

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

October 14, 2021

7:00 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

Harold Briley, Vice Chair
G.G. Galloway
Al Jorczak
Mike Scudiero
Angeline Shull
Lori Tolland
Doug Thomas, Chair

Staff Present

Steven Spraker, Planning Director
Becky Weedo, Senior Planner
Randy Hayes, City Attorney
Marcella Miller, Recording Technician

II. INVOCATION

Mr. Galloway led the invocation.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. NOTICE REGARDING ADJOURNMENT

NEW ITEMS WILL NOT BE HEARD BY THE PLANNING BOARD AFTER 10:00 PM UNLESS AUTHORIZED BY A MAJORITY VOTE OF THE BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT. ITEMS WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN HEARD BEFORE 10:00 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

August 12, 2021

Mr. Jorczak moved to approve the August 12, 2021 Minutes. Ms. Tolland seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

VI. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Spraker, Planning Director, delivered his report detailing a brief review of the following activities:

1. Park and Recreation Master Plan update on October 6, 2021.
2. Sound test/neighborhood meeting for the Ormond Garage on October 13, 2021.
3. West Ormond Transportation, City Commission Workshop on October 19, 2021.
4. Tattersall subdivision neighborhood meeting on October 21, 2021.
5. OB Life, westward focus – Transportation on November 9, 2021.
6. OB Life, westward focus – Utilities and Quality of Life on December 2, 2021.
7. Cassen Park, City Commission Workshop on December 7, 2021.
8. Park and Recreation Master Plan, Quality of Life Board and the Leisure Service Advisory Board on December 8, 2021.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. PBD 2021-072(A) – Zoning Map Amendment – 295 Interchange Boulevard, All-Aboard Storage, Interchange Depot

Mr. Steven Spraker, Planning Director, stated that PBD 2021-072(A) and PBD 2021-072(B) will be explained together. The first item is a zoning map amendment to change the zoning and the second item is the actual issuance of the development order, which gives the details of what the site plan would be. PBD2021-072(A) is a request by 295 Interchange LLC for a zoning map amendment from B-7 (Highway Tourist Commercial) with a Planned Business Development (PBD) overlay to Planned Business Development (PBD) and issuance of a development order. The Planned Business Development (PBD) zoning map amendment seeks to allow the development of a three-story indoor self-storage building of 111,825 square feet (approximately 600 units) and associated site improvements on a vacant site of 2.94 acres under certain conditions. This item is for the zoning map amendment. The subject property is located at 295 Interchange Boulevard. Mr. Spraker stated that the next parcel is located within the City of Daytona Beach. On the side looking north at State Road 40 the sidewalks and street trees are in. The infrastructure for Interchange Boulevard is already in existence. He added that the billboard on site will stay through development.

Mr. Spraker continued that the development process begins with the Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC). August 5, 2021 a neighborhood meeting was held on the project. The City Commission is scheduled to hear this item on November 16, 2021 for first reading and December 7, 2021 for second reading. If approved, it will go back to SPRC for site/building permits and a Certificate of Occupancy. He added that the property is required to maintain 15 percent of the site as natural. 19 percent of the site has been saved for tree preservation and the view corridor is being protected for the existing billboard. They are replanting in the greenbelt buffer to make it comply. Mr. Spraker commented that the site has a good site design with access all the way

around the site with two loading zones. The project is proposing a simulated wrought iron fence along the frontage and a PVC vinyl fence around the perimeter of the parking for security.

Mr. Spraker explained that the purpose of the project going through a Planned Development is due to the use. The B-7 does not allow indoor storage use. The use is a low trip generator. He added that it does not require direct access to a major roadway. The second request is to use the ITE parking generation manual which has specific requirements for indoor storage. Mr. Spraker noted that the City of Ormond Beach code does not have those requirements. It is the same parking requirement used for the storage facility on Nova Road. He continued that they are seeking additional wall signage based on the linear frontage of the building. The Land Development Code (LDC) allows 154 square feet and they are seeking 100 square feet on each side on Interchange Boulevard and Interstate 95. Based on the geometry of the building and the height, staff believes that it is appropriate.

