



Lakes & Waterways Board Regular Meeting Minutes

August 12, 2025 at 12:00 PM

City Hall Commission Chambers
401 S. Park Avenue

Present

David F. March, Ed Webman (Virtual), George T. Vietor, Clark Sprinkel, Nicole Seybold

Staff Present

Director of Natural Resources and Sustainability Gloria Eby, Assistant Director of Public Works Don Marcotte; Lakes Manager Joseph Cordell, Lakes Specialist Daniel Barber, Administrative Assistant Victoria Tabor

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:02 p.m.

2. Consent Agenda

- a. Approve the minutes of July 8, 2025

**Motion made by Mr. Sprinkel to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. March.
Motion carried unanimously with a 5-0 vote.**

3. Public Comments (for items not on the agenda)

4. Public Hearings (Public participation and comment on these matters must be in person.)

- a. Boathouse/Dock Application (BLDR-2024-0723) 2170 Fawsett Rd.

Mr. Cordell outlined the parameters for the Boathouse application BLDR-2024-0723 at 2170 Fawsett Rd. This permit amendment was made retroactively and includes a variance. The dock's deck height was constructed 3.6 feet above the ordinary high-water mark, exceeding the city code limit of 2 feet above the ordinary high water mark. Additionally, a previous variance was approved for the side setback. Ms. Eby explained that the main reason for the height restriction is related to the viewshed. The original permit was approved with a deck height of 2 feet above the high water mark as demarcated in the plans submitted by applicant, in accordance with the code.

Sheila Cichra from Streamline Permitting Eustis, FL, suggested that lakes management inspected the dock's deck height when water levels were at their lowest, highlighting the increased height of the constructed dock. She said in 29 years, she hasn't seen a dock in Winter Park inspected for height. Ms. Cichra showed two pictures of the dock

from 2022 and 2024, both underwater, and said this has been the norm for the last five years. She believes building the dock higher than allowed is necessary to prevent damage during hurricanes. Mr. Vietor asked what prompted the inspection. Ms. Cichra inquired of Mr. Cordell the reason for the dock inspection, given that he had never conducted such inspections previously. Mr. Cordell responded that, since his employment, all dock elevations have been checked.

Ms. Seybold questioned whether Ms. Cichra's comment was an apology or a sign that no one cares about dock construction standards in Winter Park. She also questioned how the dock was built so much higher. Ms. Cichra explained that while the other docks are only slightly raised by a few inches, this one was constructed a foot and a half higher. The homeowner was aware of the high water marks and desired a higher deck. The contractor had never been questioned about this before, and no one has ever been penalized. Ms. Seybold inquired whether the high water mark has been altered. Ms. Eby confirmed that the setting for Lake Sue remains unchanged.

Mr. Sprinkel inquired why a revision was not submitted to the city when construction began outside the approved permit conditions. Ms. Cichra explained that the builder believed they were close enough to the actual high point that it wouldn't be noticed. Mr. March questioned whether this situation sets a precedent for allowing buildings to be constructed first and approved retroactively afterward.

The dock has been built for six months. Mr. Vietor stated the view is not impeded, and he is inclined to grant the variance.

Mr. Sprinkel inquired about the hardship related to the variance. Ms. Eby explained that it involves a non-conforming dock, and before involving code enforcement, the lakes board can review the case and approve a variance. Ms. Seybold noted that if the pictures had been presented earlier, a variance might have been approved.

Mr. Sprinkel inquired whether the city overlooked any aspects of the permitting process. Ms. Eby explained that builders were allowed to construct to near completion of dock before inspection of dock height. A new inspection requirement has now been introduced before reaching 50%. Mr. Sprinkel recommended that if the height requirement is changed, it needs to be done on a citywide basis, not on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Sprinkel reiterated that the precedent involves approving a dock above the waterline, suggesting others might justify it by saying it was done previously. Ms. Cichra asked whether there were environmental concerns, as she understood that staff had recommended approval. Ms. Eby corrected to say that staff has concerns about docks being built without proper conformity and is seeking board direction to decide on variance approval or not.

Mr. March expressed the assumption that, had the project not been constructed and submitted for board approval, it would not have received approval. Additionally, in a different instance, the board declined to approve a variance after the completion of the

project. Further, granting approval in this case could set a precedent, potentially inviting numerous applicants to seek permission to construct docks that exceed the regulation by one foot. Ms. Cichra indicated that the code is the hardship because it differs from most municipalities. Mr. March noted that violating the code is not a solution to change it.

Mr. Vietor expressed concern that the penalty imposed to ensure the dock's compliance exceeds any potential harm resulting from its current state. Ms. Seybold pointed out that because the rules have been broken repeatedly and no one seems to care, it might be tempting to just keep breaking them. She highlights how this ongoing situation is problematic.

