
A regular meeting of the City of Daytona Beach Planning Board was held on Thursday, October 25, 2007, at 6:00 PM in City Hall Commission Chambers, 301 S. Ridgewood Ave., Daytona Beach, Florida.

Board members Present were as follows:

Anita Gallentine
Bob Hoitsma
Jeff Hurt
Larry Moore
James Neal
Sam Rogers
Edith Shelley
Cathy Washington

Absent Members:

Janet Lesage
John McGhee
Kenneth Woods

Staff members present:

Mrs. Cheryl Harrison-Lee, Chief Administrative Officer
Mrs. Belinda Collins, Principal Planner
Mr. Reed Berger, Redevelopment Director
Mrs. Marie Hartman, Deputy City Attorney
Ms. Rose Askew, Assistant City Clerk

1. **Call to Order**

Edith Shelley, Chair called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2. **Roll Call**

Ms. Washington called the roll and noted members present as listed above.

3. **Approval of the Minutes: July 26, 2007 and August 2, 2007, August 23, 2007 and September 27, 2007**

Edith Shelley had one (1) correction to the September 27, 2007 meeting minutes. She stated on page 20 of the September 27, 2007 meeting minutes the discussion the Planning Board had was never their intention to take out the verbiage "around the bridges." She stated at the City Commission Meeting there appeared to be some confusion on what the Planning Board's intention was. Mrs. Shelley stated it was supposed to be "around the bridges and from Glenview Boulevard to Oakridge." She stated what the board was trying to clarify was that the area from Glenview to Oakridge was further than what they defined as around the bridges. She stated the consensus of the Planning Board was not to take away but to add in the Glenview to Oakridge in that part of the policy.

Board Motion

It was moved by Mr. Hurt to adopt the July 26, 2007, August 2, 2007, August 23, 2007 and September 27, 2007 Planning Board Meeting Minutes, with changes as stated. Seconded by Mr. Moore.

Board Action

The motion was unanimously approved (7-to-0).

4. **SITE PLAN, DAYTONA KENNEL CLUB, DEV 2007-066**

A request by Mr. Robert Merrell, Esquire, of Cobb & Cole, on behalf of the North Delaware Land Acquisition Company, Inc. for an amendment to the existing PCD (Planned Commercial Development).

Staff Presentation

Belinda Collins, Principal Planner gave a detailed report. She stated this project was originally heard by the Planning Board in October 2006 and approved by the City Commission in January 2007. It rezoned the site from M2 (Light Manufacturing) to PCD (Planned Commercial Development). The current land use designation permits a number of uses including light industrial office, retail, multi-family and public school. She stated the site is located along Williamson and Bellevue with the airport to the northeast and the Flea Market on the other side of Interstate 95 to the west. The site plan included a 30,000 square foot entertainment facility and 11,000 square feet of offices. The amendment adds 3,640 square feet of customer service area to the entertainment facility and a canopy for the pad area, which is where the dogs are housed. It also adds the new tote board behind the track. Additional landscape has been added to accommodate the increased building area. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Hoitsma stated he noticed they added in other uses that were not in the original agreement one (1) of which is hotel/motel and retail sales and services. He stated he is assuming the uses only apply to the new parcel. He then asked if they apply to the entire area.

Mrs. Collins replied yes it applies to the entire area.

Mr. Hoitsma asked if they wanted to open it up for a motel on Williamson.

Mrs. Shelley asked the applicant to address Mr. Hoitsma's question.

Michael Woods, with the law firm of Cobb and Cole, 150 Magnolia Avenue, on behalf of the applicant stated he had a slide presentation if the board was interested but to address Mr. Hoitsma's question the amendment did not add any new uses. The uses were already provided for within the first development agreement that was approved by the board in October 2006 and by the City Commission in January 2007. He stated the amendment would only increase the square footage of the main facility by 3,640 square feet, adding the tote board on the track and the canopy for the pad area.

Mr. Hoitsma stated he was confused because it looked like the original agreement did not have hotel/motel or retail sales/service. He stated he believed it had sales that would be applied to the facility itself but not outside.

Mr. Moore stated he did not recall seeing hotel/motel either.

Mr. Hoitsma stated he did not see it in the notes and it does not appear to be in there. He stated it actually says all uses included on the dog track parcel and then seems to add in those other four (4).