Mr. Spraker explained that there are certain uses where landscaping against the building becomes difficult because of the activities in the building. The applicants are seeking to take the landscaping and move it around the perimeter of the site, not reducing it, but shifting it away from the building footprint. He added that the elevation is under the height limit required in the B-7 zoning district. The landscape plan meets and exceeds the LDC requirements including the width in the landscape buffers. Mr. Spraker continued that there is a raw waterline easement that is proposed to be given by the applicant to the City which will assist creating a duplicate line to go under Interstate 95 to Williamson Boulevard to have a repetitive raw waterline. Mr. Spraker concluded that staff recommends approval of the project.

Mr. Briley inquired about the wrought iron fence and PVC vinyl fence. Mr. Spraker answered that it provides more security. The LDC does not allow chain-link fence. The PVC vinyl fencing will provide a screening and screen the roll-up doors on the side of the Interstate 95. Mr. Spraker concluded that a 60-foot landscape buffer is required as well.

Ms. Tolland asked if the wall signage is lit and visible from the residential properties. Mr. Spraker replied that it will be a lit wall sign with a good distance that follows the code illumination standards. Mr. Spraker added that there is landscaping in front of it.

Ms. Shull inquired about the difference in the ITE Trip Generation Manual editions for the parking and the traffic. Mr. Spraker answered that the 4th edition ITE manual is for parking calculations and the 10th edition ITE manual is for calculating trips.

Ms. Shull asked what is softening the industrial appearance without landscaping. Mr. Spraker replied that the minimum landscape buffer is 10'. The area is greater than the 10' and the access easement is not something that can be waived. It is part of the Interchange Boulevard Planned Development and provides a cul-de-sac turnaround for Interchange Boulevard. Mr. Spraker added that the applicant is providing landscaping in the front and along the base of the building, just not along the sides of the building.

Regarding the zoning map amendment, Mr. Scudiero inquired about the land to the south of the site. It was determined that it is a City of Daytona Beach land use designation. There could be wetlands through the 43-acre parcel. The subject property has no wetlands on the property. Mr. Scudiero suggested the need for a traffic light at Interchange Boulevard and State Road 40 and expressed how there are numerous tickets issued there as well as numerous vehicle accidents.

Ms. Tolland remarked that it is a good project for the property with it being less trips generated. She asked about the dumpster and if it would be visible or covered. Mr. Spraker replied that it has a substantial landscape buffer.

Mr. Galloway commented that occupants of storage facilities are unable to use the facility dumpster, only the office. Mr. Galloway also inquired about the signage. It was determined that signage will be located at the front of the property by the entrance, 5' from the right-of-way, as well as on the wall. Mr. Galloway also asked how high the building stories could have been. Mr. Spraker replied that they could have gone to 50' and they are currently at 44'. He continued that they could have applied to build a four-story building as part of a Planned Development. Three-story is consistent with the hotels and the surrounding area. Mr. Galloway concluded that the project is in a perfect location and it is a perfect piece of property for the use being that one side is the Interstate.

Mr. Andy Clark, All Aboard Storage, stated that he was attracted to the site because of its location and their interest in serving the west side of Interstate 95.

Mr. Jorczak asked about the status of the leased new three-story property on Nova Road. Mr. Clark discussed the matter and explained that they are not open as of yet and All Aboard Storage has a contract to purchase it once complete. It will be operated by CubeSmart for one year. Mr. Clark remarked that the occupancy for self-storage is unprecedentedly high at the current time.

Ms. Shull asked how many storage units will fit in the 111,000 square foot building. Mr. Clark answered approximately 500 units.

Mr. Scudiero asked if the reduction in the parking would work and if the 16 spaces is adequate for year-round clients. Mr. Briley commented that he rarely sees visitors when he visits his personal storage unit. Mr. Clark replied that it will be a low amount of people with an onsite manager and secure access with a limited number of operating hours, approximately 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

Mr. Galloway thanked Mr. Clark and commended him for being a local business professional and for keeping his money local.

