City of Ormond Beach

City Commission Meeting

City Hall Commission Chambers

22 South Beach St., Ormond Beach FL 32174

March 24, 2026, 7:00 PM

Jason Leslie, Mayor
Lori Tolland, Zone 1
Travis Sargent, Zone 2
Kristin Deaton, Zone 3
Harold Briley, Zone 4

Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Leslie called the meeting to order at 07:00 PM.

Present: Mayor Jason Leslie, Commissioners Lori Tolland, Travis Sargent, Kristin Deaton, and Harold Briley, City Manager Joyce Shanahan, City Attorney Randy Hayes, Assistant City Managers Claire Whitley and Shawn Finley, and City Clerk Susan Dauderis.

2. INVOCATION

Rabbi Stanton Zamek, Temple Beth-El, provided the invocation.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Leslie led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. AUDIENCE REMARKS - REGARDING ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA & ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. David Juhl, 2040 Toni Street, discussed required testing at the Ormond Beach Municipal Airport and the response he received from city staff regarding his questions. He explained he submitted a public records request regarding the topic, noting it appeared no testing was completed. He requested the City Commission direct staff to stop all work until all laws and statutes were complied with.

Mayor Leslie requested Assistant City Manager Shawn Finley reach out to Mr. Juhl to discuss the matter.

Commissioner Sargent requested staff provide an update on the matter by the end of the next business day.

Ms. Jennifer Bright, PO Box 62, voiced concerns regarding the workshop from March 3, 2026, and provided suggestions on budget reform where tax dollars could be cut. She discussed the importance of the residents' opinions in the budget process.

Ms. Suzanne Scheiber, 548 Sandy Oaks Boulevard, thanked the Commission for their letter of support for Volusia Forever. She provided an update on the Volusia Forever program from a recent Volusia County Council meeting. She invited residents and the Commission to an upcoming event that highlighted the program and land conservation.

Ms. Catherine Pante, Exempt Address, discussed the importance of land conservation and thanked the Commission for their letter of support for Volusia Forever.

Ms. Marsha Blew, 12 Honey Bear Path, discussed the Tomoka Oaks neighborhood and proposed development. She voiced concerns regarding the transparency of airport zoning impacts on neighboring communities. She reviewed concerns regarding an expansion of the Ormond Beach Municipal Airport, Airport Master Plan, and priority of residents' concerns.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes from City Commission meeting - March 3, 2026

Mayor Leslie advised the minutes from the March 3, 2026, City Commission meeting were sent to the Commission for review and posted on the city's website for public viewing. He asked if there were any corrections, additions, or omissions. He stated, hearing no corrections, the minutes would stand approved as presented.

Commissioner Briley moved, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, for approval of the March 3, 2026, City Commission meeting minutes.

Motion passed by voice vote.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Leslie advised the actions proposed for the items on the Consent Agenda were so stated on the agenda. He asked if any member of the Commission had questions or wished to discuss any items separately and requested Item 6F be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Deaton requested Item 6A be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Sargent moved, seconded by Commissioner Tolland, for approval of the Consent Agenda, absent Items 6A and 6F.

Call Vote:	Commissioner Tolland	Yes
	Commissioner Sargent	Yes
	Commissioner Deaton	Yes
	Commissioner Briley	Yes
Carried.	Mayor Leslie	Yes

B. Bid Award - City Hall Access Control

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-33: A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF EMPIRE COMPUTING AND CONSULTING, INC. REGARDING THE FACILITIES ACCESS CONTROL PROJECT; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AN AGREEMENT AND PAYMENT THEREFOR; REJECTING ALL OTHER PROPOSALS; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

C. Bid Award - Lime Sludge Hauling

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-34: A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING A BID FROM JOE DIRT, INC. FOR LIME SLUDGE HAULING AND DISPOSAL SERVICES, UNDER BID NO. 2026-11; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT AND PAYMENT THEREFOR; REJECTING ALL OTHER BIDS; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

D. RFP Award - Fireworks Display

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-35: A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF FIREWORKS BY SANTORE, INC. REGARDING A FIREWORKS DISPLAY; GRANTING A LIMITED WAIVER FROM THE CITY'S MINIMUM INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS; ACCEPTING A CERTIFICATE OF GENERAL LIABILITY INSURANCE; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT; REJECTING ALL OTHER PROPOSALS; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

E. Fleming Avenue Pump Station Reassessment and Bidding Services

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-36: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SOLE SOURCE PROCUREMENT OF ENGINEERING SERVICES FROM MEAD & HUNT, INC. REGARDING THE FLEMING AVENUE PUMP STATION REASSESSMENT PROJECT; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A WORK AUTHORIZATION; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