Mr. Woods read for the record, the part of the recorded agreement that listed the various land uses on the site.

Mr. Neal arrived at 6:06 p.m.

Mrs. Shelley asked board members if they were interested in seeing the slide presentation or if they were comfortable with the applicant's presentation.

It was the consensus of the board that they were comfortable with the applicant's presentation and did not need to see the slide presentation.

Mr. Moore asked the applicant if they were planning on building a hotel/motel and if so where did they plan to put it.

Mr. Woods replied at this time there were no plans for a hotel/motel. He stated the hotel/motel use is for the out-parceled properties included in the original PCD agreement.

Mrs. Shelley opened the floor for citizen comments. She asked anyone speaking to complete the Public Speaking forms and place them in the box for the record.

Citizen Comments

John Nicholson, 413 North Grandview Avenue, Daytona Beach spoke against the item. He asked if the garage was tied to the addition; he asked for the definition of out parcel, its size and location. He stated the last time he was present he listened very carefully and he did not recall hotel/motel and the word outparcel.

Mr. Woods stated as to the parking question the original PCD agreement tied the parking based upon the present use of the existing facility, which is located next door to the Speedway on International Speedway Boulevard based upon historic use. The development agreement provides for the parking spaces and that is not being changed with this application. The agreement ties the parking spaces to an average use not to exceed 400 per day. He stated there are provisions for overflow parking as well utilizing recycled asphalt pavement. In addition, not creating an asphalt field qualifies his company for LEED points for conservation.

Mrs. Shelley asked Mr. Woods to answer the question on the out-parcel by showing Mr. Nicholson

where it was on the map. She stated the out parcel was not a part of the discussion tonight.

Ms. Gallentine stated the artist renderings were some of the most beautiful renderings she had ever seen.

Board Motion

It was moved by Mr. Hurt to approve Site Plan, Daytona Kennel Club, DEV 2007-066. Seconded by Mr. Rogers.

Board Action

The motion was unanimously approved (8-to-0).

LARGE SCALE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

5. **WATER SUPPLY PLAN UPDATE, DEV 2007-162**

The City is required to adopt a Water Supply Work Plan that is firmly linked to the St. Johns River Water Management District's Regional Water Supply Plan by April 2008. The plan outlines the availability of water supplies and the ability to meet projected water use demands. The plan is required to identify alternative water supply projects, including conservation and reuse, necessary to meet the water needs of the City.

James Thurrott, Water Utilities Manager stated basically the report was all good news. He stated the Water Supply Plan is an element that the state is requiring to be approved by April 10, 2008. The state requires local governments to prepare the plan to align itself with the Regional Water Supply Plans. The St. Johns River Water Management District passed their Regional Water Supply Master Plan in February 2006, which set the clock ticking for the April 10, 2008 deadline. He stated Comprehensive Plan Amendments are prepared that integrate water supply, conservation and water reuse into various elements of the Plan. The board will be asked next month to recommend approval of the Water Supply Work Plan and Comprehensive Plan Amendments. Mr. Thurrott further stated there is sufficient water capacity to serve projected demand beyond 2025. The City's well field capacity is adequate beyond 2025 and no new wells have been constructed in 17 years. The Consumptive Use Permit (CUP) allocation is 16.16 MGD, which is sufficient to serve the population well beyond 2011, when the current CUP expires. Mr. Thurrott stated projects are underway to further extend adequacy of well field to include expansion of the reuse system, additional system storage of reuse and ASR. Greater focus will be given to water conservation and reuse. He further stated the water plant pumping capacity is adequate beyond 2025 and customer demand for reuse water is increasing and will approach the supply available in the future. Expansion of some portions of the wastewater treatment plant will be necessary by 2020 to accommodate growth in demand for reuse water and that \$27 million is recommended to improve reuse capacity.

Mr. Hoitsma clarified his understanding of how Mr. Thurrott made his assumptions. He stated he believed Mr. Thurrott made his assumptions based upon what he thinks the population will be in the future.

Mr. Thurrott stated that is correct and that they are also based on the fact that the City will pump out as much water as it does now.

Mr. Hoitsma asked if there were any conditions that could occur to affect the amount of water available for pumping. He stated he did not understand well enough whether large amounts of water that are not available anymore affect the aquifer because his understanding is the aquifer runs all the way down from Georgia to Florida.