Mr. Galloway motioned to approve PBD 2021-072(A) – Zoning Map Amendment – 295 Interchange Boulevard, All-Aboard Storage, Interchange Depot. Ms. Shull seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (7-0).

B. PBD 2021-072(B) – Issuance of a Development Order – 295 Interchange Boulevard, All-Aboard Storage, Interchange Depot

Mr. Jorczak motioned to approve PBD 2021-072(B) – Issuance of a Development Order – 295 Interchange Boulevard, All-Aboard Storage, Interchange Depot . Ms. Shull seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (7-0).

C. ESR 21-092 – Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Property Rights Element

Ms. Becky Weedo, Senior Planner, stated that ESR 21-092 is an administrative request to approve a Comprehensive Plan Amendment through the Expedited State Review (ESR) process, creating the Property Rights Element, adding a Goal, Objective and Policies to ensure that private property rights are considered in local decision-making in accordance with Florida Statutes Section 163.3177(6)(i). She added that House Bill 59 became law on June 29, 2021, amending the Florida Statutes requiring every local government to include in its Comprehensive Plan a property rights element. Inclusion of the property rights element is intended to protect private property rights and ensure they are considered in local decision making. Ms. Weedo explained that the city must adopt this element before its next proposed large-scale plan amendment initiated after July 1, 2021 or before the next evaluation and appraisal report. She concluded that it is recommended that the Planning Board approve the proposed amendments to add the required property rights element to the Comprehensive Plan in compliance with the Florida Statutes. The tentative City Commission dates are November 16, 2021 for the transmittal hearing, and potentially in January 2022 for adoption.

Mr. Scudiero confirmed that this Comprehensive Plan amendment is basically a housekeeping item. The board members agreed that the proposed element will not change anything since the city already considers property rights in its decision-making process.

Mr. Briley motioned to approve ESR 21-092 – Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Property Rights Element. Ms. Shull seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (7-0).

D. ISBA 2021-100 – North U.S. 1 Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement (ISBA) second amendment – Ridge Haven

Mr. Steven Spraker, Planning Director, explained ISBA 2021-100, is an administrative request for the second amendment of the North U.S. 1 Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement (ISBA) to add the land area associated with the proposed Ridge Haven subdivision, including any enclaves. Mr. Spraker explained the location of the property. The ISBA is an agreement between Volusia County and the City of Ormond Beach that was originally approved in 2014 and amended in 2019 for the Plantation Oaks subdivision (the first amendment). The proposed second ISBA amendment is to add a map of the Ridge Haven subdivision area, including any enclaves, to the existing agreement and does not include any text changes to the existing agreement. Mr. Spraker stated that the agreement establishes jurisdictional authority within the North U.S.1 corridor whether a property is in unincorporated Volusia County or Ormond Beach, they are under the Ormond Beach land use, zoning, permitting and code enforcement. He commented that the City of Ormond Beach is responsible for the growth of the North U.S.1 corridor. Mr. Spraker continued that it was a decision made by the City Commission and has worked well as the City is going through redevelopment in that area. The City partnered with the

North US1 Coalition to do landscaping. Also, water and sewer improvements have been made which are almost complete, and the State is refinishing the pavement along North U.S. Highway 1.

Mr. Spraker explained the second amendment area, Plantation Oaks Boulevard, Addison Drive, The Village of Pine Run and the third phase of Plantation Oaks to the east. There are 10 enclaves within the area. The Site Plan Review Committee (SPRC) met with the potential developers of the Ridge Haven subdivision and they expressed interest in developing and to do so are required to connect to utilities. In order to connect to utilities in the City of Ormond Beach, properties must annex or sign an annexation agreement.

Mr. Spraker explained that there are two options to move forward: First option: The applicant can develop in unincorporated Volusia County where the City would review it for utilities and require an annexation agreement. Mr. Spraker noted that the concern is that if the property is going to be in Ormond Beach eventually, there's a desire for Ormond Beach staff to review it, inspect it and approve it, ensuring that it is consistent with the City's development standards. He continued that if the decision is not to amend the ISBA, the applicant would go back to the County and do their project through that process. The second option: Amend the ISBA to allow Ormond Beach development review and public hearings for the project. The action that is being proposed now does not include landscaping, stormwater or elevations as it is not a development application. This action by the Planning Board would be a recommendation on if it is appropriate that the ISBA be amended to include the area discussed.