G. Ormond Beach Sports Complex Stormwater Expansion Additional Work

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-38: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF ADDITIONAL WORK NUMBER ONE (1) TO THAT CONTRACT AWARDED TO GPS CIVIL CONSTRUCTION, INC. REGARDING THE SPORTS COMPLEX STORMWATER RETENTION EXPANSION PROJECT, BY INCREASING THE CONTRACT PRICE BY $91,351.14; INCREASING THE CONTRACT TIME BY 189 DAYS; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

H. Volusia Multi-Jurisdictional Program for Public Information Plan (Floodplain Management)

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-39: A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COMMISSION ADOPTING THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM, COMMUNITY RATING SYSTEM, 2025 MULTIJURISDICTIONAL PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION PLAN, AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

I. Design and Bidding Services Western Storage Tank and Pump Station

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-40: A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING A PROPOSAL FROM MEAD & HUNT, INC., TO PROVIDE DESIGN AND BIDDING SERVICES REGARDING THE WESTERN STORAGE TANK AND PUMP STATION PROJECT; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A WORK AUTHORIZATION THERETO; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

J. Design and Bidding Services Western Wastewater Treatment Plant Equalization Basin and Master Lift Station

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-41: A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING A PROPOSAL FROM MEAD & HUNT, INC., TO PROVIDE DESIGN AND BIDDING SERVICES REGARDING THE WESTERN WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT EQUALIZATION BASIN AND MASTER LIFT STATION PROJECT; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A WORK AUTHORIZATION THERETO; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

K. Yellowstone Landscape Athletic Field Maintenance Contract Amendment

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-42: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AN AMENDMENT AND RESTATEMENT OF AGREEMENT FOR ATHLETIC FIELD MAINTENANCE SERVICES WITH AUSTIN OUTDOOR, LLC D/B/A YELLOWSTONE LANDSCAPE; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

L. Yellowstone Landscape Grounds Maintenance Contract Amendment

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-43: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AN AMENDMENT AND RESTATEMENT OF AGREEMENT FOR GROUNDS MAINTENANCE SERVICES WITH AUSTIN OUTDOOR, LLC D/B/A YELLOWSTONE LANDSCAPE; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AMENDMENT #1-2026 FOR ADDITIONAL SERVICES; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

M. City Attorney Office Lease Agreement

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-44: A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH ROOT EXECUTIVE PARK, LTD. REGARDING OFFICE SPACE FOR THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE STAFF; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

N. **Disposition Item:** City Manager's Monthly Report, March 2026

City Clerk Susan C. Dauderis read by legal title only:

A. FDOT Construction Agreement - Granada Sidewalks

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-24: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY AND THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REGARDING CONSTRUCTION OF SIDEWALKS ALONG DOWNTOWN GRANADA BOULEVARD; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Commissioner Briley moved, seconded by Commissioner Sargent, for approval of Resolution No. 2026-24, as read by title only.

Commissioner Deaton expressed concerns regarding the cost of the project. She explained understanding the costs were to bring the sidewalks to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) standards, suggesting FDOT pay for the project.

Mayor Leslie inquired if the project was required by FDOT, whereby, Mr. Shawn Finley, Assistant City Manager, explained FDOT did not initiate the project and provided the history of the project. He explained staff was proposing to bring the sidewalks to FDOT standards instead of the decorative sidewalks that were in place to allow for FDOT to take over the liability and maintenance of the sidewalks.

Commissioner Deaton inquired why the city chose the decorative sidewalk in the past; whereby, Mr. Finley stated it was one of the first beautification projects in the downtown area. He discussed the history of the decorative sidewalks.

Commissioner Tolland questioned if the project was a long-range plan to repair or replace the sidewalks with the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) funds;

whereby, Mr. Finley confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Briley highlighted the liability transferring to FDOT when the sidewalks return to FDOT standards.

Mayor Leslie discussed the condition of the sidewalk, noting liability concerns.

Call Vote:	Commissioner Sargent	Yes
	Commissioner Deaton	No
	Commissioner Briley	Yes
	Commissioner Tolland	Yes
Carried.	Mayor Leslie	Yes

City Clerk Susan C. Dauderis read by legal title only:

F. Ormond Beach Sports Complex Fields 11 & 12 LED Lighting

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-37: A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING A PROPOSAL FROM A.M. WEIGEL TO PROVIDE CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES REGARDING THE INSTALLATION OF LIGHT POLES AT FIELDS 11 AND 12 AT THE ORMOND BEACH SPORTS COMPLEX; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A WORK AUTHORIZATION THERETO; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Commissioner Sargent moved, seconded by Commissioner Deaton, for approval of Resolution No. 2026-37, as read by title only.

