



**506 WEST BERCKMAN STREET
FRUITLAND PARK, FL 34731**

**PHONE: 352 360-6727
FAX: 352 360-6652**

TRC COFP Members:

City Manager Karen Manila, Chairman
Police Chief, Vice Chair
City Attorney
Building Official
Community Development Director
Code Enforcement Officer
Engineer – Halff
Fire Chief
Fire Inspector
Land Planner LPG
Public Works Director

TRC Members:

City of Leesburg Utilities
Lake County School Board
Lake County Public Works Department
Lake County Economic Development

**MINUTES
TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (TRC)
July 7, 2026
10:00AM**

- I. MEETING START TIME: 10:01AM**
- II. MEMBERS/STAFF PRESENT:** Michael Rankin of LPG and the Interim Community Development Director; Anita Geraci-Carver, City Attorney; Robb Dicus, Public Works Director; Karen Manila, City Manager; Brad Bubnitz of Halff Engineering; Danny Bass, Building Official; Kelli Fielder, Certified Permit Tech; Emily Church, Administrative Assistant and Sharon Williams, Administrative Manager. On behalf of the developments: Addie Mentry of AMLU Consulting for Urick & Wilder ; Roger Strcula, Project Engineer of Upham, Inc. for HHRE Medical Center.
- III. MEETING NOTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING:** The meeting minutes from June 2, 2026, included for review, were approved without comment or correction.
- IV. OLD BUSINESS: NONE**
- V. NEW BUSINESS:**
- A. Urick & Wilder Sign Variance, Alternate Key 1520690**
The applicant is requesting a sign variance for the recently approved Urick and Wilder (aka Urick Flats) 150 unit multi-family residential development. The maximum sign coverage, in accordance with the city's Land Development Regulation, limits signage to 32 square feet. The

applicant is requesting sign coverage of approximately 59.11 square feet to allow for the following: sign for an externally illuminated main wall; mail pavilion; leasing office; and directional ground sign. A justification letter was submitted along with the sign plan for approval consideration.

Michael Rankin, Interim Community Development Director, introduced the project and inquired whether there was anyone in attendance representing the project.

Addie Mentry stepped forward and introduced herself stating that the variance was primarily for a primary identification sign and some ancillary signs including a wayfinding sign, leasing office sign, and a 'mail' sign for the pavilion. She further explained that there were two options proposed for an illuminated sign; one was just a flat icon sign that would not be illuminated and the second option would be externally illuminated with gooseneck lighting that would be shone directly onto the sign (front-illuminated not outward into traffic or onto other properties).

The main identification sign is vertical and approximately 49.85+/- sf. The 'leasing' sign is approximately 5.68 sf. The small channel letter sign in the mail pavilion that just says 'mail' is approximately 3.58 sf. She stated that overall the total proposed signage is actually 59.78 sf. She stated that the R-15 zoning designation allows 32 sf of signage which is why she believes that the 32sf would not be adequate based on the scale of the residential property. Based on the rate of travel on the road and visibility studies, the goal is to maximize the visibility while also having a sign proportionate to the size of the building.

Mr. Rankin acknowledged that larger developments often require a combination of identification and wayfinding signage, similar to libraries, medical facilities, and other multifamily projects. The City Manager expressed concern regarding the amount of internal wayfinding signage and questioned whether the size of the primary identification sign was necessary for a residential development rather than a commercial property with highway frontage. In response, Ms. Mentry explained that the building's architectural features and window placement limited alternative sign locations and that the proposed sign size was the minimum needed to achieve adequate letter visibility for motorists traveling along the adjacent roadway. Ms. Mentry further noted that the sign would be front illuminated only, with lighting directed onto the face of the sign to avoid light spill.

City Attorney stated that the applicant resubmitted responses to her comments, however, she did not have a chance to review to ensure her comments were properly addressed. Additionally she stated that the resolution consistent with what the applicant was requesting had been submitted to staff. There were no further comments

B. HHRE Major Site Plan, Alternate Key 1699649

The applicant is seeking to develop property located at 305 CR 466A for 2.62 +/- acres for a pad site in front of the newly constructed Evolve at Grove Park 222 multi-family unit apartment complex. The property is zoned PUD via Ordinance 2022-024 (when the property was formally known as the Hawthorns at Fruitland Park) and is currently known as Evolve at Grove Park. HHRE (Harrod Healthcare Real Estate) is proposing to construct a 24,380 SF medical office/clinic. The proposed plan lists 9 tenants leasing space of various sizes within the one-story building (Tenant 1 space of 3,984 sf; Tenant 2 space of 2,030 sf; Tenant 3 space of 2,030 sf, Tenant 4 space of 2,660 sf; Tenant 5 space of 2,682; Tenant 6 space of 2,660 sf; Tenant 7 space of 2,030 sf; Tenant 8 space of 2,030 sf and Tenant 9 space of 4,014 sf). The proposed number of parking spaces is 134 (6 ADA compliant; 25 compact cars and 103 standard size car parking).