Mr. Spraker added that the outparcels have access to platted roads. Once development starts, the developers cannot block or impede access to the enclaves. If approved there would be future contracts and Planned Amendments for the enclaves, master development and zoning. Additional steps will take place after this process. It was discussed that there are currently water and sewer utilities within Plantation Oaks and on Addison Road.

Ms. Tolland asked if it would give the City of Ormond Beach better oversight on the property and in the future for development. Mr. Spraker agreed that it would and explained that it was expressed to the applicant how it would give the SPRC, Planning Board and City Commission the ability to review and negotiate through the Planned Development process, rather than Volusia County coordinating the process.

Ms. Shull asked how the property owners that own the enclaves feel about it. Mr. Spraker suggested hearing their feelings on it tonight as some are in attendance.

Mr. Glenn Storch, P.A., Glenn Storch & Associates, stated that he represents the owner of the large parcel. He explained that they tried to find the owners of the enclaves to work with them but that they could not be reached. It was mentioned that one of the owners was in attendance. Mr. Storch remarked that the goal is to work together with the City and the enclave owners to do a better project. Under the current county designation, the parcel area is county-medium (8 units per acre, 624 units), as well as a piece that is already in Ormond Beach, designated for multi-family (10 units per acre, 187 units), 811 units total. Mr. Storch stated his client believes that the area should be Ormond Beach. He explained that they are working on a plan that would

reduce the 811 units to 278 units. If able to work out the ISBA and work in Ormond Beach, restrictions would be placed in the Comprehensive Plan with plans to work with Volusia County staff for compliancy with their wetland standards.

Board discussion ensued regarding if the homes were vacant or not and if it was determined that there may be one or two homes.

Audience Comments

Mr. Tom Gaynor, 22 Rocky Bluff Drive, Ormond Lakes Homeowners' Association (HOA), commented that there is a lot of development in the corridor which creates more water and stormwater movement downhill. He added that Ormond lakes is the last stop before the estuaries. Mr. Gaynor explained the provided map he distributed to the Board that included Ridge Haven and explained how it will send water to the area. He added that Total Comfort's construction also send water to the ditches and then to his neighborhood area. Mr. Gaynor noted that it goes across Pine Run and then into a small lake at the end of his property. He advised that staff assured him that it will not be a problem and the water will hit the lake and go into the estuaries. He commented that when water backs up that there is nowhere for the water to go and how it goes around the back of the homes and into their big lake. Mr. Gaynor remarked that the area has had a lot of water lately and how it bypasses the existing spillways, creating erosion on the lake that has to be repaired. He added that they are also receiving water from Plantation Oaks, the south land area, and Stor-it into the Pine Run lakes and eventually in Ormond Lakes. Mr. Gaynor expressed his concern with future development increasing the water, and the affect that it has on stormwater and the money their HOA already spent to keep the lakes clear.

Mr. Briley asked Mr. Spraker about the status of the two projects discussed in the past that were planned to help alleviate the water issue. Mr. Spraker replied that there was a predevelopment condition when Ormond Lakes was built with the subdivision accepting offsite water. As each of the projects develop they are required to demonstrate that they are not discharging any more water than they were in the predevelopment condition. Mr. Spraker reiterated that the topic at hand is the amendment of the interlocal agreement. Information was provided to Ormond Lakes and the HOA regarding maintenance issues taking place in Ormond Grande that are the responsibility of the HOA.

