

M I N U T E S
ORMOND BEACH PLANNING BOARD
Regular Meeting

June 08, 2023

6:00 PM

City Commission Chambers
22 South Beach Street
Ormond Beach, FL 32174

PURSUANT TO SECTION 286.0105, FLORIDA STATUTES, IF ANY PERSON DECIDES TO APPEAL ANY DECISION MADE BY THE PLANNING BOARD WITH RESPECT TO ANY MATTER CONSIDERED AT THIS PUBLIC MEETING, THAT PERSON WILL NEED A RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND FOR SUCH PURPOSE, SAID PERSON MAY NEED TO ENSURE THAT A VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING IS MADE, INCLUDING THE TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE UPON WHICH THE APPEAL IS TO BE BASED.

PERSONS WITH A DISABILITY, SUCH AS A VISION, HEARING OR SPEECH IMPAIRMENT, OR PERSONS NEEDING OTHER TYPES OF ASSISTANCE, AND WHO WISH TO ATTEND CITY COMMISSION MEETINGS OR ANY OTHER BOARD OR COMMITTEE MEETING MAY CONTACT THE CITY CLERK IN WRITING, OR MAY CALL 677-0311 FOR INFORMATION REGARDING AVAILABLE AIDS AND SERVICES.

I. ROLL CALL

Members Present

Angie Shull, Vice Chair
G.G. Galloway
Al Jorczak
Mike Scudiero (excused)
Barry du Moulin
Troy Railsback
Doug Thomas, Chair

Staff Present

Steven Spraker, Planning Director
Randy Hayes, City Attorney
Marcella Miller, Recording Technician

II. INVOCATION

Chairman Thomas led the invocation.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. NOTICE REGARDING ADJOURNMENT

NEW ITEMS WILL NOT BE HEARD BY THE PLANNING BOARD AFTER 9:00 PM UNLESS AUTHORIZED BY A MAJORITY VOTE OF THE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT. ITEMS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN HEARD BEFORE 9:00 PM MAY BE CONTINUED TO THE FOLLOWING THURSDAY OR TO THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING, AS DETERMINED BY AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF THE MAJORITY OF THE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT (PER PLANNING BOARD RULES OF PROCEDURE, SECTION 2.7).

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 11, 2023

Mr. Jorczak moved to approve the May 11, 2023 Minutes. Ms. Shull seconded the motion. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (6-0).

VI. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

No report.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. ZMA 2021-079(A), Ormond Enclave, 145 North Yonge Street, Zoning Map Amendment to PBD
- B. ZMA 2021-79(B), Ormond Enclave, 145 North Yonge Street, Zoning Map Amendment to PRD
- C. PRD/PBD 2021-079(C), Ormond Enclave, 145 North Yonge Street, Issuance of a Development Order

Mr. Steven Spraker, Planning Director, stated that items (A), (B), and (C), are interrelated and will be discussed together but must be voted on by the Planning Board individually. Mr. Spraker detailed the history of the project including a 2005 approval, 2009 approval and a 2019 Comprehensive Plan amendment. Mr. Spraker continued that the subject property has three (3) land uses of "General Commercial", "Medium Density Residential", and "Low Density Residential." The land uses allow a maximum of 193,014 of building area or 107 residential units.

Mr. Spraker stated that agenda item (A) was for a zoning map amendment for 0.34 acres that has a B-4, Central Business zoning designation that has been purchased by the project team and needs incorporation into the PBD, Planned Business Development zoning designation. Mr. Spraker continued that agenda item (B) was for a zoning map amendment for 0.72 acres that has a R-3, Single-Family Medium Density zoning designation and needs incorporation into the PRD, Planned Residential Development zoning designation. Mr. Spraker noted that the staff report called the area a total of 0.99 acres, but it was discovered that an additional lot was added to this total that is already Planned Residential Development.

Mr. Spraker stated that agenda item (C) was the issuance of the development order and reviewed the proposed site plan. Mr. Spraker noted:

- The gross density is 10.09 units per acre.
- There is an existing use – Dollar General – 9,014 square feet that would remain.
- A total of 131 parking spaces required and 164 parking spaces provided.
- The proposed building height is 25' 2", a total of two stories.
- There are eight buildings.
- The minimum setbacks to existing residential lots is 50'.

Mr. Spraker displayed a PowerPoint slide detailing the areas of fencing and stated that areas not fenced have heavy natural vegetation. The Land Development Code (LDC) allows the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) to determine the appropriate fencing, but because this is a Planned Development, the Planning Board can provide its recommendation.

Mr. Spraker reviewed the project traffic and building elevations. He elaborated that there were four correspondence items received for this project. Mr. Spraker stated that the Planning Board's options for the project are (1) approve as submitted, (2) approve with conditions, or (3) deny as submitted. Mr. Spraker concluded that the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) is recommending approval of agenda items (A), (B), and (C).

Chairman Thomas opened it up to the Board for questions.

Board Discussion and Questions

Ms. Shull asked what the date of the traffic study was. Mr. Spraker replied that the project is in a transportation concurrency exception area, therefore a study is not required. Additionally, the projects do not trigger enough trips, as 1,000 trips a day, requires a traffic study.

Ms. Shull asked for clarification on the number of stories and units proposed for the project. It was confirmed that the buildings would be two-story with 64 units.

Mr. Galloway asked for the location of the dumpster to be pointed out. Mr. Spraker displayed the location of the dumpster on the PowerPoint presentation and explained that another location can be proposed.

Mr. Railsback asked if Dollar General has a dumpster. Mr. Spraker replied that they may have a dumpster but that he would let the applicant speak on the matter as they are more familiar with that site.

Mr. Jorczak inquired about the project's main exit, asking if it is in the Dollar General parking lot. Mr. Spraker explained that the main entrance and exit is off of U.S. Highway 1. He continued that the entry-only access is off of Highland Avenue, and Dix Avenue is full-access.

Chairman Thomas inquired if there is access headed south for Highland Avenue. Mr. Spraker explained that there is a turn-lane off of U.S. Highway 1 that allows drivers to go into Highland Avenue. The state roadway allows a left-turn onto Highland Avenue. Highland Avenue will be a one-way access point in.

Chairman Thomas commented that he would like to hear from the residents how they go south off of Highland Avenue.

Mr. du Moulin asked if an Environmental Impact Study was done. Mr. Spraker replied that there are no wetlands onsite and added that the property is not in the floodplain therefore, there are no requirements for the study..

