



# Comprehensive plan committee meeting

## Meeting Minutes

May 13, 2026, 5:30 PM

234 U.S. 1, Oak Hill, FL 32759, US

### 1. Call To Order

#### 1a. Roll Call

Present: Chair Jeff Bracy, Vice Chair David Hogan, Committee Member Auggie Mauro, Committee Member Doug Gibson, Committee Member Terry Mason, Committee Member Tim Morton

Absent: Committee Member Mike Arman (Joined during the meeting)

#### 1b. Approval of Minutes: April 22, 2026

Chair Bracy called for any objections to April 22, 2026, minutes. No substantive issues were raised beyond a previously noted concern regarding dates, and the minutes were approved without further objection.

### 2. Committee Review of Comprehensive Plan

#### 2a. Chapter 8: Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Before formally proceeding into Chapter 8, the committee engaged in a wide-ranging preliminary discussion revisiting unresolved issues from prior chapters, particularly relating to agricultural zoning classifications, annexation policy, and infrastructure.

##### Agricultural Zoning – Minimum Acreage and Classification

Chair Bracy raised a longstanding concern regarding the city's single agricultural zoning classification and the requirement that a property must contain a minimum of five (5) acres to place a dwelling on it. Chair Bracy argued that this requirement was never the original legislative intent, explaining that when the city's land use code was developed, the state had pushed for a ten-acre minimum and the city negotiated it down to five acres, but that the five-acre threshold was intended as a minimum for subdivision into one-acre lots, not as a prerequisite for placing any structure on agricultural land.

The committee discussed the practical hardship this creates. A committee member offered the example of a property that had been five acres but was reduced to approximately four acres after a family member was gifted a portion, leaving the remaining parcel ineligible for agricultural classification despite the owner maintaining livestock. The discussion noted that this situation is common and that the current code effectively disenfranchises landowners with slightly undersized parcels.

The committee evaluated whether to introduce multiple agricultural sub-classifications (e.g., Ag-1, Ag-2, Ag-3) modeled after county classifications, or to simplify the approach. After deliberation, the committee agreed that

adding multiple tiers risked unnecessary complexity. The preferred approach was to retain a single agricultural zoning category but to redefine its minimum acreage requirement.

The committee reached consensus on the following recommended amendments to Policy 1.1.0.2, Item A (Chapter 1):

- Reduce the minimum acreage for agricultural zoning from five (5) acres to three (3) acres.
- Allow agricultural parcels to be subdivided down to a minimum of one (1) acre per lot (consistent with existing language already present in the code).
- Eliminate the requirement that a property must have five (5) acres to place a mobile home or modular structure on it.

Chair Bracy emphasized that the existing five-acre mobile home placement requirement was an inherited provision that was never intended to operate as it has, and that its removal is necessary to provide equitable treatment to agricultural landowners.

#### Incomplete Language – Page 8-3

Chair Bracy identified an incomplete sentence on page 8-3 of Chapter 8, specifically in the second paragraph, where the final sentence ends with "future construction of the \_\_\_\_" with no concluding language. The committee agreed this is a product of a prior copy-and-paste error. Chair Bracy directed staff to bring the matter to City Manager John Barkley for review and to supply the appropriate language.

#### Annexation and Interlocal Agreements

The committee discussed non-contiguous annexations after a committee member noted that the city's attorney had confirmed such annexations are permissible under Florida law, provided the parcel falls within the city's local service boundary. A specific property located west of the city limits but south of Ariel Road, which falls within Oak Hill's service boundary, was cited as a candidate.

Chair Bracy directed staff to prepare a written reminder to City Manager John Barkley urging the City Commission to act on securing an interlocal agreement along Ariel Road from Beacon Light to Maytown Road before the corridor is annexed by the City of Edgewater. Chair Bracy expressed urgency, noting that failure to act could result in the loss of this boundary to a neighboring municipality. The committee was in strong agreement that a clear demarcation line, Ariel Road extending to I-95—should be formalized.

The committee also noted that the cost of legal advertising for annexations had previously been a barrier, as the News-Journal's advertisement rates were prohibitively high compared to rates available through the Beacon, where county and municipal legal notices are published at a fraction of the cost. It was noted that free annexations had previously been conducted when advertising costs were manageable.

Chair Bracy directed staff to bring the annexation advertising issue to City Manager John Barkley as a separate action item.

#### Water Supply and Infrastructure, Pages 8-4 and 9-6

The committee reviewed policy language regarding the city's 10-year water supply facilities work plan and confirmed that, under the applicable framework, Oak Hill aligns with the St. Johns River Water Management District's plan rather than maintaining an independent plan. The committee was satisfied that this relationship is appropriately characterized in the document.

The committee reviewed page 9-6, which states that "Oak Hill does not own or operate central potable water, central sanitary sewer, or solid waste facilities." A committee member noted that while the city does not own or operate treatment facilities, Oak Hill does own utility infrastructure, specifically the pipes and related assets, in at least one development, as established in that development's recorded restrictive covenants. The committee agreed this language must be updated to accurately reflect the city's current infrastructure ownership.

Discussion also addressed a long-term aspiration to reduce or eliminate Oak Hill's dependence on Edgewater for water service. A committee member noted that Florida Rural Water has funding available and that exploratory conversations have taken place regarding the possibility of the city leasing land from a local property owner to install two wells with reverse osmosis purification units. The committee also noted that Volusia County is exploring well development south of Oak Hill, which could eventually allow the city to purchase water from the county rather than Edgewater, a prospect the committee viewed favorably.