Mayor Leslie questioned if staff was able to secure additional funding as the grant applied for was not awarded to the city; whereby, Mr. Robert Carolin, Parks and Recreation Director, explained the funds would be used from the Parks and Recreation Impact Fee fund, which had dollars set aside for projects. Mr. Carolin noted the importance of the project.

Call Vote:	Commissioner Deaton	Yes
	Commissioner Briley	Yes
	Commissioner Tolland	Yes
	Commissioner Sargent	Yes
Carried.	Mayor Leslie	Yes

Commissioner Sargent discussed Item 6M regarding the City Attorney's Office Lease Agreement, questioning what would happen to the Ames House; whereby, Ms. Joyce Shanahan, City Manager, explained the mold remediation was ongoing.

Mr. Finley provided further details on the mold remediation at the property.

7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mayor Leslie opened the Public Hearings.

City Clerk Susan C. Dauderis read by legal title only:

A. Tomoka Reserve, Issuance of a Development Order (Second Reading)

ORDINANCE NO. 2023-55: AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION AND ISSUANCE OF A DEVELOPMENT ORDER FOR A PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT LOCATED AT 20 TOMOKA OAKS BOULEVARD, TO BE KNOWN AS THE “TOMOKA RESERVE” RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION; AUTHORIZING THE DEVELOPMENT OF 254 SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED LOTS; ESTABLISHING CONDITIONS AND EXPIRATION OF APPROVAL; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Commissioner Sargent moved, seconded by Commissioner Tolland, for approval of Ordinance No. 2023-55, on second reading, as read by title only.

Mr. Steven Spraker, Planning Director, reviewed the ordinance, history of the property, and the next steps in the process. He discussed the development order conditions, updated site plan, and the applicants’ proposed public improvements for infrastructure. He noted staff was recommending approval as all requirements were met for the development order.

Mayor Leslie inquired about past density and staff previously not recommending approval; whereby, Mr. Spraker stated the lots were reduced and irrigation provided to the buffer, noting those were the two issues staff had previously. Mayor Leslie questioned if staff heard from the property owner when they purchased the property regarding due diligence on the property; whereby, Mr. Spraker stated he did not recall.

Commissioner Tolland asked about soil testing and protection from airborne toxins; whereby, Mr. Spraker stated soil testing would be completed by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP).

Mayor Leslie questioned if soil testing was completed; whereby, Mr. Spraker stated he could not confirm what was completed in the soil study, noting he was aware there was communication between the applicant and FDEP. Mayor Leslie inquired if the city received information regarding the testing or studies completed by the applicant; whereby, Mr. Spraker stated the city would be provided with copies, noting the city could not withhold city permits based on state permits. Mayor Leslie asked when the city would be notified of the results of the study or testing; whereby, Mr. Spraker stated the city would be notified or could pull the results from the state, noting it would occur during the preliminary plat stage of the project.

Commissioner Tolland questioned how and when the residents would request for the space to remain an open-space zoning after being notified the PRD zoning expired; whereby, Mr. Spraker stated every property had a land use and zoning which came with certain entitlements, noting the city could not administratively change the land use or zoning as it could remove the entitlements. She inquired about the wildlife impacts and environmental studies; whereby, Mr. Spraker stated a preliminary study was completed, noting one would be completed before the preliminary plat stage. He reviewed the contractor's obligations regarding wildlife. She questioned the density calculation; whereby, Mr. Spraker reviewed the zoning regulations of the surrounding neighborhood, noting they had a split zoning and the open-space conservation did not allow for any density.

Mayor Leslie clarified there were no wetlands on the property; whereby, Mr. Spraker confirmed there were no wetlands in the project area.

Commissioner Tolland discussed concerns of the lot sizes and potential density if the zoning reverted to R-2; whereby, Mr. Spraker stated there were conceptual plans with around 300 homes.

Mayor Leslie inquired about if there were sidewalks proposed; whereby, Mr. Spraker indicated sidewalks would be required and discussed other required traffic improvements.

Commissioner Tolland reviewed the buffer levels; whereby, Mr. Spraker discussed what the buffer levels were, noting the buffer proposed was at a higher commercial level. She questioned if the emergency access was up to regulation; whereby, Mr. Spraker stated the Fire Department was part of the Site Plan Review Committee and approved the emergency access easement.

Commissioner Deaton clarified the emergency access would not be utilized during construction; whereby, Mr. Spraker confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Dennis Bayer, Tomoka Oaks Homeowners Association (HOA) Representative, requested the matter be remanded to the Planning Board and apologized to Mr. Randy Hayes, City Attorney, for the tension between them. He reviewed the HOA's concerns including HOA input, density, construction traffic, and increased traffic. He discussed the Commission's authority, buffer, and natural preservation. He requested the proposed development order language around the traffic light be modified.

Mr. Jeff Boyle, 614 North Halifax Drive, discussed concerns with the density and inaccurate statements made in the staff report for the project. He urged the Commission to vote no on the item.