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Glenn Storch, P.A., Storch Law Firm, 420 S. Nova Road, Daytona Beach, Representative, stated that infill development is encouraged, in which is what they are proposing with the project. He reviewed a presentation outlining the proposal and stated that at this time it is an undeveloped site surrounded by residential and commercial development off of U.S. Highway 1. Mr. Storch explained how infill is efficient, allowing walkability, driving less, with the opportunity to live downtown and support local businesses. He added that this is the first downtown multi-development in the area in 40+ years. Mr. Storch referenced the traffic concerns, noting that staff has been working on addressing the concerns with traffic-slowing devices. He explained how the project proposes that traffic go through the site as opposed to going around it. The owner purchased additional lots for a better design, expounding property boundaries. Mr. Storch remarked that instead of the 107 units allowed, only 64 units would be going in. He explained the access points and traffic flow, noting that rather than access off of U.S. Highway 1, it would be blocked off with landscaping. There will only be one access via Highland Avenue. Dollar General delivery trucks will be able to go through the project site as opposed to going around.

Mr. Storch displayed the viewshed overhead of what the vacant property has looked like on U.S. Highway 1 with vagrants using it, the trash that has been thrown on it, brazilian peppertrees and other invasive species overgrowth. He explained the typical appearance of a vacant property in any downtown area. The proposed project will allow a two-story building viewshed of extensive landscaping along U.S. Highway 1, a shared access with Dollar General, and the aforementioned access along Highland Avenue. He added that a section of Highland Avenue will be preserved for a tree preservation area and dog park. Mr. Storch remarked that the zoning allows a five-story building on the site or a three- to- four-story residential project.

Mr. Storch stated that the parking changes to the plans, moved parking internal to the site. There is 50' between the apartments and the adjoining perimeters and have provided for vegetation and structures to ensure there is no impact. Mr. Storch explained that if the area were to have single-family in its place, they would be much closer to the existing single-family.

Mr. Storch reiterated the earlier comment that there are no environmental issues on the site. There are no wetlands or flood plain impacts. 33 percent of the site is maintained in open space. Mr. Storch stated 33,000+ square feet is part of the tree and natural vegetation preservation area and is not being touched. Mr. Storch explained the stormwater for the site, explaining that it will be improved from what it currently is and that once the stormwater system is in, there will be 72 percent less stormwater runoff from the property. He added that there is a large wet-retention system in the rear of the property that is surrounded by vegetation, as well as another system designed to reduce the amount of nutrients in stormwater. The quality of the stormwater will be far less with the nutrients removed.

Board Discussion and Questions

Mr. du Moulin asked for additional explanation of the wet-retention system. Mr. Storch pointed to the area next to the lake system in his presentation overhead,

explaining that the water goes into it and filters out the nutrients before it goes offsite, providing additional stormwater protection.

Mr. Storch advised the Board that once the project goes in, it will be a 12 million dollar investment into the Downtown District.

Mr. Railsback commented that he appreciates the effort in reducing the density concurrency and stormwater impacts. He expressed concern about access between properties as an adjacent property owner, and inquired about fencing or walls planned for the project. Mr. Railsback stated that he would feel more comfortable with limited or eliminating access. Mr. Storch replied that there are a few homes on the Dix Avenue side, and approximately two homes adjacent to the site on the Highland Avenue side. There is a 6' white vinyl fence planned on the Dix side of the site as well as the setback and additional stormwater. Mr. Storch agreed to work with the citizens if they are interested in landscaping on the other side. He continued that the applicants would be willing to put a fence up if requested. There was no plan for a fence there initially due to the preserved natural preservation. Mr. Storch confirmed that the proposed project plan was not to encompass the site by a fence but that it can be added into the plan.

Chairman Thomas stated that he would like a masonry fence in place of a vinyl or chain-linked fence.

Mr. Railsback concurred with Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Storch suggested adding a stipulation for a masonry wall for every area adjacent to a neighbor.

Mr. Railsback commented that a neighbor to the property, Mr. Bill Navarra installed a fence all the way around his property, and suggested that being an incentive for supporting the project for the majority.

Mr. Jorczak referenced the aforementioned walkability comment and remarked that he noticed an easement on the Dix Avenue side for a sidewalk on the plans, but did not notice a sidewalk on Highland Avenue. Mr. Storch replied that Dix Avenue is already developed and it was determined that there is already a sidewalk there.

Mr. du Moulin asked for details on the retention pond, irrigation and its maintenance. Mr. Storch replied that there is an irrigation well and the applicants are open to, if recommended, harvesting from the stormwater pond. With stormwater, it allows the water to flow into the aquifer as opposed to being taken offsite. Mr. Storch added that the wet-retention pond has water all of the time. The dry-retention area next to it does not have water at all times, and is raised up to be a retention area in case of something.

Mr. Steve Buswell, Engineer, Parker Mynchenberg & Associates, stated that there is an existing control structure and a positive outfall from the pond out to FDOT. The design has been permitted by the St. John's Water Management District. He continued that the pre-treatment ponds purpose is to attenuate and provide additional treatment and for nitrogen and phosphorus removal from downstream waterbodies so that there are no algae blooms. Mr. Buswell added that there is not an opportunity to do the stormwater harvesting system in a standard and small wet-detention system.

He remarked that sometimes the nutrients will build up into the irrigation system and clog the heads over time.

Mr. Galloway inquired why the dumpster is so far away from the building and not more towards the south corner of the Dollar General lot. He added that it would be a straighter shot for Waste Management to drive in and would keep it closer to the applicant versus the residents houses. Mr. Storch answered that it is in the location that it is in due to the large buffer area between the proposed dumpster area and the residents, but advised it can be changed when going through the process.

Mr. Buswell explained the reasoning for the dumpster placement, stating that there is an existing access point there that is not being changed. Residents are able to dispose of trash in the proposed location which keeps the garbage truck from circling internally. The turning radius is on the wide point of access, allowing for delivery and garbage trucks.

Mr. Galloway commented that the closer a dumpster is to the public road, others will use it.

