

**Personnel, Operations & Procedures Committee
Volusia Growth Management Commission**

MINUTES FOR
MEETING HELD
Wednesday, March 23, 2016

Thomas C. Kelly Administration Center
Frank T. Bruno Jr. County Council Chambers
123 W. Indiana Avenue
DeLand, FL

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by Committee Chairman, Gerald Brandon and roll was taken.

The following POP Committee Members were present: Committee Chairman Gerald Brandon, Sandy Lou Gallagher, Robert Lovelace, Don Romanik, Robert Storke, and Rich Walton. Also in attendance were VGMC Chairman James Wachtel, VGMC Member Saralee Morrissey, VGMC Legal Counsel Heather Ramos, VGMC Planning Consultants Jim Sellen, Erika Hughes and Chris Dougherty, and VGMC Operations Manager Merry Smith.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Brandon stated he would like Ms. Ramos to bring the members of the committee up to date since they last met, including the differences between the 3/9/16 and the 3/16/16 draft versions of the rules amendments, as well as the discussion at the Charter Review Commission (CRC) meeting which occurred earlier in the day. He also recognized several individuals in the audience, including: CRC Chairman Hyatt Brown, Kent Sharples, Joe Yarborough, Deanie Lowe, County Manager Jim Dinneen, and Beth Lemke.

Mr. Brandon asked VGMC Legal Counsel, Heather Ramos, to address the committee.

Ms. Ramos stated a new package of materials (a copy of which is attached to these minutes as Exhibit A) dated today, 3-23-16, has been provided to the committee members, including a memo summarizing the concepts of the rules changes made to-date. Since the last POP Committee meeting, Ms. Ramos stated there have been primarily two changes to the proposed amendments: 1) An expansion to the streamline review process to include not only small scale amendments and large scale amendments that are subject to a Joint Planning Area (JPA) Agreement, but also amendments that are subject to other forms of interlocal agreements dealing with planning or facilities; 2) A provision was added back into the rules which would allow VGMC staff to call for a public hearing in the limited situation where a proposed amendment may be deemed inconsistent with conditions of approval of a prior VGMC resolution. She stated this was discussed with VGMC planning staff and also raised before the CRC at an earlier meeting.

Before moving into further discussion, Mr. Brandon asked Hyatt Brown if he would like to address the committee. Mr. Brown briefly addressed the committee relating to recent CRC activities and apologized relating to confusion earlier in the week as to how the school board would be addressed within the rules. He expressed support for continuing to allow the school

board to be part of the VGMC process as they presently are, and the school board attorney will be involved in crafting language within the rules to ensure that. Mr. Brown stated the CRC is also looking at a proposal for changes to the charter that are needed to implement some of the rules changes being proposed by the VGMC. He also commented that the VGMC has shown real leadership in trying to make changes in the best interest of the citizens of Volusia County under the current circumstances, and he feels there is a good deal of concurrence amongst those that have been involved. Mr. Brown closed by saying he feels what the committee and commission is considering tonight conforms with what the CRC has reviewed and understood.

Committee member Lovelace arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Brandon thanked Mr. Brown for addressing the committee and stated where we are today is through a collaborative effort of VGMC staff, County staff, the CRC, and others attending the various meetings representing the business community and cities.

Referring to item 3 of Ms. Ramos' memorandum dated March 23, 2016 relating to standing, Mr. Romanik asked where the federal government fits in the process with respect to impacts on federally owned property, adding that they were omitted in the Oak Hill application. Mr. Brandon responded that the VGMC does not need to address the federal government since we look at consistency within the jurisdictions of Volusia County, and the federal government is included in other review areas of the comprehensive planning process. Mr. Sellen stated the VGMC needs to review an amendment within the context of the VGMC rules, and federally owned lands are not defined in the rules as an adjacent or affected local government. In the case of Oak Hill, he stated if the development occurs based upon what was approved by the City and the VGMC, and there is a federal process involved, that would be when the federal government would get involved. He also spoke briefly regarding the Oak Hill application and what the VGMC looked at and gave consideration to in terms of impacts to neighboring properties. He added that the federal government is not a part of the VGMC process. Mr. Brandon stated that when a project moves forward, there are a number of agencies that are part of the review process, such as the St. Johns River Water Management District and the Department of Economic Opportunity, which is where these agencies would voice their concerns. Mr. Sellen concurred.

Moving forward with the proposed rules revisions, Mr. Brandon stated he understands there is only one outstanding issue which relates to how the school board will be addressed, and a meeting has been scheduled early next week for the attorneys to discuss this issue. Mr. Brown added that the CRC has a meeting scheduled for Wednesday, March 30th and the hope is that the school board issue is resolved by then. He stated if all of the issues have been resolved, the proposal will come before the CRC at the March 30th meeting and a straw vote will be taken by the CRC with respect to support of the proposed rules changes. Then on April 11th, the CRC would anticipate a final vote on a proposed charter amendment to implement the rules changes.

With respect to the school board issue, Mr. Brandon stated the committee has recommended the school board have standing along with all of the local governments. The only outstanding issue is where and how it will be specifically addressed within the proposed amendments. Ms. Ramos

stated there are a couple of other minor issues being dealt with the municipalities and the business community in terms of tweaking some of the language. As a result, the resolution she drafted for consideration by the commission would allow for these non-substantive changes to be made after approval by the commission if the members were comfortable with that.