Ms. Nancy Lohman, 80 North Halifax Drive, stated she did not hear support from any resident regarding the proposed project. She requested the Commission work towards a win-win for the residents and developer of the project, encouraging transparency. She reviewed concerns of the project.

Ms. Joni Hunt, 88 North Halifax Drive, requested the Commission vote no on the item, noting traffic, setbacks, buffer maintenance, and wildlife needed to be addressed.

Mr. Paul Mena, 9 Oakmont Circle, expressed concerns regarding residential growth in the neighborhood and Ormond Beach. He reviewed the issues regarding infrastructure impact and requested all analysis on the project's impact was completed before proceeding.

Mr. Shaune L Clark II, 21 Pine Valley Circle, voiced concerns regarding the proposed traffic light costs, noting its immediate importance. He explained the proposed emergency path would not meet minimum standards. He encouraged the Commission deny the proposed item.

Ms. Melissa Clark, 21 Pine Valley Circle, reviewed the comprehensive plan requirements and Senate Bill 180 restrictions. She highlighted residential developments already approved and the expected growth for the city. She discussed the mandates previously provided for the development. She stated the neighboring property owners were paying an incorrect amount for property taxes, reviewing the discrepancy.

Mr. Greg Gimbet, 255 Euclid Avenue, Daytona Beach, reviewed similarities to proposed developments in the City of Daytona Beach and reviewed issues with land use versus zoning. He stated the prior PRD development order with a density of 122 properties was the maximum the surrounding neighborhood could handle. He indicated it was worth fighting and encouraged the Commission to deny the project.

Ms. Susan Persis, 3 Tidewater Drive, discussed her history in the city, noting she was a Commissioner when the project came to the City Commission. She expressed support of the Tomoka Oaks residents and encouraged the Commission to listen to the residents' concerns regarding compatibility, character of the community, and open space.

Ms. Mary Greenlees, 94 North St. Andrews Drive, stated she did not agree with the legal advice previously provided to the Commissioners. She discussed online bullying and urged the Commission, if approving the item, to approve with conditions.

Ms. Bright expressed concerns regarding statements made regarding budgeting shortfalls, litigation costs, and outside legal counsel costs, noting the importance of fiscal transparency.

Mayor Leslie recessed the City Commission meeting at 8:33 PM.
Mayor Leslie reconvened the City Commission meeting at 8:47 PM.

Mr. Kirk Thrush, 1 Tomoka Oaks Boulevard unit 106, reviewed the developers' tactics and history of the project and encouraged the Commission to deny the project. He reviewed concerns of traffic and increased density.

Mr. Tyler Brown, 90 North St. Andrews Drive, reviewed concerns of reuse water shortage, buffer size, and density.

Ms. Mariah Zirkelbach, 328 River Bluff Drive, highlighted concerns of incompatibility, density, traffic, open space areas, and stormwater drainage of the proposed project. She expressed concerns regarding the legal action taken by the developer. She encouraged the Commission to stand with the residents and previous votes to deny the project.

Mr. Bill Zirkelbach, 328 River Bluff Drive, argued the staff report incorrectly stated the project would not adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood. He expressed concerns regarding construction noise and potential toxins. He encouraged the Commission deny the current proposal.

Ms. Michelle Zirkelbach, 328 River Bluff Drive, discussed the litigation costs if the project was denied. She shared concerns regarding emergency response and evacuations if the project were approved.

Mr. Charles Hillman, 50 Oakmont Circle, discussed the surrounding community's covenant and legalities surrounding it and the litigation. He expressed concerns regarding increased traffic and the need for traffic improvements.

Ms. Michelle Edwards, 34 Iroquois Trail, stated the proposed development would directly and negatively impact her street, noting concerns of traffic, pedestrian safety, emergency access, and inaccurate traffic study.

Mr. Tom Fitzgibbon, 51 St. Andrews Drive, expressed concerns regarding increased traffic, lack of sidewalks for pedestrian safety, and the need for a traffic light and other traffic improvements.

Ms. Denise Corley, 51 South St. Andrews Drive, voiced concerns regarding the outdated traffic study, compatibility, soil remediation, and density. She urged the Commission to vote no on the item.

Mr. Skeeter Surguine, 104 North St. Andrews Drive, discussed the citizen engagement, litigation, and history of the project. He expressed concerns of open space in the community and encouraged the Commissioners to examine their roles as community leaders.

Mr. Norman E. Hoffman, PhD, 33 Iroquois Trail, reviewed concerns of increased traffic and pedestrian safety, urging the Commission to vote no on the item.