Audience Comments/Input

Mr. Robert Ezell, 132 Highland Avenue, expressed his Highland Avenue area traffic concerns with the proposed project. He stated that he will not let his grandchild play in his front yard. He added that his light pole has been taken out twice by cars. Mr. Ezell commented that the speeds on the roads are crazy. A right-of-way (ROW) tree was taken out by the city and the city employees were astonished by the speeders going down the road. Mr. Ezell remarked that they have speed bumps at each end of the road, but that drivers drive 25 mph up to the speed bump, stop and cross it, and then go 35 mph and is not safe. He added concerns about having a sidewalk only halfway down the road for aesthetic purposes for residents to go downtown. Mr. Ezell asked about the rest of the road and sidewalks, commenting that the roads are already narrow. He asked if the city will be taking more right-of-way (ROW) or easements from the residents to extend a sidewalk or if it will put people out in the roads. He stated something be done about the traffic, explaining that you cannot get a truck and a car down the road at the same time without a vehicle being scratched from all of the trees that are extending over the road. Mr. Ezell concluded that he does not really want the project in the neighborhood but understands that it is a revenue generator for the city, and suggests protecting the citizens and residents that are already there.

Chairman Thomas concurred and added that he is concerned as well about the entrance off of Highland Avenue.

Mr. Rick Sandora, 36 Highland Avenue, stated that there are 82 homes on Dix Avenue and Highland Avenue and the proposal will double the amount of people in the area. He added that there is a dog park but no provisions for children. Mr. Sandora commented that it is difficult to get around landscapers on Highland Avenue. The road is narrow and there is no way of putting a sidewalk all the way down Highland Avenue. Kids will be attracted to the river down the street, which will be an attractive hazard to the people living on the river, according to Mr. Sandora. He added that the speedbumps are ineffective. Mr. Sandora expressed that he feels once the project is done, it is done, and there will not be an opportunity to rectify it after it is allowed

He stated that he is against it. He expressed further concerns about traffic, commenting that drivers going out onto U.S. Highway 1 have to go south from Highland Avenue. Numerous drivers use Dix Avenue and Highland Avenue as a cut-thru to Beach Street, which is backed up past Highland Avenue and Dix Avenue in the morning rush hours.

Ms. Beth Putnam, 83 Dix Avenue, commented that she sees no sidewalk access for the proposed family-friendly apartment complex. There is no sidewalk to go to the dumpster. She remarked that the Dollar General dumpster backs up to Dollar General and is not in the location that the project is proposing. Where it is proposed will be borderline with one of the residential properties and when the winds come from the west, the dumpster smell will go up Dix Avenue. Ms. Putnam referenced the earlier comment on sidewalks, and stated that the subject needs to be addressed with 100 cars that will be coming and going at all times and that the children will be unable to walk to school safely with the sidewalk on Highland Avenue ending, therefore will be in the middle of the narrow street. She continued that an alternative is to walk down U.S. Highway 1 to cross Granada Boulevard. Ms. Putnam commented on the lighting, and suggested down-lighting or dark sky-lighting and not flared out security lighting. She suggested solar would have been best. Ms. Putnam addressed the ponds and suggested there be a security fence around the water with the children. She added that the schools are crowded and that there was no discussion on the impact the project would bring to the school. Ms. Putnam added her water and traffic-use concerns, remarking that she cannot be enthusiastic about the project right now.

Applicant Response

Mr. Storch addressed concerns, stating that the project has been reviewed with the Volusia County School Board and they indicated that there is sufficient capacity for the additional children that may come from the proposed development. He reiterated that it is already in the comp plan for medium density residential units. Mr. Storch added that with ponds and lakes, a slope is put in and there will be a wall around the area, preventing children to access them. He referenced the down-lighting comment, confirming that it can be done and to add as a stipulation. Mr. Storch added that a sidewalk can be provided to the dumpster. The applicants will work with staff on the best location for the dumpster. Regarding the sidewalk concerns, the applicants will support any additional sidewalks for the project working alongside the city. Mr. Storch referenced the Highland Avenue access inquiry and stated that it is an engineering issue and has to be done where people cannot easily make the connection and turn to the left, suggesting that it can be done with higher curbing and signage to discourage and prevent people from making the left-hand turn onto Highland Avenue. Mr. Storch reiterated that the impact will be less on Highland Avenue with access going through Dollar General into the project. Mr. Storch concluded that stipulations can be added to accommodate for this.

Chairman Thomas referenced the Sterthaus Avenue onto Nova Road access area, and stated that even with the no left-turn signage, drivers still do. Mr. Storch stated that the entrance only off Highland Avenue can be engineered to discourage any illegal turning movements. Chairman Thomas asked if the city would allow that design. Mr. Spraker stated that design could be accomplished.

Chairman Thomas asked about traffic coming off of U.S. Highway 1 turning onto Highland Avenue. Mr. Storch confirmed that the only left turn into the neighborhood in this area of U.S. Highway 1 is located at Highland Avenue. Mr. Storch stated that access only into their site is needed to prevent traffic coming off U.S. Highway 1 from going to the site through the existing neighborhood to access their development. This access point on Highland Avenue would encourage traffic to go the easy way and not through Highland Avenue, Ridgewood Avenue and Dix Avenue. Mr. Storch stated the whole design of the project is to prevent their project traffic from using Dix or Highland Avenues. Mr. Storch stated project trips now are going around Highland Avenue to North Ridgewood Avenue and west on Dix Avenue. This entrance only would prevent that movement in the existing neighborhood. Mr. Storch concluded that he believed that the project design would reduce traffic on Highland and Dix Avenues.

Board Discussion and Questions

Mr. Galloway stated that this property was originally bought for a large furniture store and residential in the rear portion of the site. The property is zoned to allow the type of use proposed. Mr. Galloway stated that the residents should demand sidewalks. He stated that his utility bill has information on sidewalk improvements and commented that if sidewalks are desired in this area that there is money in the city budget.

Mr. Galloway expressed concern for the dumpster location. Mr. Storch stated that the project could stipulate for the movement of the dumpster.

Mr. Galloway stated that he heard that kids were going to be in the apartment complex. He stated that this is an assumption and it is underdetermined who will be within this development.

Mr. Galloway stated that there are issues with urban sprawl and remarked that here is a project that is developing in the core of the city. Mr. Galloway indicated that he would be supporting this project.

Mr. Jorczak stated that he is aware of the narrowness of the roadways and that he has contacted the city to trim the vegetation in the right-of-way (ROW). Mr. Jorczak concurred with Mr. Galloway regarding the need for the city to install sidewalks in this area. Mr. Jorczak continued that he supports the walls along the project perimeter and agreed that the pond should have additional security to protect children's safety. Mr. Jorczak also stated that he concurred that the dumpster should be moved. He added that he thought the population density was reasonable and the architectural style looks attractive. Mr. Jorczak stated the secondary issues need to be addressed. Mr. Storch replied that the applicant is willing to provide stipulations that could be part of the recommendation on the project. He stated that dumpster would be stipulated to be moved to the project interior with sidewalk access. Mr. Storch added that the project can stipulate for additional security around the stormwater pond. Mr. Thomas inquired about a stipulation on the wall requirement. Mr. Storch confirmed that the project would stipulate to a wall around the project abutting existing residential uses. He continued that the project would also stipulate to ensure in-bound access from Highland Avenue to the project with raised curbing.