Mr. Thurrott replied certainly and there are always unexpected occurrences. One of the major differences between surface water supplies and groundwater supplies is the susceptibility of surface water supplies to conditions like drought conditions. He stated they are almost as serious as flooding conditions, which bring unexpected contaminants in the water supply. One of the defining characteristics in ground water supplies is they are very consistent. He stated they may slowly change over time but they are not subject to the rapid changes that happen with the surface supply water. Mr. Thurrott stated a concern with ground water supply throughout Florida has always been the threat of salt-water intrusion and the City has established quite an elaborate monitoring network to give the earliest warning signal possible should that develop in the future. At the current time salt water intrusion is not a threat and we are very fortunate.

Mr. Hoitsma stated he thought salt-water intrusion was a problem. He stated some of the people living along the beach who pump water out of the ground were having problems with their grass dying because there was salt in the water but evidently that may not be accurate.

Mr. Woods stated from the areas that they are pumping that can be a problem.

Mr. Moore asked if salt-water intrusion had moved back over so many years.

Mr. Thurrott replied most of the information they have at this point is anecdotal and unfortunately they do not have really good records from the 50's and 60's. He stated the City use to have a well field along the Adams Street area and although they do not have data their understanding is that salt-water intrusion became a problem but at the same time a concern over salt-water intrusion in those years was any increase in salinity of content in the water. Today it is looked at differently. The salinity content of wells today is extremely low enough to where it is almost shocking to some other communities. He stated if they see a slight increase they become concerned.

Mr. Hoitsma asked what was approximately the difference in the cost of water from water taken from the salt water.

Mr. Thurrott replied 10 times is a good place to start. He stated desalination processes or a number of different processes could be chosen from. They are pretty expensive relative to the cost of treating water today. He stated it is probably important to note that when you talk about desalination you are probably not talking about withdrawing water directly from the ocean. There are so many confounding contamination problems associated with that that it is much more likely they would look at desalination from brackish water and depending on the level of salinity of the

brackish water the cost is really proportionate. Mr. Thurrott stated one of the things they will learn from the ASR project, which is underway is just how salty the water is at very deep levels.

Mr. Moore asked the effect of the concentration on reuse water going through sprinkler systems; does reuse water eventually get back to the aquifer and if so how does it affect the quality of the water.

Mr. Thurrott replied the reuse water quality is basically drinking water quality. He stated there is very little chemically to distinguish one from the other. One of the reasons why they strongly recommend against drinking reuse water directly is because the monitoring does not take place at the same frequency as it does with drinking water to daily ensure the water is safe. Reuse water monitoring is much more infrequent.

Mr. Hoitsma stated he hopes the City does not let up on conservation because it has enough water supply to last through 2025.

Mr. Moore referenced a statement on page six (6). He feels the statement is disingenuous and feels it has been the case for many years. He stated Daytona Beach without a doubt was the City that broke WAV apart. They had about four (4) concerns, two (2) of them he feels were concerns that could have been addressed and should have been resolved. He stated Daytona Beach has superior water facilities and feel most of the surrounding cities would agree.

Mr. Thurrott stated he feels it was intended to refer to WAV's previous incarnations. The original water co-op ...

Ms. Gallentine stated she had a few questions but wanted to say she did not read through the entire report. She asked about the \$27 million that will be needed for capital improvements over the next few years. She asked if it would come from funds that exist through people paying their water bills or would there be some kind of special voter referendum.

Mr. Thurrott stated that figure was the total that was identified from the Reuse Master Plan as needs. He does not believe all the sources of the money have been identified.

Ms. Gallentine stated she always thought Daytona Beach water was exceptional but she has noticed in the last couple of years the quality to her does not appear to be as high as it once was. She asked if there was any indication that the quality was not as high as it once was.

Mr. Thurrott stated that was an interesting question and they do have data that goes back to the late 40's and early 50's that reflect the quality as identical to what it was 60 years ago. He stated depending on where you live and where the water main may be routed from that serves your particular house may have been in the pipe a while and may not be the same quality as a neighbor one (1) block away. He stated it is difficult to predict.

