns off the detail layers of the site plan  
**Response:** See attached Dimension Plan.

**Markup: C002 – SURVEY**

33. **Comment:** All drawings and technical documents that need to be signed and sealed by a licensed design professional must be done so using a Digital Signature that contains a Public Key Certificate issued through a 3rd Party Certification Authority. This "Authority" is a commercial service paid for by the design professional to verify their identity through various methods and then issues a security certificate that contains both a Private Key that is password protected by the design professional and a public key that allows the recipient to download and view the certificate. Please provide the digital signature for this drawing.

Electronic Signature Required. Survey shall be signed, dated and sealed and certified to the city in accordance with Section 4-06(4)b. of the Land Development Code.

All drawings and technical documents that need to be signed and sealed by a licensed design professional must be done so using a Digital Signature that contains a Public Key Certificate issued through a 3rd Party Certification Authority. This "Authority" is a commercial service paid for by the design professional to verify their identity through various methods and then issues a security certificate that contains both a Private Key that is password protected by the design professional and a public key that allows the recipient to download and view the certificate.

Please provide the digital signature for the survey.

**Response:** See updated Survey with electronic signature.

34. **Comment:** A survey is needed of the land area west of SR A1A. Please provide.  
**Response:** West parcel survey added to Site Plan.
35. **Comment:** Please provide a legal description (including the overall acreage) for the development order.  
**Response:** See Cover Sheet with legal descriptions and total site area = 2.95 ac.
36. **Comment:** Please provide the calculated average setback as determined by the surveyor.  
**Response:** See revised east parcel survey sheet 4 of 4.

**Markup: C003- SITE**

37. **Comment:** Please provide the rear yard setback, please provide the setback established by the surveyor.  
**Response:** Rear setback of 64 ft requested in PBD application.

**Markup: C003- SITE**

38. **Comment:** Please provide the side corner yard setback dimension on the plan set.

---

**Response:** Side corner yard setback is 30 ft from existing north property line. The north lot line is proposed to shift south for the public parking along Seminole Ave. approach. PBD application is requesting side yard setback of 23.5 ft.

**Markup: C003- SITE**

39. **Comment:** Please provide the side yard setback on the site plan.

**Response:** Side yard setback of 139 ft dimensioned on Site Plan.

**Markup: C003- SITE**

40. **Comment:** The project is seeking remote parking through the PBD process. Section 3-29 of the LDC states:

Design standards. If it is not feasible to provide parking as stated in subsection (a)(1) or (2) of this section, parking spaces which are separated from the premises to be served by a local or collector street (as identified in the city or county comprehensive plan) or arterial road related to tourist commercial use or beach access may be allowed by special exception, provided the following requirements are met and are strictly adhered to:

(1) The spaces are situated upon a lot any portion of which is located within two hundred feet (200') of the premises to be served, and which lot is in the same zoning district as such premises, in a B-5 or I-1 district, or a zoning district allowing the principal use which the lot serves.

(2) All site development standards of the zoning ordinance (including, but not limited to, buffer areas, landscaping, irrigation, fencing, driveway and parking bay location and design) shall be complied with.

(3) The illumination of the site shall be adequate for on-site safety and shall not produce off-site glare.

(4) There may be only one (1) sign, with routed or raised lettering only, up to six (6) square feet in area and four feet (4') in height; this sign may include only the name of the establishment being served by the site and a reservation clause.

(5) The applicant shall install such crosswalks, traffic control devices or other safety-related items as the city may determine to be necessary based on professionally recognized safety standards.

(6) The applicant, on behalf of himself and all successors in interest, and the city shall execute and record a written agreement prohibiting the disposition of the remote parking area other than in conjunction with the disposition of the premises which are served thereby, so long as the spaces provide required parking for the premises served thereby. The applicant shall bear all costs of recording.

(7) The applicant, at his expense, provides the city attorney with a title opinion of an attorney at law licensed in the state or a certification by an abstractor or a title company showing that apparent record title to both the remote parking area and the premises served thereby were in the common ownership of the applicant at the time and date the agreement was recorded.

Please detail how the remote parking will be permanently tied with the hotel parcel.

**Response:** See PBD application.

**Markup: C003- SITE**

41. **Comment:** The Public Institutional land use will need to be amended for the parking lot use.  
**Response:** See PBD application.

**Markup: None**

42. **Comment:** I could not locate the required bicycle parking. See Section 3-26(f) of the LDC that requires 2.5 percent of the required car parking for bicycle parking. Please provide the required bicycle parking.  
**Response:** See revised Cover Sheet for bicycle parking calculations and revised Site Plan.