Mr. du Moulin stated that he agreed with the comments provided and had no additional comments.

Mr. Railsback commented that he supports infill development and added that it is a good use of that parcel. He stated he concurred with the stipulations stated. Mr. Railsback continued that he went through a multi-family development proposal next to his subdivision and believes that the masonry wall is necessary to protect the existing residential uses. He stated that he supported mitigating the traffic impacts of the project and the downlighting mentioned earlier. Mr. Railsback concluded that he would support the project with the stipulations referenced if they are included in the recommendation.

Ms. Shull stated that she likes the project but has concerns with the depth of the residential uses. She added that she likes that the buildings are two-story with concrete block construction. Ms. Shull commented that she is supportive of the perimeter wall, movement of the dumpster, and downlighting. Ms. Shull stated the main issue is the traffic. She remarked that what we do not seem to understand is that there are residents that have lived in the neighborhood for a long time and there is turnover to new residents. Ms. Shull stated she is a realtor and people love this area and the neighborhood. She stated that she does not think that the existing residents are being taken into consideration as projects are being developed. Ms. Shull stated that if we do not stand up here and say something about traffic, the city is not going to hear us. We need to have the city hear us. The speed tables are doing nothing. Ms. Shull stated that the state of Florida has an issue with speeders. She stated that the city needs to protect the existing residents. Ms. Shull concluded that she liked the project, but is going to vote no, based on the traffic impacts to make the city aware of the issue. She stated she wanted the city to do something about Dix and Highland Avenues so that the people who live there and pay taxes can be heard. Mr. Storch stated he agrees that traffic is so important, but the fact is that this project and the units proposed are allowed to be here. Ms. Shull stated that she understood that but if she did not speak up, the issue would not be addressed. The traffic issues should be taken care of first before development is approved. Ms. Shull stated an approval would allow development that would further add to the traffic problem. She stated that she knows that the project has done everything they can do from a design perspective.

Chairman Thomas reviewed the traffic issues of the city and project. He questioned the possibility of making Dix and Highland Avenues one-way streets. Chairman Thomas stated that one-way streets may reduce traffic. He was unclear if the residents would be supportive of the concept and understood that there may be inconveniences. Mr. Thomas stated that Dix and Highland Avenues were city streets and the city could make changes if desired. Chairman Thomas encouraged residents to talk to the City Manager and City Commission about the one-way roadway concept.

Chairman Thomas discussed infill development and the goal of the Board to make the project possible. Chairman Thomas understood the concern of the residents of Dix and Highland Avenues. He stated that he was supportive of the project with the stipulations previously discussed.

Board Recommendation

Chairman Thomas opened it up to the Board for a motion.

ZMA 2021-079(A)

Mr. Railsback motioned to approve ZMA 2021-079(A), Ormond Enclave, 145 North Yonge Street, Zoning Map Amendment to PBD. Mr. Jorczak seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (6-0).

ZMA 2021-079(B)

Chairman Thomas opened it up to the Board for a motion.

Mr. Jorczak motioned to approve ZMA 2021-79(B), Ormond Enclave, 145 North Yonge Street, Zoning Map Amendment to PRD. Mr. Railsback seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (6-0).

DO 2021-079(C)

Mr. Spraker stated that he desired to confirm the stipulations that were agreed to through the public hearing process and they are:

1. The dumpster location would be moved from its current location and relocated closer to the mutli-family units. The dumpster location would have sidewalk access to the dumpster.
2. Additional security for the stormwater pond.
3. Masonry or post and panel wall along the project perimeter where it abuts existing residential uses.
4. The Highland entrance is entrance only with raised curbing to prevent vehicles from exiting this access point.
5. Provide downlighting (Mr. Spraker noted that this is already required, but could be reinforced in the stipulations).

Mr. Railsback asked if there was a wall behind the existing Dollar General property. Mr. Spraker stated that he believed that there was a wall existing. If there is not, this section would be included in the wall requirement.

Chairman Thomas opened it up to the Board for a motion.

Mr. Railsback motioned to approve DO 2021-079(C), Ormond Enclave, 145 North Yonge Street, Issuance of a Development Order, with the following five stipulations stated by Mr. Spraker. Mr. Jorczak seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (5-1). Ms. Shull stated that her no vote was based upon traffic impacts.

Chairman Thomas thanked the residents for their attendance and input and asked residents to remember that the Planning Board only makes recommendations and that the City Commission provides the final action for the project.

Mr. Jorczak stated that he concurred with the concept of one-way roadways and questioned if the Planning Board should make this a recommendation.

Mr. Galloway offered to meet and discuss with city staff. Mr. Galloway stated that it is on his water bill that they are supposed to be building sidewalks. Now is the time to put sidewalks along these roadways.

Mr. Spraker recalled with the land use amendment that there was a meeting regarding traffic along Dix and Highland Avenues. This meeting led to the residential traffic calming program. The concept of one-way streets was discussed at the meeting for traffic calming. The route is to go is through the traffic calming program, including working with the Engineering Department. Mr. Spraker stated that there would need to be resident support of the one-way concept. There is an existing mechanism to pursue the concept of one-way streets discussed tonight.

Chairman Thomas stated that the concept needs to start with the citizens and expressed that he is unsure if there would be support. Mr. Spraker concurred and stated that it would be a similar process of obtaining the speed tables. He stated that staff is available to meet with residents.

Mr. Galloway asked if the residents would rather have one-way streets or sidewalks. Mr. Spraker stated that the issue with the sidewalks is that there is only 33' of right-of-way (ROW) versus a typical width of 50'. There is insufficient right-of-way (ROW) to construct sidewalks. This area was likely platted in the early 1900's and the street layout was not designed for the traffic patterns that exist today. The project tonight provided easements on private property to allow the installation of sidewalks. Mr. Spraker stated that it is unclear if property owners along these streets are willing to provide easements to construct sidewalks.