Citizen Comments

John Nicholson, 413 North Grandview Avenue referenced 10 years ago when Cary Smith was here the City was going to sell excess reuse water to New Smyrna Beach. He stated a couple of years later there was a shortage. He asked where all the reuse water went because as far as he knows the City does not have a plan to put reuse water in all of its redevelopments. He further stated approximately nine (9) years ago there was a program to switch out old toilets and showerheads in the inner City because they were three (3) gallon per flush. It was estimated the City could save approximately 10 years worth of water by switching them out. He then spoke on land acquisition out west and a plan for putting reuse pipes in new developments.

Mr. Moore stated he saw in the backup where new development is required to install reuse water, which is excellent. He asked if there were any plans to get reuse water in other parts of the City. He stated if they could get reuse water for their sprinkler system that would be a big plus.

Mr. Thurrott stated all new development is required to put in reuse lines west of Jimmy Ann Drive, which would include the LPGA and Bayberry areas. He stated Pelican Bay is a tough situation. He stated they have heard a lot of interest on the part of the homeowners to have reuse water available to them. The consultant looked into it a couple of years ago and determined the problem was in the cost of routing the transmission lines through established neighborhoods.

There was additional lengthy discussion concerning reuse water in the Pelican Bay area.

Mr. Thurrott then answered Mr. Nicholson's question regarding changing out old toilets and showerheads. He stated the program involving the toilets is a continuing program. What the City has offered is a rebate to any City customer that wishes to replace a high volume with a high efficiency toilet. The rebate is applied as a credit on the person's water bill. He stated that program is still in effect. The showerhead replacement program was a one-time situation where a lot of showerheads were purchased and distributed to the Utilities Department who in turn distributed them to citizens until they were all gone. Mr. Thurrott stated the City has a joint well field purchase area just west of town but formal plans have not been made for the land. He stated to Mr. Nicholson that he was correct; in some areas the recharge rate is much higher.

Mr. Rogers asked how the City informs residents about the rebate program.

Mr. Thurrott stated the information is at the front office in the water-billing department, which is where most of the inquiries come. He stated they could do a better job of getting the word out to residents.

Ms. Gallentine suggested putting it on the water bill.

Mr. Moore stated he guesses a lot of that activity will come from what is left of WAV. He stated he hopes to see some more programs come forward from other cities.

Mr. Thurrott stated one of the strong points of WAV currently is they have a conservation coordinator who in turn has a budget to work with each of the cities. She has approached each of the member utilities to identify what the most effective water conservation programs may be.

Mrs. Shelley stated this is for discussion only. It will be on the agenda next month.

Other Business

Downtown/Balough Road Redevelopment Report

Mrs. Shelley reported the board met on October 16, 2007 at 12:00 noon. There were no items on the agenda for action, only discussion items. She stated she was not able to attend the meeting so she had no report.

Midtown Redevelopment Area Board Report

Mr. Rogers reported the board met Tuesday, October 9, 2007 at 6:30 pm. They heard a report from the Police Department, Code Enforcement and the Redevelopment Department. The Redevelopment Department gave an update on the CRA audit, the ISB project for Midtown logo, Hope VI projects on South Street, ISB and Mary McLeod Bethune Boulevard. The overview on Corridor Studies was postponed for a workshop.

Main Street/South Atlantic Redevelopment Board Report

No report given.

Vision Committee Report

Mrs. Shelley stated they have had some wonderful meetings. Two (2) meetings ago the committee was hosted by Bethune-Cookman University (BCU) at their Center for Civic Engagement. She stated there were representatives from BCU's Student Government Association, Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (ERAU) Student Government and representatives from Daytona Beach College (DBC). The representatives participated in the committee's discussion and were very excited about the inclusivity of the vision process. The main discussion was government: how citizens can become more involved; what citizens feel is lacking, what citizens would like to see and how to incorporate these things into a vision for the community. The last meeting was one (1) week ago Monday and they had an economic vision report from the Community Action Team. Mrs. Shelley feels the report was very good. She stated the committee is revising the report and trying to get some bullet points from it to put into a written vision type form. The next Steering Committee meeting will be November 12, 2007 at 6:00 pm at the Schnebly Center. The committee will address concerns related to quality of life and possibly some land use issues that are of concern to the community. Mrs. Shelley stated she met with the new Chamber director and different community leaders trying to make sure the committee is on track with the issues they want to see brought forward and they will come forward with a document that the community will not only support but also help move forward and implement. She stated she had the privilege of attending the Florida Redevelopment Conference here in town where she received great information. She stated it was very encouraging because a lot of communities are really going through a lot of the same issues even with their visioning plan process. That is encouraging to her because she realizes the

committee appears to be doing the right thing.