## Emergency Response

A committee member raised concerns about the city's emergency preparedness, noting that the city's emergency response team currently lacks basic equipment such as radios and tarps, with only a cell phone charger on hand. The committee noted that reliance on Red Cross resources and the restoration of cellular service following past emergencies has been the de facto response, and that "luck is not a strategy." No formal action was taken, but the issue was flagged for further attention.

## Policy 1.7.0.1 – Tri-Party Agreement

The committee reviewed Policy 1.7.0.1, which references a tri-party agreement governing emergency services coordination. The committee recommended striking the reference to the "tri-party" agreement and replacing it with language referencing a bipartite interlocal agreement between the county and the city, with the consensus being that the city should formally sever its emergency services coordination ties with Edgewater.

## Law Enforcement Contract and Impact Fees

The committee engaged in an extended discussion regarding the city's law enforcement services contract with the Volusia County Sheriff's Office, currently valued at approximately \$750,000 per year. A committee member questioned whether the city is receiving adequate service for that expenditure, citing inconsistent patrol presence and uncertain response times. While the Sheriff presented a summary of Oak Hill-area activity at a recent commission meeting, some members felt the data alone did not confirm that the city is receiving full value.

The committee discussed the feasibility of establishing a police services impact fee applicable to new residential development. The rationale offered was that as Oak Hill's residential base grows, the demand for law enforcement services increases proportionally, and that new development should contribute a one-time fee toward that expanded cost. A committee member proposed that the impact fee be calculated as a proportionate share of the annual law enforcement contract cost, divided across the existing and projected residential unit count, yielding an estimated fee in the range of \$1,500 per unit at a minimum, though comparisons were made to Edgewater's combined county and city impact fee of approximately \$6,500 per unit.

The committee confirmed that the city currently has legal authority to assess impact fees for parks and roads. The question of whether a police services impact fee is legally permissible was not conclusively resolved, and the matter was noted for further legal review.

## Stormwater Retention – Developer Responsibility

Vice Chair David Hogan raised the language under future development needs related to stormwater, which states that developers must retain "most" stormwater on-site. Vice Chair Hogan moved to recommend changing "most" to "all," consistent with the St. Johns River Water Management District's standard requiring 110% on-site retention. The committee concurred.

Additionally, Vice Chair Hogan raised the issue of long-term maintenance responsibility for stormwater infrastructure installed by developers. He recommended that language be added to the comprehensive plan requiring developers, or their successors and HOAs, to bear the cost of maintaining stormwater infrastructure, with the city retaining the right to charge back any maintenance costs it incurs on the developer's behalf. The committee agreed that this provision should be added, citing a prior instance in which a PLDRC applicant agreed, after committee pressure, that the development's HOA would assume maintenance responsibility for drainage culverts along Bells Hill Road.

## Capital Improvements – Minimum Threshold

The committee reviewed the capital improvements element, which sets a \$25,000 threshold for capital expenditures. Several members expressed the view that this figure is outdated given current costs, noting, for example, that the city's playground equipment alone cost approximately \$60,000. The committee discussed whether to raise the threshold to \$70,000. After debate, the committee acknowledged that while the \$25,000 figure may be low, keeping the threshold conservative ensures more projects remain subject to plan oversight. No final amendment was agreed upon, but the item was flagged for further consideration.

## Recreation and Open Space

The committee reviewed the open space level-of-service standard of six (6) acres per 1,000 residents. A committee member noted that a prior dispute over whether the city met this threshold stemmed from the failure to count a 33⅓% ownership interest in approximately 72 acres of land held in the city's name in county records. The committee affirmed that this acreage is city-owned and should be included in future open space

calculations, with the caveat that the property is currently subject to a two-year St. Johns River Water Management District dredging project, after which the city will have full discretion over its use.

#### Solid Waste

The committee briefly noted that solid waste service is addressed through the city's contract with Waste Pro and that the Tomoka Farms Road landfill, the primary disposal facility, has an estimated nine years of remaining capacity, with an expansion currently under construction.

#### Commercial Mixed-Use Overlay

A committee member raised, for future discussion, a proposal to establish a commercial mixed-use zoning overlay along both sides of U.S. Highway 1, permitting ground-floor commercial uses with residential or professional office uses above. The committee noted that the current height limit of 35 feet may be a constraint for two-story mixed-use development and that ordinance language requiring a minimum ceiling height for commercial ground floors further limits feasibility. The committee agreed to take up this topic before the conclusion of the comprehensive plan review cycle.

#### Chapter 10 – Public School Facilities Element

The committee briefly addressed Chapter 10, which governs public school facilities. A committee member noted that Oak Hill has no public schools within its boundaries and questioned whether the chapter remains applicable. It was determined that the city may still have obligations to the county school system under state law even without a school facility, and that the chapter requires careful review rather than simple elimination. Chair Bracy directed staff to obtain copies of Chapter 10 for all committee members for review at a future meeting.

#### Next Steps

The committee confirmed that upon completing its review of the comprehensive plan, the document will be revised by City Manager John Barkley and forwarded to the Planning, Land Development, and Regulatory Commission (PLDRC) before proceeding to the City Commission. The committee also anticipates beginning its review of the Land Development Regulations (LDR) at a subsequent meeting.

### 3. Citizens Comments

No citizens comments were recorded.

### 4. Adjournment

Minutes respectfully submitted for approval by Deputy City Clerk Megan Jones

X

Jeff Bracy  
Chair

Chair Jeff Bracy Comprehensive Plan Committee

X

John Barkley  
City Manager

City Manager John Barkley City of Oak Hill, Florida