Mr. Randy Hendrix, 9 Tomoka View Drive, discussed a recent neighborhood meeting regarding increased traffic in the area, noting the meeting highlighted the immediate need for traffic control. He requested the Commission postpone their vote until they could visualize the impact the development had on the surrounding neighborhood.

Ms. Marcia Rudman, 72 Wrendale Loop, expressed concerns regarding water supply, street size, construction disruption, and traffic light installation. She encouraged the Commission to change their vote to deny the development.

Mr. Bob Hunter, 128 Shady Branch Trail, thanked the Commission for a beautiful city and voiced concerns regarding stormwater management.

Ms. Stacy Dinkowitz-Beyer, 10 Maplewood Trail, voiced concerns regarding the proposed entrance, access streets, increased traffic, pedestrian safety, and neighborhood flooding. She inquired how the development would improve the quality of life of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. William Beyer, 10 Maplewood Trail, expressed concerns regarding increased traffic and school availability. He requested the Commission reconsider the development and vote no.

Ms. Deborah Green, 84 South St. Andrews Drive, discussed her history in the community and concerns of increased traffic and pedestrian safety.

Mr. GG Galloway, 1305 Oak Forest Drive, encouraged the Commission to hear the residents' concerns and look for a win-win, noting the importance of strong architectural standards.

Mr. Paul Hughes, 4 Lauren Court, explained he attempted to purchase the golf course, noting he was still interested in purchasing the property.

Ms. Kelsi Kipi, 52 Pine Valley Circle, reviewed the title and covenants of the property, noting it was set to be a golf course perpetually. She discussed the history of the project and prior concerns of the City Commission. She urged the Commission to fully consider all concerns that remain unaddressed.

Mr. Gary Seibert, 394 Muddy Creek, inquired if the item passed, would the answers to Ms. Greenlees' questions at the March 13, 2026, City Commission meeting be made public and reviewed her questions.

Ms. Missy Herrero, 111 North St. Andrews Drive, thanked the Commission for their time and voiced concerns regarding the minimally modified proposed project. She discussed the history of the item, the residents' desire for compatible lots, and concerns of quality of life.

Mr. Alan Burton, 915 Ocean Shore Boulevard, disclosed he was running for Zone 1 City Commission. He stated he provided a letter on his stance on the project. He encouraged someone to purchase the land and request it be rezoned to a park. He stated a park should be included in the development order. He noted the due diligence needed on the property including financial impact. He requested the Commission consider requesting city staff to look into a park purchase of the property.

Ms. Patti Surguine, 104 North St. Andrews Drive, discussed her history in the community. She stated she was promised when she bought her home the golf course would stay a golf course and was not notified when that changed. She discussed concerns regarding potential impact on the wildlife in the neighborhood. She urged the Commission to vote no.

No Name Provided, No address provided, discussed the importance of the neighborhood and requested the Commission not allow the threat of a lawsuit to dictate their decision. She discussed concerns of traffic, potential school overloading, street space, emergency access, incompatible density, and homeowner equity strains.

Ms. Kristen Okarski, 17 Iroquois Trail, reviewed the reasons she chose the Tomoka Oaks subdivision as her home, noting concerns of increased traffic and degraded quality of life for the neighborhood.

Dr. Ian Tafel, no address provided, voiced concerns regarding neurological issues with people living close to golf courses due to their toxins. He inquired if there was a risk mitigation plan.

Ms. Melonie Caldwell, 18 Oakmont Circle, expressed concerns of density, noting her love of the community.

Ms. Bernadette Williams, 118 River Bluff Drive, shared concerns of tree preservation, reclaimed water, and quality of life.

Ms. Barb Moor, 11 Oakmont Circle, requested the Commission consider all facts and vote down the developers' plan. She expressed concerns of possible cuts in tax revenue as a factor in the decision.

Ms. Darla Widnall, 7 Shawnee Trail, voiced concerns regarding the wildlife and demolition of the clubhouse. She questioned why the documents related to the project were removed from the city's website, citing concerns of availability of the documents for the residents.

Mr. Doug Widnall, 7 Shawnee Trail, expressed concerns of traffic and safe evacuation plans.

Ms. Beth Rabitaille, 22 Rio Pinar Trail, stated she didn't believe the traffic study was accurate and expressed concerns regarding traffic, natural preservation, buffers, and infrastructure. She requested the Commission vote no.

Ms. Kathy Crotty, 106 North St. Andrews Drive, urged the Commission to vote no. She stated she did not believe the city had adequate legal counsel or appropriate subject-matter experts for the project. She expressed concerns of neighborhood integrity.

Ms. Bonnie Kloepfer, 23 Tomoka Oaks Boulevard, expressed concerns of pedestrian safety, outdated traffic study, traffic signal installation timeline, and crowding in the neighborhood.