Attorney Hayes explained that what is currently being asked is to expand the footprint of the ISBA area and how there is no development proposal. Whether the property comes within the city's jurisdiction or the county's jurisdiction is going to have to undergo some development application. He expounded on the history of the ISBA and how there were problems with the county's developments along the north U.S. Highway 1 corridor, with Cheaters, The Outlaws Group and other businesses. In over a year and a half period the issues resulted in a joint planning service area agreement which is beneficial in how it gives authority to the city to regulate lands that may be situated in the unincorporated county and bring them in under the city's umbrella to give more control for development purposes. Attorney Hayes commented that it has worked well and has cleaned that area up with more still yet to go. He elaborated on how it enables the staff to have more regulatory jurisdiction over these kinds of issues. He explained that the discussion should stay true to the application with a recommendation to the City Commission. When a development

application is in and the City Commission agrees to expand the footprint, the City would then have to annex land and consider the development application and that is when it is time for other inquiries.

Chairman Thomas proposed coming back with the stormwater suggestions at the appropriate time.

Mr. Charles Genter, 58 Indian Head Drive, Ormond Lakes HOA, remarked that based on Attorney Hayes suggestion, they will be back.

Mr. Scudiero assured Mr. Gaynor that Mr. Storch will work with them. He stated that he does not see the negative in the amendment and commented on how the City's standards are second-to-none in good ways for the developers and residents. It's preferable that the City of Ormond Beach's density and standards be used if the property was eventually to be located in Ormond Beach.

Ms. Tolland concurred with Mr. Scudiero on Ormond's high standard of oversight and development.

Ms. Shull concurred and inquired if the property owners have a say-so in the project. Mr. Spraker replied that they were noticed on the application with letters sent to all property owners. He continued that when it moves forward they will maintain the same density whether they are in or outside of the city. They will have similar land use and zoning that they have in the county. It will be City R-4 versus County R-4. They have the opportunity to speak at public meetings. The access will not be restricted to their properties and they will likely be improved with paved roads and utilities closer to their lot.

Mr. Spraker stated that the enclaves are not required to annex. They can keep the county millage rate if they desire to. The City does not force annexation until the utility connection is made, as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code (LDC).

Mr. Galloway remarked on one of the agenda's votes today, individual property rights, and how he is a believer of them. He expressed interest in hearing from the ten property owners in the development that will also be affected. He concluded that he agrees with the second amendment of the ISBA area in the City of Ormond Beach for the decision making and not the County.

Mr. Jorczak concurred with having the areas discussed in the ISBA under the City of Ormond Beach and believes it is a long-term benefit for the property owners, as well as beneficial for the city, making it easier for the land owners to operate in a more favorable, controlled environment.

Mr. Briley stated that the area being part of the ISBA allows the City to annex the properties that want to be annexed. He noted that the benefit regarding the water situation is that with the annexation there would be one jurisdiction (City) to deal with instead of two (County and City).

Chairman Thomas concurred. He asked if it is a state law that water cannot affect someone else's property. Mr. Briley remarked that it is in the code.

Mr. Gaynor commented that the developers agree to anything because they are gone in six years. They agreed to the development 20 years ago and he expressed frustration that now the HOA is responsible for the maintenance and stormwater system that is not going to be adequate for all of the development that is taking place. He commented that Planning staff is wonderful but the developers are gone and the HOA has the water issue.

Ms. Tolland motioned to approve ISBA 2021-100 – North U.S. 1 Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement (ISBA) second amendment – Ridge Haven. Mr. Scudiero seconded it. Vote was called, and the motion was approved (7-0).

Mr. Spraker stated that Volusia County also has to consent to the ISBA amendment if approved by the City Commission, with the County Council needing to take action on approving or denying the amendment.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Jorczak stated that at the last Flagler County Council meeting they approved an 1,800 home addition to the Hunter's Ridge development and there was discussion on how they are going to handle the traffic. Mr. Spraker explained that in the early 1990s there were two development orders issued, one in the City of Ormond Beach and one in Flagler County and it was a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) where they had a traffic study and required certain improvements and had to pay Volusia County impact fees as one of the conditions. He continued that there were certain improvements that the DRI included. As long as they're within the DRI, the number of proposed dwelling units are part of the overall development that was approved in the 1990s. Mr. Spraker added that there is not a lot of vacant land left in Ormond Beach and it forces the demand to where there is vacant land which is Hunter's Ridge, Flagler County.