Chairman Thomas questioned if a sidewalk has to be five (5') feet. Mr. Spraker responded that there are minimum widths based on handicapped access requirements. Mr. Spraker stated that there is a process to consider the one-way process. If there was an easy way to construct sidewalks along these roadways, they would already be in place. Mr. Spraker concluded that staff hears the concerns presented tonight and the issue would be presented to the City Commission.

Mr. Galloway asked if property owner's taxes would be decreased if they provided an area for the sidewalk. Mr. Spraker stated that the sidewalk would be in an easement and the property owner still owns the land area.

Chairman Thomas asked how many people attended the first traffic meeting. Mr. Spraker responded with approximately 50 individuals. Chairman Thomas asked the results of the meeting. Mr. Spraker stated that the meeting led to the residential traffic calming program that led to speed tables, radar feedback, signs and signage. Mr. Spraker stated that the one-way concept could be an evolution of the residential traffic calming program. Chairman Thomas appreciated that there is a path and stated that it is important to discuss the issue with the residents in attendance.

Ms. Shull asked about the width of Dix and Highland Avenues. Mr. Spraker stated he had not measured the width and speculated 17' to 20'. Ms. Shull asked if there was a one-way roadway, would this reduce the needed paved width. Mr. Spraker

stated that it does and there needs to be verification of the fire access requirements. Mr. Spraker restated that the first step is that there be a majority of residents that desire a one-way traffic pattern. The second step, if residents are interested, is the actual design that could be developed and then voted on by the residents of the roadways.

D. ZMA 2022-098(A) 121 East, 121 East Granada Boulevard, Planned Business Development

E. DO 2022-098(B), 121 East, 121 East Granada Boulevard, Planned Business Development, Issuance of a Development Order

Mr. Steven Spraker, Planning Director, stated that items (D) and (E), are interrelated and will be discussed together but must be voted on by the Planning Board individually. Mr. Spraker displayed the land use and zoning for the property at 121 East Granada Boulevard. Mr. Spraker stated that the land use allowed a total of 24 residential units and the zoning allowed 20 residential units. He showed pictures of the existing site and a Florida Power and Light (FPL) structure. Mr. Spraker stated that agenda item (A) was for a zoning map amendment for 0.76 acres that has a B-4, Central Business zoning designation that is seeking a PBD, Planned Business Development zoning designation. The zoning map amendment provides a framework for the next agenda item of the issuance of a development order.

Mr. Spraker summarized the development order process that included SPRC review, a neighborhood meeting, Ormond Beach MainStreet review, Planning Board review, and future City Commission dates. Mr. Spraker stated that the project was in the Downtown Overlay District and noted that the master plan encouraged residential development.

Mr. Spraker detailed the project site plans. He stated that the building was five (5) stories over the ground floor of parking. The second floor has a pool/amenity area to the north of the property and a dog walk area to the east of the building. Mr. Spraker displayed a first floor site plan and the project building elevations.

Mr. Spraker stated that there were two correspondence items received for this project, an e-mail from a resident who was not in favor of the project and desired another use, and the other correspondence, a letter of support from Ormond Beach MainStreet. Mr. Spraker concluded that the Planning Board's options for the project are (1) approve as submitted, (2) approve with conditions, or (3) deny as submitted. Mr. Spraker stated that the SPRC is recommending approval of agenda items (D) and (E).

Applicant's Presentation

Mr. Robert A. Merrell, Esquire, Cobb Cole, 149 South Ridgewood Avenue, stated there has been months of work put into the project and there is a project team to answer any questions. The property owner and contractor, Mr. Bryan Collyer, is available for any questions. Mr. Merrell remarked that the staff report reviewed in detail the Comprehensive Plan, Downtown Master Plan, and Land Development Code (LDC) requirements and he did not intend to repeat this analysis. He expressed a few key points, the desire to create a sense of place, compact pedestrian

development, and high-quality urban design. Mr. Merrell mentioned that Ormond MainStreet reviewed the project and provided an endorsement.

Mr. Luke Kilic, Project Engineer, Zev Cohen and Associates, 300 Interchange Boulevard, reviewed the project architecture and displayed a fly-around of the proposed building. He stated that the building is broken into a north and south wing. There is a service corridor link between the wings. Mr. Kilic detailed the amenities, including a pool, deck, amenities area, and dog walk. He stated that parking is on the ground floor and the project includes exfiltration chambers for underground stormwater. Mr. Kilic detailed the building including balconies and oversized wings. The elevators would open straight into individual residential units. Mr. Kilic reviewed the front hardscape areas, signage, and heavy landscaping. He stated that the project would generate 68 daily trips.

Mr. Merrell stated that the project is luxury condominiums and is designed to be an iconic structure, and added that the project would provide a large increment of taxes to the Community Redevelopment Area (CRA).

Board Discussion and Questions

Chairman Thomas opened it up to the Board for any questions.

Mr. Railsback asked what the intent was from a leasing perspective and short-term rental. Mr. Merrell stated that they would be allowed to do whatever the Land Development Code (LDC) allowed. Ms. Shull inquired if condominiums set their own rental allowances. Mr. Merrell answered that they can. Mr. Railsback added that the condominium cannot be less restrictive than the municipality and/or state allows. Mr. Merrell responded that these are going to be very expensive units and are not expected to be rentals.

Ms. Shull asked where the air conditioning units would be. Mr. Kilic responded that they will be on the ground floor under the building and are not rooftop units.

Ms. Shull stated that when she first reviewed the packet, the building architecture looked like all of the 1970 condominiums on the beach. She stated that the fly around provided a great perspective and the building is cool looking.

Mr. Galloway remarked on the age of the FPL structure.

Audience Comments/Input

Ms. Pamela Gatfield, 127 Putting Green, read a letter she wrote to the mayor:

“I moved here in 2019 for the beautiful home town feel of Ormond. From the beautiful street lanterns and the Casements, to the palm trees and parks surrounding the best bridge in Volusia County. Why would you ruin it by planting a six-story condo building on our main street? A six-story building crammed into that tiny lot will change the entire aesthetics of this beautiful beach town. We do not need 24 units, roughly 50 people to save our shops. I ride my bike into town daily. I shop, go to sunrise service at the beach, all on my bike. The reason the builder says it is such a challenge is because a six-story building on .76 acres is ridiculous. May I suggest another restaurant with outdoor seating? Something beautiful and unique with

partial ocean view and parking in the back? Maybe something we can brag about?”