Medical office/clinic is listed as an approved/allowable use within the PUD.

Michael Rankin, Interim Community Development Director, introduced the project and invited the applicant's representatives, Roger Strcula and Johnathon Bishop to the table.

Roger Strcula of Upham Engineering, representing the applicant, provided an overview of the project and advised that revised plans addressing staff comments would be submitted. He noted that a traffic study determined the development would operate at an acceptable level of service and would not independently warrant a traffic signal. However, coordination has occurred with neighboring developments to accommodate a future signalized intersection if traffic volumes increase.

Robb Dicus commented that, because the development is proposed with nine tenant spaces, each tenant would require a separate water meter. He requested that the site be revised to include a dedicated utility easement for the meter installation and advised that a sketch and legal description of the easement would be required with the next submittal. Mr. Strcula confirmed the water service would be provided from the rear roadway and agreed to provide the required easement documentation. Mr. Dicus also requested that the plans clearly identify where city maintenance responsibilities would terminate within the easement.

Additionally, Mr. Dicus addressed the proposed loading area and future tenant flexibility. While Mr. Strcula indicated the development is intended for medical office and retail uses only, Mr. Dicus noted that if a restaurant or similar use were permitted in the future, the site would likely require a grease trap and a larger loading area capable of accommodating delivery vehicles. Mr. Strcula responded that a loading zone could be created by reconfiguring several parking spaces without reducing the overall parking count.

Mr. Dicus questioned whether the proposed 20-foot driveway radii would adequately accommodate delivery vehicles over time and expressed concern that repeated truck movements could result in damage to curbs, sidewalks, and other infrastructure. While Mr. Strcula advised that the proposed radii match the adjacent Evolve development and that vehicle tracking had demonstrated adequate maneuverability for emergency vehicles, Brad Bublitz requested that the next submittal include additional turning movement analyses for larger delivery vehicles, including a standard WB-46 truck, to verify that the proposed design would function without creating future maintenance issues.

Brad Bublitz addressed landscaping within utility easements. Mr. Dicus requested that shade trees and other plantings be relocated away from existing water, reclaimed water, and sewer utilities to avoid conflicts with future maintenance. Mr. Strcula confirmed that the landscape plan had been revised by relocating trees closer to the parking areas while maintaining the required landscape buffers.

The applicant proposed using 18-foot parking spaces with a two-foot vehicle overhang along portions of the site. City Attorney noted that the Planned Development requires compliance with the City's parking standards unless specifically modified. Mr. Rankin advised that if the proposed parking layout does not meet the approved development standards, a variance may be required. Mr. Strcula explained that the reduced parking dimensions were intended to remain within the project's floor area ratio limitations while maintaining the required parking count.

Mr. Strcula agreed to address the outstanding Engineering and Public Works comments, submit

revised traffic and vehicle turning analyses, provide the required utility easement documentation, revise the landscape plan as discussed, and respond to the parking design comments with the next submittal. Staff advised that the application would proceed to the Planning and Zoning Board following review of the revised plans which are anticipated within a few weeks of this meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Carl Yauk, 1123 Ritter Road, Villages of Pine Hills, questioned several aspects of the proposal, including the use of parking spaces with a two-foot vehicle overhang, the proposed 45-foot building height, and whether six ADA parking spaces would adequately serve a nine-tenant medical facility.

He also requested clarification regarding the proposed electric service provider, asking whether the development should be served by Leesburg Electric or SECO Energy under existing service agreements. Additionally, he raised questions about rear parking, dumpster capacity, accommodation of delivery and service vehicles, and whether the proposed signage was proportional to the building's height.

This section is reserved for members of the public to bring up matters of concern or opportunities for praise. Note: Pursuant to F.S. 286.0114 and the City of Fruitland Park's Public Participation Policy adopted by Resolution 2013-023, members of the public shall be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard on propositions before the Planning and Zoning Special Magistrate. Pursuant to Resolution 2013-023, public comments are limited to three minutes.

ADJOURNMENT: 10:39 AM