Attorney Hayes concurred with Mr. Spraker and reiterated information about the two development orders issued by the State of Florida in a litigated forum. One is Hunter's Ridge, Flagler County, and the other is Hunters Ridge, Ormond Beach. The Hunters Ridge in Ormond Beach is built out as municipalities are in the business of providing utilities. The Hunters Ridge in Flagler County was slow to develop because they did not have the abilities or facilities that the City of Ormond Beach has. It took many years for Flagler County and city officials to discuss those issues. Approximately in 2015-2016 the City and Flagler County entered into an interlocal boundary agreement that allows the City to provide water to utilities to Flagler County. As part of the development order there are certain conditions that were mandated by the State. The Ormond Beach DRI and Flagler County DRI were identical. In 2010 the ownership of Hunters Ridge, which changed over time, the then owner asked Flagler County to amend the Flagler County DRI with substantial changes. Traffic, concurrency, transportation corridors including Flagler County, State Road 40, Airport Road, Williamson Boulevard, Nova Road, and Clyde Morris Boulevard, were also discussed. The developers were also directed to coordinate with Flagler County, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Volusia County. The Legislature repealed the DRI Statute several years ago. Attorney Hayes noted that there is coordination between staff at Flagler County, Volusia County and Ormond Beach on some of the development occurring in the Flagler County area as the City provides the utilities. He stated that it is hard to gauge the impact on traffic

and concurrency is going to be as well as what the developer has done with Flagler County and the Department of Transportation (DOT), but that the City does their best to monitor the best way they can.

Mr. Jorczak commented that it was stated that there was going to be 1,800 homes and the original order was to be phased and now is out the window but the commission gave them the go-ahead with the proposal, therefore the development will happen quickly. He reiterated how it would be beneficial to see that information and impact in advance. Attorney Hayes remarked that initially the developments were proposed to occur at the same time but they are usually done in phases. The best that can be done is for the City to try their best to identify the capacity issue in terms of roads, utilities and their impacts and plan for them.

Mr. Galloway stated that there are only approximately 12 empty lots on the beachside to build a house on unless a lot is chosen to tear the house down, therefore the only place for growth is out off of U.S. Highway 1 or State Road 40. He commented that few are Florida natives and there is going to be growth unless the building construction issues and increased prices stop it. Mr. Galloway added that someone offered \$40,000.00 for a paper lot that used to be sold for \$8,000.00 to \$15,000.00.

Chairman Thomas remarked that he is not against growth but does not want to create another Avalon Park north.

Mr. Galloway added that Ormond Crossings is putting in another 3,000 houses and with State Road 40 and the increase in houses going up out west, there could be an additional 10,000 houses. Housing developments off of Clyde Morris Boulevard in Daytona Beach are full. He claimed that although prices of homes today, including labor and material, could slow things down and reiterated that the City of Ormond Beach is growing.

Mr. Jorczak commented that the area is still half the price of what California and New York housing markets are.

Mr. Briley remarked that he and Ms. Shull as commercial real estate professionals, see a thousand people moving to Florida per day. He noted that they are working with several out-of-town buyers.

Ms. Tolland asked Mr. Spraker about Ridge Haven and the ISBA amendment and if all properties include sewer upon annexation as well. Mr. Spraker replied that sewer is required except for large lots that do not have a reasonable access of a sewer connection. One example is the property at North Tymber Creek where there is no water and sewer availability past Southern Pines. He concluded that Plantation Oaks, Ridge Haven, and Tattersall subdivisions will all be on city sewer.

X. MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Briley mentioned that he and Mr. Galloway will be out of town during next month's scheduled Planning Board meeting and inquired about moving the meeting date up to the week prior. Discussion occurred and it was decided to move the Planning Board meeting to November 4th.

Mr. Jorczak asked if AT&T is putting a cellular tower up on the west side of the airport on Pineland Road. Mr. Spraker replied that there are no current applications in on it.

Mr. Galloway expressed his condolences to Mr. Scudiero concerning the passing of his friend, Mr. Marc Bernier, radio talk show host, WNDB.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Steven Spraker, Planning Director

ATTEST:


Doug Thomas, Chairman

Minutes transcribed by Marcella Miller.