Ms. Gatfield stated that was the letter she sent to the mayor. She commented that her other concerns are the aesthetics. Ms. Gatfield remarked that it is a beautiful building and video, but you do not see the rest of the town that is already there. Ms. Gatfield stated that it looks like Daytona and not like Ormond. She stated that one of the things she loves about Ormond are the houses north of Granada Boulevard on Ocean Shore Boulevard, with no big high-rises. Ms. Gatfield expressed concern about the traffic and the lack of parking. She stated that urban is a term that is thrown around a lot in the CRA documentation. Ms. Gatfield stated urban has a definition of dense with compactness and lots of buildings. She questioned if the desire is to have the small-town beach vibe or an urban vibe. Ms. Gatfield referenced other places that she has lived and stated that this project does not line up for a small-town beach vibe on Main Street. She expressed that when she thinks of walkability, and where people want to go out to eat or shop, she thinks of New Smyrna Beach or Flagler. Ms. Gatfield concluded that she and her friends love the quietness of Ormond, but go elsewhere or by where the Grind is because it has cool restaurants.

Mr. Merrell stated he appreciated the comments and reminded the Board that a lot of thought went into the guiding documents for this area. The question of beach town or urban was raised, and Mr. Merrell stated that they wanted to be both. Mr. Merrell stated this is the definition of infill and concluded that it is a pioneering development with the property owner taking a large risk.

Ms. Rosa Morey, 158 Tomoka Avenue, stated that she has lived in Ormond and went to school in the area and moved to Miami, attended the University of Miami, and purchased a home in the Village of Palmetto Bay. She commented that she witnessed this same scenario in Miami. Ms. Morey added that they fought against this type of development and explained that they started with four (4)-stories and now they are at twelve (12)-stories. Ms. Morey remarked that she is here because it is like she is re-living something all over again. She stated that she came back to Ormond, opened a business, working with the community, and loves what she does. Ms. Morey expressed that she loved the idea of what they are doing and stated that the city needs to grow. She stated that the project needs to conform to what the city already has and commented that we have a beautiful community and hates that the Ormond Hotel was lost. She expressed that she believes that the project needs to be downsized and thinks that it will look like a sore thumb. Ms. Morey stated that the project needs to be looked at from another angle, and remarked that the new development should not be rushed into, and that the residents should be listened to. Ms. Morey thanked the Planning Board members for their efforts and time invested into the community.

Ms. Gatfield added that she placed the photos of the project and her letter on the Nextdoor app and she got over 3,000 responses. She stated that 95% of the responses were not favorable and encouraged individuals to come to the meeting. Ms. Gatfield commented that respondents felt like nothing was going to happen if they attended the meeting.

Board Discussion and Questions

Mr. Railsback stated that he supports infill and responsible development. He added that from a zoning perspective there are two minor triggers, unit count and building length. Mr. Railsback remarked that he believes that the building height is conforming and is less than the Ormond Heritage. Mr. Railsback indicated that he would support the project.

Mr. Galloway recalled the development history of Ormond Beach and when the Granada Plaza did not exist. It is understood that people hate change, but we are in the next renaissance of Florida. Florida is growing. Mr. Galloway stated he would rather have controlled growth and local developers that build their project. He stated that the developer is taking a risk. Mr. Galloway pointed out that as far as a restaurant, that the property has failed three times as a restaurant. Mr. Galloway stated he would be supporting the project and remarked that housing is needed.

Mr. Jorczak stated that he attended the neighborhood meeting. He recalled that the form based code has been worked on for a number of years and that the aesthetics are appropriate. Mr. Jorczak added that he believes that this is a first-class, high-quality development that will be beneficial to the city and the downtown. Mr. Jorczak concluded that he supports this project and its infill development.

Mr. du Moulin recalled his experiences living in two condominiums which were not positive. He stated that he attended the neighborhood meeting and thought that this was a well thought out project. Mr. du Moulin indicated that he would support the project. He stated that it is inevitable that something will occupy this spot.

Ms. Shull stated that she likes the project and how it has the Ormond Heritage on one end, which are also condos. She commented the project is redeveloping a blighted piece of property. She added that she appreciates that the air conditioners were not roof-mounted. Ms. Shull indicated that she would be supporting the project.

Chairman Thomas stated that in his work he visits a lot of condominiums and that this would be the first project where the elevators open into the individual units. He remarked that he believes that this would be a first-class condominium. Chairman Thomas agreed that there is a need for infill condominiums. He recalled that the site has been a seafood restaurant, then a barbeque restaurant. He agreed with Mr. Galloway that there were concerns if a restaurant would be viable at this location. Chairman Thomas concluded that he thought the project would be a great addition to the city.

ZMA 2022-098(A)

Chairman Thomas opened it up to the Board for a motion.

Mr. Galloway motioned to approve ZMA 2022-098(A) 121 East Granada Boulevard, Planned Business Development. Ms. Shull seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (6-0).

DO 2022-098(B)

Chairman Thomas opened it up to the Board for a motion.

Ms. Shull motioned to approve DO 2022-098(B), 121 East, 121 East Granada Boulevard, Planned Business Development, Issuance of a Development Order. Mr. Jorczak seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (6-0).

F. SE 2023-045, Mister Car Wash, 49 South Yonge Street, Special Exception

Mr. Spraker, Planning Director, explained this is a request for a Special Exception to allow the addition of vacuum stalls, remove an access point, and install site landscaping at 49 South Yonge Street operating as Mister Car Wash. Mr. Spraker showed a picture from 2019 that showed a canopy with vacuums and hand detailing of vehicles. He also showed a current picture that the canopy and hand detailing service no longer exists.

Mr. Spraker reviewed the Special Exception request that includes removing an access point to U.S. Highway 1, adding of vacuum cleaning stations, and addition of landscaping to screen the vacuum cleaning stations. He displayed renderings of the landscaping and the vacuum cleaning stations. Mr. Spraker concluded that the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) recommended approval of the Special Exception application.

Board Discussion and Questions

Mr. Jorczak asked about the height of the proposed plantings and if they would screen the cars. Mr. Spraker replied that the goal is to screen the vacuum equipment and cars. He continued that the city Landscape Architect has specified the planting material and height to provide the screening.

Ms. Shull inquired if a knee-wall was proposed if it will only be landscaped. Mr. Spraker responded that the proposal is just for the landscaping and if the Planning Board believes a wall is needed, that it could be added.

Mr. Railsback asked what required the need for the Special Exception. Mr. Spraker confirmed that the vacuums are within the front yard requiring the Special Exception. Mr. Spraker added the proposed level of intensity is greatly reduced compared with the Sparkle-N-Shine use. Mr. Spraker stated that the height of the landscape material is specified on the landscape plan.