Ms. Hilary Deininger, 23 Oakmont Circle, voiced opposition to the proposed development, quoting standards from the city's comprehensive plan. She expressed concerns regarding compatibility, potential increase in rental homes, and property values. She discussed the need for low density developments.

Ms. Blew quoted the city's strategic plan's values and Mayor's message.

Ms. Roberta Naleway, 45 Pine Valley Circle, voiced concerns of traffic and golf course toxins.

Mr. Spraker discussed the concurrency plan, tree preservation, traffic light installation, denial of R-2, definition of overcrowding, R-2 versus PRD, covenant and restrictions on the property, website updates, and records available for the public.

Commissioner Sargent inquired when the traffic light would be installed; whereby, Mr. Spraker indicated prior to the first Certificate of Occupancy unless it was bonded.

Commissioner Deaton questioned if the bonded option could be changed; whereby, Mr. Spraker stated the Commission had the authority to amend the development order.

Mr. Finley explained why a developer would bond a traffic light.

Commissioner Deaton stated there was an immediate need for a traffic light and questioned how to make that happen. She suggested tabling the item until the questions could be answered.

Commissioner Tolland inquired if the item could be postponed; whereby, Mr. Randy Hayes, City Attorney, explained the revised project before the Commission and the need for the Commission to determine if the plan met the city's criteria for a PRD. He stated he could not comment on the litigation, noting there was a tight window closing April 3, 2026, and postponing was not an option. He reviewed the Commission's options.

Mayor Leslie clarified the options were to approve as presented or deny with no options to amend or modify the development order; whereby, Mr. Hayes indicated that was correct.

Commissioner Deaton motioned to deny the item.

Mr. Hayes stated there was already a motion and second for approval on the floor and that would need to be addressed before a motion to deny could be made.

Mr. Bayer expressed concerns regarding the Commission not being able to amend the order; whereby, Mr. Hayes stated the Commission could request amendments from the developer, noting the developer would need to approve the amendments. Mr. Bayer explained the importance of architectural standards and compatible lot size. He requested the Commission approve with conditions or remand the project back to the Planning Board.

Mayor Leslie questioned why the project was working backwards, noting the need for environmental and traffic study. He explained he had trouble understanding how the city was in the situation, noting the PRD was not compatible when it was brought to the Commission before, and now it was compatible. He expressed concerns regarding not participating in the mediation meetings and the choices presented now. He stated he did not know all the facts, voicing frustration with the change in procedure to bring the item before the Commission. He thanked the residents for reaching out and educating him on their concerns. He indicated he felt the developer was bullying the Commission. He stated he would vote no on the item.

Mr. Hayes clarified the entire Commission was fully informed of everything that transpired with the project.

Commissioner Sargent inquired if the land was for sale; whereby, the developer indicated it was not. Commissioner Sargent questioned where the 16 million dollar amount came from; whereby, Mr. Hayes stated it was a part of pending litigation and he could not publicly discuss.

Mr. Hayes clarified if the item was denied the Commission would need to provide the criteria as to why the item was denied.

Commissioner Tolland questioned what it meant if the item was denied; whereby, Mr. Hayes stated the litigation would continue and could not provide further details.

Commissioner Deaton asked the developer how he would feel if the golf course in his neighborhood turned into a development. She urged the Commission to vote no and proceed with litigation. She reviewed all meetings she attended, all documents read, and agreed with the residents' concerns of compatibility, traffic, traffic light installation, density, and lack of contracted builder. She indicated she understood the citizens' stance, noting if there were further litigation, it could mean increased taxes.

Commissioner Tolland inquired if residents and Commission supported the risk of continuing litigation with potential negative financial costs and the possibility of reverting to the higher density zoning of R-2; whereby, Commissioner Deaton supported the gamble, noting many residents reached out to her saying the same thing.

Commissioner Briley questioned if there were amenities within the proposed subdivision accessible to the surrounding neighborhood; whereby, Mr. Spraker indicated that was correct, noting there was originally planned pedestrian access. Commissioner Briley questioned and Mr. Spraker clarified the density for R-2 and PRD zoning. Commissioner Briley stated more green space would be ideal, discussing the golf course zoning throughout the county. He expressed concerns of the zoning, prior zoning compatibility, and reverting to R-2. He inquired about the impervious coverage and architectural standards; whereby, Mr. Spraker indicated the R-2 zoning would require 35 percent lot coverage, 75 percent impervious coverage, and would result in loss of architectural standards.

Commissioner Tolland asked about the bridge and water issues in the neighborhood; whereby, Mr. Finley discussed the Main Trail bridge work and reviewed statistics and proposed work for the water supply in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Sargent stated a resident informed him that their home's water pressure was minimal; whereby, Mr. Finley requested the address to provide a follow-up.

The entire Commission disclosed the residents they spoke with and emails received on the project.