Mr. Cordell clarified that there has not been a height variance brought before the board in his employment since 2022. Mr. Marcotte noted that the ordinance is based on the ordinary high water level and not for storms. Ms. Cichra stated that if the variance is denied, lowering the structure would cost over \$20,000.

Preston Copenhaver, the owner, explained that the original dock was on city property with permission. He and his wife elected to repair the old dock; however, they were advised that it would require demolition and reconstruction. Subsequently, they engaged a marine contractor and adhered to the contractor's recommendations.

Mr. Webman agreed with Mr. March's assessment.

Motion made by Mr. March to table the granting of a variance until the next meeting; seconded by Mr. Sprinkel. The motion carried unanimously.

b. Boathouse/Dock Application (BLDR-2025-0461) 443 Lakewood Dr.

Mr. Cordell provided the parameters, aerial and Birdseye views, survey, site plans and plans for dock permit application BLDR-2025-0461, 443 Lakewood Dr, a 228 square foot platform on Lake Osceola. Staff recommends approval.

Ruth Corddry, 455 Lakewood Drive, is concerned that the existing boathouse will remain. Nicklaus Adams, representing contractor Peter Fleck, stated that the current boathouse will be demolished.

Motion made by Mr. Sprinkel to approve with the condition that the existing dock be removed; seconded by Mr. Vietor. The motion carried unanimously by a 4-0 vote.

c. Boathouse/Dock Application (BLDR-2025-0514) 570 Seminole Dr.

Mr. Cordell provided the parameters, aerial and Birdseye views, photos, survey, site plans and plans for new boat dock application BLDR-2025-0514, 570 Seminole Dr, on Lake Osceola. Staff recommends approval.

Motion made by Dr. March to approve application BLDR-2025-0514; seconded by Mr. Sprinkel. The motion carried unanimously by a 4-0 vote.

d. Seawall Application (SAP-2025-0006) 1602 Summerland Ave.

Mr. Cordell provided the parameters, aerial and Birdseye views, photos, survey, site plans and plans for a seawall and riprap application permit SAP-2025-0006, 1602 Summerland Ave, on Lake Maitland. Requires revegetation. Staff recommends approval.

Motion made by Dr. March to approve application SAP-2025-0006; seconded by Mr. Sprinkel. The motion carried unanimously by a 4-0 vote.

5. Action Items

6. Non-Action Items

7. Staff Updates

a. Winter Park Police Department Update

Not in attendance

b. Lakes Management Update

Mr. Cordell provided the lakes management update. There is no water quality update this month, but several hydrilla treatments have been carried out on the lakes. Lake Bell received algae treatments. The Venetian canal is expected to be completed in approximately two weeks. The boat ramp at Dinky Dock is currently being dredged and the public beach is being restored. The weedoo operation has been conducted two to three times weekly to remove floating eelgrass debris.

Mr. Sprinkel asked if resolving the eelgrass issue is possible and at what cost. Ms. Eby explained the seasonal increase. The Weedoo cost \$92,000, requiring at least three operators to remove 9,000 gallons of eelgrass. Controlling it would need scaling, extra equipment, and operators.

Mr. Cordell announced the plant of the month, Duckweed, which is common in ponds. It is both native and invasive. When observed, it is treated because it can spread, shade the bottom, and interfere with gas exchange.

c. Upcoming Events announced by Mr. Cordell

Fix It! Don't Pitch it! - September 6th 8am @ Winter Park Community Center

Orange County Lake Killarney Advisory Board Meeting - September 11th 5pm @ Public Safety Building (500 N. Virginia Ave.)

Paddleboard Cleanup - September 13th 9am @ Kraft Azalea/Lake Maitland

d. Stormwater Management Update

Mr. Marcotte provided the CIP and reported on the underground storm pipe replacement along Killarney Drive, confirming that all underground work has been completed. The new drainwells at Lake Spier are now active. There is also another storm pipe replacement on Temple Drive, expected to be finished this week. The NRCS-funded ditch system north of Mayflower, extending into the Interlachen Country Club golf course, is nearing completion.

Ms. Seybold inquired whether there is a fine for blowing leaves into the street. Mr. Marcotte confirmed that such enforcement exists. Mr. March asked whether the projects' funding would be affected if property taxes were eliminated. Mr. Marcotte was uncertain about the answer.

8. Board Comments

- a. Discussion of Public Comments Received

9. Upcoming Agenda Items

- a. Discussion of Upcoming Agenda Items

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:27 p.m.

Approved by the board on October 14, 2025

/s/ Bahiyah Layton, Board Coordinator