Mr. Railsback asked for confirmation that individuals are not parking any closer to U.S. Highway 1 than today. Mr. Spraker confirmed that the project is not seeking any parking location exceptions and the design would remove an access point and make the property safer.

Mr. Galloway inquired about the lot behind 49 South Yonge Street is a city lot. Mr. Spraker answered that their parking lot was a shared lot with the car wash owning a portion (203 Tomoka Avenue) and the city owning a portion of the parking lot area (179 Tomoka Avenue). Mr. Galloway asked for the intent of the portion of the lot at 203 Tomoka Avenue for the vacuum areas. Mr. Spraker replied that his understanding was that they are to be left as they exist today and that the applicant may be able to provide additional information. Mr. Jeff Burr, Mister Car Wash, explained that the rear vacuums are free vacuums to individuals. Mr. Burr added that they anticipate a lot less traffic on the rear lot once the proposed improvements are

completed. Mr. Burr stated that the landscaping would be maintained to ensure the buffer.

Ms. Shull asked if the vacuum business was that busy. Mr. Burr replied that it is, especially with the free vacuums behind the car wash. Mr. Burr stated that the proposed vacuums would be for car wash customers only.

Mr. Railsback asked if the 203 Tomoka Avenue vacuum area would ever be removed. Mr. Burr stated that they would need to see what happened over time, but not at this time.

Audience Comments/Input

There were no individuals who spoke on this item.

Board Recommendation

Chairman Thomas opened it up to the Board for a motion.

Mr. Railsback motioned to approve SE 2023-045, Mister Car Wash, 49 South Yonge Street, Special Exception. Ms. Shull seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (6-0).

G. PP 2023-051, Archer's Mill, Phase 2, Preliminary Plat

Mr. Steven Spraker, Planning Director, stated that this is a request for a Preliminary Plat for a 68 lot single-family subdivision on 25.32± acres. He displayed maps describing the project's location. Mr. Spraker detailed the Plantation Oaks Planned Residential Development and showed an exhibit that provided the subdivision's zoning approval. Mr. Spraker explained the three-step subdivision process: (1) zoning approval which occurred with Ordinance 2022-16, (2) Preliminary Plat, which includes subdivision construction drawings, and (3) Final Plat, which is a legal document to subdivide land after constructing improvements or posting a performance bond. Mr. Spraker concluded that Archer's Mill, Phase 2 is consistent with the zoning approval and the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) recommended approval.

Board Discussion and Questions

Ms. Shull stated that she likes the green space provided by the roadway.

Mr. Jorczak asked about the build out of Plantation Oaks. Mr. Parker Mynchenberg, 1729 Ridgewood Avenue, Holly Hill, stated that Archer's Mill, Phase 1, is under construction and reviewed the other phases of the Plantation Oaks subdivision.

Mr. du Moulin asked if the development was restricted to individuals 55 and older. Mr. Mynchenberg reviewed the history of the project and stated that the age restriction was lifted in 2022. He continued that the phase 2 lots would maintain the age restriction of 55 and older but that the other phases are not age restricted. Mr. du Moulin asked about Volusia County School concurrency. Mr. Mynchenberg stated that zoning map amendment had a letter regarding school capacity from Volusia County Schools. Mr. Mynchenberg stated that the Volusia County Schools reviewed

the project before the rezoning and that an additional certificate of concurrency would be obtained during the plat.

Mr. du Moulin asked if this project has a Homeowner's Association (HOA). Mr. Mynchenberg stated that there will be an HOA. Mr. Mynchenberg continued that the water management district and municipality requires either a Property Owners Association (POA) or Homeowners' Association (HOA) to maintain the common elements. For this project, these are gated/private streets that the HOA would have maintenance responsibility. Mr. du Moulin stated that he spoke to his attorney and there is no better format than an HOA. Mr. du Moulin expressed concerns regarding code enforcement and asked if city code enforcement would be applicable on subdivisions with an HOA. Mr. Railsback stated that code enforcement is a reactive approach and an HOA and would generally have a proactive approach. Chairman Thomas stated that city code enforcement is complaint driven. A discussion occurred regarding management companies providing enforcement services for HOA covenants and restrictions violations. Mr. Railsback recalled a positive code enforcement action that occurred within his subdivision.

Audience Comments/Input

There were no individuals who spoke on this item.

Board Recommendation

Chairman Thomas opened it up to the Board for a motion.

Mr. Jorczak motioned to approve PP 2023-051, Archer's Mill, Phase 2, Preliminary Plat. Ms. Shull seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (6-0).

H. PP 2023-052, Archer's Mill, Phase 3, Preliminary Plat

Mr. Steven Spraker, Planning Director, stated that this is a request for a Preliminary Plat for a 59 lot single-family subdivision on 22.42± acres. He displayed maps describing the project's location. Mr. Spraker detailed the Plantation Oaks Planned Residential Development and showed an exhibit that provided the subdivision's zoning approval. Mr. Spraker stated that the subdivision process is a three step process: (1) zoning approval which occurred with Ordinance 2022-16, (2) Preliminary Plat, which includes subdivision construction drawings, and (3) Final Plat, which is a legal document to subdivide land after constructing improvements or posting a performance bond. Mr. Spraker concluded that Archer's Mill, Phase 3 is consistent with the zoning approval and the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) recommended approval.

Board Discussion and Questions

Mr. Railsback indicated that he supports responsible development and is supportive of this application.

Audience Comments/Input

There were no individuals who spoke on this item.

Board Recommendation

Chairman Thomas opened it up to the Board for a motion.

Mr. Railsback motioned to approve PP 2032-052, Archer’s Mill, Phase 3, Preliminary Plat. Ms. Shull seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (6-0).

I. FLUM 2023-055, 860 Hull Road and 1399 Hull Trail, Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Mr. Spraker, Planning Director, explained that this is an administrative Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map amendment for the property at 860 Hull Road and 1399 Hull Trail, totaling approximately 52 acres, from Volusia County “Industrial” to Ormond Beach “Heavy Industrial” based upon annexation. The amendment would contain a map annotation limiting the Floor Area Ratio to 0.60, the same as the Volusia County land use. Mr. Spraker stated that the amendment was reviewed based on Policy 2.5.2. of the Future Land Use Element and it was determined that the amendment was an appropriate use of land, consistent with the Volusia County land use, and does not have negative infrastructure impact. Mr. Spraker concluded that staff recommends approval of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map amendment for the property at 860 Hull Road and 1399 Hull Trail.