Commissioner Deaton urged the Commission, if voting yes, to include conditions.

Commissioner Tolland clarified there was no threat of a lawsuit, the city was in active litigation. She discussed the time frame, the legalities regarding approval, and concerns of toxins and conditions.

Mayor Leslie inquired if conditions could be requested; whereby, Mr. Hayes stated many issues discussed were typically discussed during the preliminary plat approval, noting the Commission could ask the developer if they would accept the conditions.

Commissioner Sargent asked if the plan were approved with conditions would litigation end; whereby, Mr. Hayes stated it could be the final action, noting it was up to the developer if it was accepted.

Commissioner Briley clarified many items could be addressed during the plat review; whereby, Mr. Hayes noted it could be addressed then if the developers were willing to accept.

Commissioner Deaton inquired if the developer could speak to the acceptance of the conditions; whereby, Mr. Rob Merrell, applicant representative, explained he could not provide details and Mr. Hayes was correct with reasonable conversation during the platting process. Commissioner Deaton inquired if there would be rentals in the development; whereby, Mr. Merrell stated it would depend on the local laws.

Mayor Leslie questioned if any conditions could include lower density; whereby, Mr. Merrell stated he was unable to speak to density.

Commissioner Tolland asked if architectural standards could be discussed during the platting process; whereby, Mr. Merrell stated architectural treatment was in the staff report.

Mr. Spraker clarified there were no restrictions on ownership of the properties, noting rentals were allowed if they were longer than six months; whereby, Mr. Hayes stated there were regulations in place preventing short-term rentals.

Mayor Leslie inquired if there was time to postpone the item to a future meeting; whereby, Mr. Hayes stated that was not possible.

Commissioner Deaton expressed concerns of a rental community.

Call Vote:	Commissioner Briley	Yes
	Commissioner Tolland	Yes
	Commissioner Sargent	Yes
	Commissioner Deaton	No
Carried.	Mayor Leslie	No

City Clerk Susan C. Dauderis read by legal title only:

B. 699 South Nova Road, Circle K, Special Exception Outdoor Activities

RESOLUTION NO. 2026-45: A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION AND ISSUANCE OF A DEVELOPMENT ORDER FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO ALLOW OUTDOOR ACTIVITY IN ASSOCIATION WITH A PROPOSED CONVENIENCE STORE, TYPE B, LOCATED AT 699 SOUTH NOVA ROAD WITHIN THE B-8, COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS; ESTABLISHING CONDITIONS AND EXPIRATION DATE OF APPROVAL; AND SETTING FORTH AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Commissioner Sargent moved, seconded by Commissioner Tolland, for approval of Resolution No. 2026-45, as read by title only.

Mr. Spraker reviewed the special exception application, noting the proposed items to remain in front of the storefront. He stated the Planning Board recommended denial reviewing their concerns, noting the applicant provided an updated special exception exhibit to address the comments received at the Planning Board.

Commissioner Deaton expressed opposition to the water storage.

Commissioner Sargent inquired about similar approvals; whereby, Mr. Spraker reviewed a list of similar exceptions.

Mr. Jarod Stubbs, applicant representative, reviewed the application, noting the need for the outdoor storage in emergency situations.

Commissioner Deaton voiced support of the propane storage, inquiring if the water could be stored inside the store; whereby, Mr. Stubbs stated majority of the water was moved inside based on Planning Board feedback. She asked if the ice machine could be more aesthetically pleasing; whereby, Mr. Stubbs stated it would be the same structure but print on the outside could be modified.

Commissioner Briley expressed concerns regarding outdoor storage based on similar prior approvals not being adhered to.

Commissioner Tolland explained her reservations regarding the location of the store and the neighboring residential homes. She expressed support of the propane but did not support the ice machine and water storage.

Mayor Leslie expressed concerns regarding compatibility, noting he would vote no on the item.

Mr. Stubbs stated the applicant was willing to remove or reduce branding and the ice machine and keep only the water bottles and propane.

Ms. Amber Bobak, 397 Collins Street, reviewed her history on the project and concerns of the policies in place. She discussed concerns regarding compatibility and stormwater runoff.

Mayor Leslie inquired if a permit could be applied for during emergency situations to temporarily store items such as water outside of the building; whereby, Mr. Spraker stated the process was for the company to obtain a special exception just as the item presented was.

Call Vote:	Commissioner Tolland	No
	Commissioner Sargent	No
	Commissioner Deaton	No
	Commissioner Briley	No
Failed	Mayor Leslie	No

Mayor Leslie closed the Public Hearings.

8. DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION ITEMS

A. Potable Water Reuse and Drinking Water

Mr. Finley reviewed potable water types, water reclamation facility, drinking water standards, and pilot plans for the feasibility of direct potable reuse water in the surrounding areas. He provided information on the city's consumptive use permit renewal, statistics of treated effluent water, and the pushback initially received on reclaimed water utilized for irrigation. He explained the advantages of expanding the reclaimed water for irrigation purposes. He reviewed the Volusia County Council and City of Daytona Beach items regarding "toilet-to-tap" for residents to vote on.

Commissioner Briley stated he would support an item on the ballot for the residents to vote on, noting the state may pass legislation which could nullify the item. He noted concerns of other entities' practices affecting the city's water sources and effects of Senate Bill 7034.

Commissioner Sargent discussed other states issues with the potential of running out of drinking water within the next five years, noting he did not see that issue in Florida. He agreed with Commissioner Briley, noting he would support an item on the ballot.

Mayor Leslie inquired if Mr. Finley was aware of Senate Bill 7034 and the residual effects of it, whereby, Mr. Finley stated staff did follow legislation, noting water flow. He reviewed the consumptive use permit standards, explaining the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) permitting process and what they looked at before approving the permit.

Commissioner Sargent inquired if the city utilized the reverse osmosis process; whereby, Mr. Finley reviewed the two processes used. Commissioner Sargent questioned if the city was utilizing Ultra-Violet (UV) lights in the treatment process; whereby, Mr. Finley explained the city was in the process of installing the UV lights at the advanced wastewater treatment plant. Commissioner Sargent asked how the city could get to the point to remove pharmaceuticals and perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS); whereby, Mr. Finley stated staff was looking into it, noting there was a project in the five-year Capital Improvement Plan to replace the filters in the water reclamation facility.

Mayor Leslie questioned if there was equipment to detect and notify staff if there was any contamination in the aquifers; whereby; Mr. Finley stated the water was tested at many stages in the treatment phases.

Mr. Gimbert questioned how many millions of gallons a day the city used; whereby, Mr. Finley stated the city used around five million gallons a day. Mr. Gimbert indicated there were many entities well below their permitted limit. He expressed concerns regarding the entities who over-utilized their permitted limit and the legislation removing municipalities' rights. He highlighted the need to reserve the city's protection by putting the item on the ballot for the residents to vote. He stated he was working with the state to ban it at the state level.

Mr. Burton disclosed he was running for Zone One City Commissioner. He stated it was a good idea to put the item on the ballot, did not support "toilet-to-tap", and suggested the city make its own water by utilizing an atmospheric water generator.

Ms. Pante expressed concerns regarding the misleading information. She discussed the issues regarding pulling water from the ocean and Mr. Gimbert's claims. She discussed the need for land conservation and suggested the city reach out for more information on the claims made, as there was not an immediate need for a ban.

Mr. Tom Caffrey, 236 Cypress Trail, discussed the changing environment within the city. He reviewed standards of water and highlighted the change of water from Disney. He advocated for clean water and to not wait for the state to provide direction.

Commissioner Briley stated an ordinance would be sufficient; whereby, Ms. Shanahan stated an ordinance could be implemented.

Mayor Leslie expressed support of an ordinance, questioning the amount of support needed to approve it on a ballot; whereby, Mr. Hayes reviewed the options and their impacts based on what the direction would be from the Commission. Mr Hayes stated research and information gathering would be needed with any option.

Commissioner Briley stated the financial impact would be minimal if on the ballot as there was an election scheduled at the time. He stated he would support a policy that could be changed in the future.

Commissioner Tolland questioned if there was a policy in the past; whereby, Mr. Finley clarified there was no policy as it was never an issue that needed to be addressed. She asked if staff wanted to change the way it was handled, was Commission approval needed; whereby, Mr. Finley stated as it was such a large policy decision it would be brought before the Commission. She stated an ordinance or vote was not needed at the time as direction would be needed by the Commission when time came; whereby, Ms. Shanahan confirmed the Commission would need to provide direction.

Commissioner Sargent supported an item on the ballot, noting prior ordinances repealed by future Commissions.

Commissioner Deaton expressed concerns with the time of night of the discussion, noting she would support an item on the ballot.

Commissioner Tolland stated it may be best to table the item to a future meeting.

Ms. Shanahan clarified staff could do research on what other communities were doing and provide options for the Commission to review before providing further direction.

9. REPORTS, SUGGESTIONS, REQUESTS

Events, Updates, and Congratulations

Ms. Joyce Shanahan, City Manager, thanked the Commission for their time and hard work and provided details on upcoming meetings.

Mr. Hayes provided details on upcoming City Commission meetings.

Commissioner Sargent congratulated Police Sergeant Garner on his graduation from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) National Academy.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Leslie adjourned the meeting at 12:19 AM.

APPROVED: April 21, 2026

BY: ______________________________

Jason Leslie, Mayor

ATTEST:

____

Susan Carroll Dauderis,
City Clerk