**Markup: #04 – Trip Generation Analysis**

43. **Comment:** This trip generation report is geared for the land use amendment and is not applicable to the site plan development.  
**Response:** See PBD Application for updated traffic report.
44. **Comment:** What land use is being sought for the west side parcel?  
**Response:** See PBD application.

**UTILITY 1 – Mike Stephenson**

**Markup: C005 - UTILITY**

45. **Comment:** E.O.R. to provide justification documentation for the 6-inch gravity line sizing. My preliminary manning equation evaluation suggests a single 6-inch line is undersized, but I do not have projected demands at this time.  
**Response:** See attached water and sewer demand calculations. Proposed peak sewer flows are 49 gpm, the 6" service lateral at 1% slope has capacity up to 240 gpm.
46. **Comment:** E.O.R. to provide documentation for the anticipated potable and sewer demands for the proposed construction  
**Response:** See attached water and sewer demand calculations.

**Markup: C004 - CIVIL**

47. **Comment:** Recommended maximum pipe sizes for Type C inlet is 18-inches per FDOT Index 425-052 SPI (Standard Plans Instruction). E.O.R. to review the inlets shown on the proposed parking lot.  
**Response:** Inlets revised to Type E.

**Markup: C004 - CIVIL**

48. **Comment:** My assumption is that core drilling existing drainage structures will require remove and replace sidewalks/curbing. Recommend hatching  
**Response:** See revised Site Plan.

**Markup: C004 - CIVIL**

49. **Comment:** My assumption is that core drilling existing drainage structures will require remove and replace sidewalks/curbing. Recommend hatching  
**Response:** See revised Site Plan.

**Markup: C014 – DETAILS**

50. **Comment:** Detail/title block appears cut off on my end.  
**Response:** See revised Site Plan.



**Markup: C003 – SITE**

51. **Comment:** No downlight detail present in the plans that I can see. Recommend adding.  
**Response:** Downlight detail added to Sheet 12.

**Markup: C004 - CIVIL**

52. **Comment:** Existing 8-inch water main shown currently present between proposed Inlet structure #12 and western connection to existing drainage structure. Assuming 3 foot of cover would suggest existing main will be in conflict with proposed 18-inch RCP. E.O.R. to review and advise.  
**Response:** Existing water main shown to be relocated under proposed storm pipe. See revised Utility Plan.

**Markup: C004 - CIVIL**

53. **Comment:** Plans callout a 10" NE invert, but 15" RCP to existing drainage structure is called out as well. Recommend E.O.R. review.  
**Response:** Core drill callouts revised to match pipe sizes.

**Markup: C004 - CIVIL**

54. **Comment:** Existing City GIS information shows a 10-inch water main on the west side of Atlantic Avenue near the backside of existing sidewalk. This main could be in conflict with the proposed 15-inch RCP traveling east from proposed structure #16. Recommend E.O.R. to review.  
**Response:** Existing water main shown to be relocated under proposed storm pipe. See revised Utility Plan.

**Markup: C005 - UTILITY**

55. **Comment:** E.O.R. to specify what materials/fittings will be utilized to connect to the existing 8-inch gravity main. Concern is that establishing a connection will require asphalt R&R. E.O.R. to advise.

Advisory information: Nearest manhole has Top EL of 10.5 and S INV EL of 6.1 according to City GIS information. The proposed 18-inch RCP at EL of 6.30 between structure #12 and #13 could make the gravity connection interesting.

**Response:** See revised Utility Plan.

**Markup: C005 - UTILITY**

56. **Comment:** 6-inch fire line and a 4-inch fire line currently called out. E.O.R. to confirm dual fire line sizes are intentional. Perhaps there is a rationale for things on the building plans side of things that I cannot currently see.  
**Response:** 6" fire line to feed fire sprinkler system and 4" piping to FDC.

**Markup: C005 - UTILITY**

57. **Comment:** E.O.R. to advise on anticipated 'fullness' of the existing 8-inch gravity main once proposed construction is connected. I interpret the '137 Keys' callout as 137 ERU's being proposed. Concern is that the existing 8-inch line and downstream lift station 4P will not be sufficient to handle proposed flow rates with peaking factors applied.  
**Response:** See attached water and sewer demand calculations.

**Markup: C005 - UTILITY**

58. **Comment:** E.O.R. to advise on cover for proposed water main when going over/under proposed storm. Can we get a cross section view for all proposed utilities at this location between roadway and building? Area looks like a utility smorgasbord.

August 19, 2022

Page 10 of 10

---

**Response:** See detail sheet 15 with pipe crossing and water main separation details. Backflow preventors moved further from roadways to provide additional room to adjust water main around other utilities.

Should you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (386)677-6891.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Kevin Lee". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Kevin Lee, P.E.

KL/kh

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Josh Howard  
Mr. Adam Plous