Staff Comments

Mr. Hoitsma complimented Mrs. Shelley on a great job representing the Planning Board at the last City Commission Meeting.

Ms. Gallentine stated she received a call from Mrs. Dot Bolding who was concerned about a notice she received from Attorney Jim Morris regarding a street vacation request on Lenox. She stated Mrs. Bolding is older and was quite upset because she thought the Planning Board had addressed the street vacation issue, which it has and voted no on it. She did not know why she was receiving notice from Mr. Morris on behalf of Mr. Morrison. She stated a week ago she asked Mrs. Collins what the status of it was because Mrs. Bolding has had to hire an attorney because she is afraid this item could come back. Ms. Gallentine stated Mrs. Collins told her the item could not come back but she would like to know what the procedure was if Mr. Morrison wanted to pursue it again in front of the Planning Board. She asked once the board says no does he have a year to and then he can reapply or is it no forever.

Mrs. Collins no, there is a specific time frame before he can come apply again but what she was referring to in terms of the letter was another action similar to that one. He is preparing to present another request for the board. Mrs. Collins stated she thinks he has been in conversations with the neighbor and have come to an agreement on what is going to happen with that. She stated staff has not received all of the information but they have begun putting something together to present.

Ms. Gallentine asked if he could come back through his attorney and asks for a street vacation again.

Mrs. Collins replied she does not believe for the same area. She stated there are some nuances in his request but she could not explain them because she did not have the paperwork.

Marie Hartman, Deputy City Attorney stated she was looking at the board's by-laws and the limitation in the by-laws is 120 days but that is from the date the denial of the request for amendment of the zoning map. She stated she did not see it addressed elsewhere except a rezoning.

Mr. Moore stated he just wanted to thank The City of Daytona Beach and Florida Redevelopment Association (FRA) for their generous offer to allow the board members to attend the FRA meeting. He stated it was extremely informative and gave him an appreciation for a lot of what staff goes through. He stated there are computer programs that will simulate what a new development will look like so the board can get a visual of the project. He stated someone not with the City informed him that currently this is a requirement of Daytona Beach with higher structures but he stated he has not seen anything other than the artist sketches. Mr. Moore stated there has been a lot of change in the Planning Department and maybe that is something that was dropped. He stated if it hasn't he would like to start seeing that.

Mr. Rogers employed Mrs. Shelley to urge the Planning Department to pursue this issue.

Mrs. Shelley stated she has spoken about this with Mayor Ritchey and he is very supportive. She stated she has told him that the Planning Board has been asking continually for a program like that so they are able to see development. It would be easier for the board as well as the community. She

suggested a motion to get full board consensus on staff obtaining 3D visual on screen programming to show potential projects.

Mr. Moore asked if it would be the responsibility of someone making the presentation or the responsibility of staff. He stated to his understanding it takes a staff person approximately three (3) days to put it together once they have the connections and they go to another program to put scale there that comes back to this program and sets it right in so you would have a finished product.

Mrs. Shelley asked if it was the consensus of the board to direct planning staff to implement some sort of a program that will show the 3D visual on the computer screen to look at projects when they come forward.

Board members replied yes.

Mrs. Shelley stated everyone should have received a reminder of the remainder of the 2007 meeting schedule. She stated for the record make sure you note the November meeting is scheduled for November 15, 2007 because of the Thanksgiving Holiday and the December meeting is December 13, 2007 because of the Christmas Holiday. She asked all board members to make the change on their calendars.

Proposed 2008 Planning Board Meeting Schedule

Board Motion

It was moved by Mr. Hoitsma to approve the 2008 Planning Board Meeting Schedule. Seconded by Mr. Moore.

Board Action

The motion was unanimously approved (8-to-0).

Adjournment

There being no further actions to come before the board, the meeting was adjourned at 7:17 pm.

EDITH SHELLEY
Chair

ATTEST:

CATHY WASHINGTON
Secretary