Item #	51
l	\sim 1

SEMINOLE COUNTY GOVERNMENT AGENDA MEMORANDUM

Continued from 02/10/2004 BCC meeting

SUBJECT: Briefing Regarding Fence and Wall Techniques
DEPARTMENT: Planning & Development DIVISION: Development Review
AUTHORIZED BY: Donald S. Fisher CONTACT: Michael Rumer Ext. 7337
Agenda Date <u>02/24/04</u> Regular ☐ Consent ☐ Work Session ☐ Briefing ☒ Public Hearing – 1:30 ☐ Public Hearing – 7:00 ☐
MOTION/RECOMMENDATION:
This is a briefing to provide information to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on alternatives to the Active /Passive Buffer wall requirement.

BACKGROUND:

Per direction of the Board at its meeting of May 13, 2003, staff evaluated alternatives to the brick or masonry wall requirement for Active/Passive Buffers. This report evaluates the different types of fence and wall materials relative to their durability, aesthetics, cost, opacity, maintenance and installation.

Current Standards:

Currently the Seminole County Land Development Code (LDC) Sec. 30.1232 requires the Active/Passive Buffer as a design standard to all commercial, office, industrial and multi-family development adjacent to properties assigned a residential zoning classification or a residential land use designation. The buffers and setbacks are intended to separate incompatible land uses and eliminate or minimize adverse impacts such as light, noise, glare and building mass on adjacent residential use (See Table 1).

Reviewed by:
Co Atty:
DFS:
Other:
DCM:
CM:
/
File No. <u>bpdd01</u>

Table 1

Building Height One (1) Story	Passive Buffer/Setback*	Active Buffer/Setback**
Office	15/25	25/50
Commercial	15/25	25/50
Multi-Family	15/25	25/50
Light Industrial	15/25	25/100
Industrial	15/25	25/150

Building Height	Passive	Active Buffer/Setback**
Two (2) Story	Buffer/Setback*	
Office	15/50	50/100
Commercial	15/50	50/100
Multi-Family	15/100	50/100
Industrial	15/150	50/150

^{*} Passive buffer component: four (4) canopy trees per 100 linear feet & a perimeter brick or masonry wall six (6) feet in height.

The following is an outline of the characteristics/specifications of the current permitted wall materials:

Brick -

- 1. Opacity 100% opaque
- 2. Durability Highly durable
- 3. Maintenance Low Maintenance
- 4. Cost \$67 and up per linear foot
- 5. Installation Footers are required the entire length of wall section
- 6. Aesthetics Aesthetically pleasing and fits in most surroundings

Masonry Block -

- 1. Opacity 100% opaque
- 2. Durability Highly durable, however when used with stucco it is susceptible to chipping, fading and cracking
- 3. Maintenance Low maintenance
- 4. Cost \$57 a linear foot
- 5. Installation Footers run the distance of the wall
- 6. Aesthetics Moderately pleasing however aesthetics can be improved with split face block or stucco

<u>Landscape Earthen Berm & Wall</u> – May be used if approved by the planning manager

- 1. Opacity 100% opaque
- 2. Durability Highly durable
- 3. Maintenance Landscaping only

^{**} Active buffer component: eight (8) canopy trees per 100 linear feet & a perimeter brick or masonry wall six (6) feet in height.

- 4. Cost costs associated with landscaping and creation of berm
- 5. Installation installing landscaping and berm
- 6. Aesthetics Aesthetic natural look

Alternatives not provided for in the code:

The following is an outline of the characteristics/specifications of alternative wall/fence types.

<u>Wood Fence</u> – Made of spaced picket, solid board, shadow box, stockade or post & rail

- 1. Opacity Opacity depends on style
- 2. Durability Durability depends on climate, soil conditions and materials used
- 3. Maintenance Wood fences require periodic cleaning, painting or sealing and many fences are not properly maintained.
- 4. Cost \$18 a linear foot
- 5. Installation Panels are fastened to 4x4 post set 24"-36" inches in the ground or a column made of brick or rock secured by footers to the ground
- 6. Aesthetics Wood fences have a nice aesthetic look when new, over time they deteriorate

PVC /Vinyl – Constructed with the same in same style as wood fence

- 1. Opacity Opacity depends on style
- Durability –The solid fence is durable but is prone to split or crack from UV rays, the split rail fence is prone to break or crack from contact with falling debris or human contact
- 3. Maintenance Little to no maintenance. Mold or mildew removal may be necessary at times
- 4. Cost \$22 \$27 a linear foot
- 5. Installation Panels or rails are connected to 4x4 PVC post set 24"-36" in the ground or a column made of brick or rock secured by footers to the ground
- Aesthetics Very pleasing when new and appears to keep the new look for several years, however since susceptible to mold and mildew requires constant upkeep

Aluminum or Wrought Iron

- 1. Opacity This type of fence provides no usable opacity
- 2. Durability Highly durable
- 3. Maintenance Little to no maintenance
- 4. Cost \$23 \$28 a linear foot
- 5. Installation Fence is attached to columns made of brick or rock
- 6. Aesthetics this type of fence provides no usable opacity

Chain Link - Comes in vinyl coated or galvanized aluminum

- 1. Opacity Plastic slats are inserted to obtain opacity
- 2. Durability Long lasting
- 3. Maintenance Maintenance free
- 4. Cost \$13 \$18 a linear foot depending on whether it is coated or not
- 5. Installation Fence is attached to post set in the ground
- 6. Aesthetics Very poor look. Minimal aesthetical value

Styrofoam - Requires coating of Stucco

- 1. Opacity 100% opaque
- 2. Durability Not durable
- 3. Maintenance Stucco is easily cracked. Periodic maintenance to stucco is required
- 4. Cost \$45 a linear foot
- 5. Installation Metal Posts are inserted in ground with the Styrofoam wall inserts added
- 6. Aesthetics Minimal aesthetical value

Prefabricated -

- 1. Opacity 100 % opaque
- 2. Durability Highly durable
- 3. Maintenance Little maintenance
- 4. Cost \$53 a linear foot
- 5. Installation Concrete columns are set in the ground. The pre-made wall sections are inserted between the columns
- 6. Aesthetics Can be painted or imprinted to look pleasing

Summary

Upon request of a waiver, some of the alternatives described above could be considered acceptable options. However, staff believes that the current standards are appropriate and waivers should be evaluated on a case by case basis.