Board Discussion and Questions

Mr. Railsback asked about the type of uses and if anything was included or excluded. Mr. Spraker stated this was the land use item and the next item detailed the allowed uses for the I-2 zoning district.

Audience Comments/Input

There were no individuals who spoke on this item.

Board Recommendation

Chairman Thomas opened it up to the Board for a motion.

Mr. Railsback motioned to approve FLUM 2023-055, 860 Hull Road and 1399 Hull Trail, Large Scale Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Galloway seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (6-0).

J. LDC 2023-056, Creation of the I-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District

Mr. Steven Spraker, Planning Director, explained that this is a Land Development Code (LDC) amendment for the creation of the I-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District, providing use definitions, and creating conditions for conditional and special exception and zoning uses. Mr. Spraker detailed the Land Development Code (LDC) sections proposed for amendments.

Mr. Spraker stated that staff met with representatives of Halifax Paving who provided suggestions for the definition of asphalt batching and cement plants as follows: “Asphalt Batching and Cement Plants means a manufacturing facility where

equipment is used to combine various ingredients to form concrete or asphalt before it is sold, distributed and/or transported to a construction site ready to be poured. A concrete or asphalt batching plant can have a variety of manufacturing equipment, parts and accessories, including: mixers (either tilt drum or horizontal or in some cases both), crushers, cement batchers, aggregate batchers, conveyors, radial stackers, aggregate bins, cement bins, heaters, chillers, cement silos, batch plant controls, and dust collectors.” Mr. Spraker stated that staff had no objections to the revision and asked that the Planning Board accept the revision to the definition as part of their approval.

Mr. Spraker stated the Land Development Code (LDC) amendment provides a zoning framework of heavy industrial uses. He continued that the zoning district is designed for annexed lands, not existing land areas in the city. Mr. Spraker stated that no land areas are being assigned the I-2 zoning district with this zoning action and zoning map amendments require a separate public hearing. Mr. Spraker concluded that staff is recommending approval of the Land Development Code (LDC) amendments.

Board Discussion and Questions

Mr. Jorczak asked if there was any adjacent land that could be incorporated into this zoning district. Mr. Spraker replied that there are a few parcels in Volusia County with a zoning of Volusia County I-2 that could be utilized in this zoning in the future. He continued that those properties would likely not annex until there is a utility connection. The Board reviewed parcels in and around Hull Road that may utilize the proposed I-2 zoning district in the future.

Mr. Galloway asked if all the Ormond Crossings property is within the city. Mr. Spraker confirmed that all of the Ormond Crossings property is within the city and that the property has its own zoning and development order.

Mr. Jorczak stated that he has a concern regarding the proposed zoning and its impact on the airport that he discussed with city staff. His concern focused on ensuring that the airport runway would not be impacted. Mr. Jorczak stated that Mr. Rademacher, city Economic Development Director, and Steven Lichliter, Airport Manager, reviewed his concerns and that the zoning district would not impede airport operations. Mr. Jorczak concluded that city staff answered his concerns.

Audience Comments/Input

There were no individuals who spoke on this item.

Board Recommendation

Chairman Thomas opened it up to the Board for a motion.

Mr. Galloway motioned to approve LDC 2023-056, Creation of the I-2, Heavy Industrial Zoning District with the amended definition for Asphalt Batching and Cement Plants. Mr. Jorczak seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (6-0).

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

The opportunity was announced and it was determined that there was no one in attendance that wished to deliver any public comments.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

X. MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Galloway expressed appreciation for the board discussion on the agenda items tonight. He stated that he expected to see more infill development over time.

Chairman Thomas stated that he thought it was important to discuss options with infill development when the residents are in attendance.

Mr. Jorczak stated that he was happy that there was an alternative company to Spectrum that is laying fiber optic cables and asked if there was a timetable for their completion. Mr. Spraker replied that MetroNet is under construction and if there are any construction-related issues, the city Engineering staff is working with MetroNet to resolve construction issues.

Mr. du Moulin expressed his appreciation for the Board discussion tonight.

Mr. Railsback apologized for not attending the last meeting as an issue arose at the last minute. He stated as projects come forward, he believes that the Airbnb is an issue that needs attention. Mr. Railsback added that traffic is also a key component in reviewing projects as they come forward.

Ms. Shull thanked the Planning Department and the Board members for the discussions on the agenda items.

Chairman Thomas inquired about the MetroNet substation on the west side of South Yonge Street. Mr. Spraker stated that the project is under construction and would have walls and landscaping.

Chairman Thomas asked about the status of Tomoka Oaks. Mr. Spraker responded that the project has made a submittal today with the intention of being on the July 13, 2023 Planning Board agenda. Mr. Spraker stated that there are a lot of moving parts to the project which need to be worked out. Staff is reviewing where the meeting should be held.

Chairman Thomas asked the City Attorney if the Board could request a discussion item. City Attorney Hayes stated he would need to research the Board duties. Chairman Thomas stated that the City Commission expressed interest in electronic changeable copy signage. He stated that he is interested in a discussion item for the electronic changeable copy signage. City Attorney Hayes replied that he believes that the City Commission was going to start reviewing past documents related to the topic. From there, the topic discussion, direction would be provided, including potentially referring the item to the Planning Board. Chairman Thomas stated he is not looking for any additional information to be provided, but solely a discussion item to discuss the topic. Mr. Spraker stated that the information provided to the City Commission can also be provided to the Planning Board and then a future discussion item can be determined later.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Spraker, Planning Director

ATTEST:

Doug Thomas, Chair

Minutes transcribed by Marcella Miller.

DRAFT

From: [Beth Putnam](#)
To: [Community Development](#)
Subject: For the planning board
Date: Monday, June 5, 2023 10:49:14 AM

[External Email-Use Caution] - OB/IT Helpdesk

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

I reside at 83 Dix Avenue and have attended other "Enclave" presentations. The developers are offering nothing but increased density for a "family friendly" apartment complex. There does not seem to have any green space or play area for the children. All I see is very tight parking spaces in which someone is going to be injured. The waste bins are still at the edge of residential homes on Dix Avenue. As the prevailing winds are from the west, the odors will be most unpleasant to taxpayers!

The development shows no imagination, solar panels for energy relief or enhancement to Ormond Beach. Is the BEST they can offer, or are they just trying to make a quick buck? I am totally against this complex as it stands right now.

Beth Lindley Putnam
Psalm 20:4