In the interest of time, Mr. Brandon asked Ms. Ramos to address only the changes to the proposed rules since the committee last met. Ms. Ramos stated the only changes are the two items she mentioned earlier relating to the expansion of the streamline review process to include other planning agreements, and also for the ability of VGMC staff to call for a hearing if an amendment may be deemed inconsistent with conditions of a prior VGMC resolution. She agreed the open issue was working with the school board to adequately address that issue and confirmed a meeting will be scheduled early next week with the County Attorney and School Board Attorney.

Ms. Ramos discussed a provision in the resolution that would allow minor, non-substantive changes be made to the rules without the need to bring back to the full commission. She added that if a substantive change was being proposed as a result of the meeting with the school board or the CRC, then it would be brought back before the POP and full commission for consideration. Ms. Ramos clarified that it appears the County will be putting a charter amendment on the ballot in November in order to implement the proposed rules changes. She stated she added language in Section 3 of the resolution that the resolution may be amended, revised or repealed by the commission prior to the referendum date or adoption by the County Council, and changed the effective date to November 9, 2016 which would be the day after the election if the referendum passes. Ms. Ramos stated she also added Section 5 which says if the charter amendment is not approved by the voters, the resolution shall expire and be repealed, and the present rules would continue to exist.

Mr. Brown asked for clarification relating to the proposed resolution language which would allow the VGMC to revise the rules prior to November. Ms. Ramos responded that could only occur prior to the Volusia County Council approving them. Mr. Brown then asked if those rules changes that would not require a charter amendment to be implemented would become effective if approved by a 2/3 vote of the Volusia County Council. Ms. Ramos responded that no changes will become effective until the County Council has approved them and the referendum passes. Mr. Brown stated that he and the CRC will be appearing before the County Council with the proposed charter amendment relating to the VGMC, and suggested that the VGMC also participate to show that the groups worked together and there is concurrency on the proposal. Mr. Brandon stated the VGMC would attend as well.

Ms. Lowe raised concern regarding the repeal revision in the proposed resolution. With all of the work that has gone into the proposed rules changes, she stated there must be a way to implement those changes that wouldn't require a charter amendment should the referendum fail. Ms. Ramos stated in her opinion, all of the changes could be made without the need for a charter amendment, however, we haven't had an opportunity to approach that with the County. Additionally, she stated the County has put out several memos indicating a charter amendment is

necessary to effectuate the rules that are being proposed. Mr. Brandon stated that we've contended all along that a charter amendment is not necessarily needed to incorporate the concept of the changes, however, if it does go before the voters and does not pass, we can amend the proposed changes and go back to the County Council at that time. In the meantime, he suggested we move the resolution and proposed amendments forward as a package to the County Council.

Mr. Walton asked for clarification relating to item #5 of Ms. Ramos' memorandum relating to VGMC staff calling for a public hearing. Ms. Ramos responded that at the last POP meeting, the committee agreed that VGMC staff would no longer have the ability to independently call for a public hearing. After speaking with Jim Sellen, he felt it was very important for the VGMC to be able to call for a public hearing in the limited situation where a proposed amendment may be inconsistent with a condition of approval from a prior VGMC resolution. As an example, Mr. Sellen stated if the VGMC approved a resolution at a public hearing two years ago with a condition that required a specific road improvement be made, and a new amendment is submitted that deletes that requirement, he stated it may not be a problem and the commission may approve it, however, a public hearing and approval by the commission would be necessary to do so. Other than that type of situation, the only way a public hearing could be held under the proposed amendments is if another unit of local government objected. Mr. Walton asked if a public hearing would still be necessary even if there is data and analysis submitted by the applicant local government to support the proposed amendment. Mr. Sellen stated in that case, VGMC staff would issue a recommendation to the commission in support of the amendment, however, since the condition was previously imposed by the commission at a duly noticed public hearing, the commission would be required to remove the condition at a noticed public hearing. Mr. Brandon concurred with Mr. Sellen's statement. Mr. Walton commented that he understands what's being proposed, however, doesn't necessarily feel that is the most efficient way to handle those situations.

Joe Yarborough, City Manager of South Daytona, asked if the version of the rules amendments being considered tonight incorporates the various changes that were suggested by some of the cities. Ms. Ramos explained that there were a number of revisions recently requested by the business community and some of the local governments, most of which are included within the current draft. There are several items that still need to be addressed. Following further dialogue between Ms. Ramos and Mr. Yarborough, Ms. Ramos commented that the purpose of including a provision in the resolution that would allow non-substantive changes to be made was to allow time to further address these and any other non-substantive recommended changes that may arise without the need to bring it back before the commission.

There was discussion relating to Section 90-37(i) which allows the commission to reopen and reconsider a prior certificate of consistency if it is determined that additional information provided changes the facts and circumstances of the original certification. Mr. Yarborough raised concern that this is another way that VGMC could call a public hearing. Mr. Sellen stated this provision does not necessarily require it come to the commission in the form of a public hearing, the additional information would reviewed by staff and if there were no issues, there

would be no need for a hearing. Following further discussion, there was general agreement to retain the provision and if additional tweaking is necessary that is not substantive, it can be modified.

Ms. Morrissey stated she understands the issues relating to the school board are expected to be addressed in a meeting next week, however, in order to prepare for that, she needed to understand the purpose for adding the 20-year work plan school board language in the definitions of the comprehensive plans that are contained in the present draft. Also, in all other places of the rules where comprehensive plan is mentioned, she asked if that would also include the school board document referred to in the definition of comprehensive plan. Ms. Ramos explained the reason she added that language for purposes of the VGMC rules is because at one of the previous POP Committee meetings, Scott Simpson raised the point that the school board does not have a comprehensive plan and he asked what the school board would be using to compare the consistency of a proposed comp plan amendment. Ms. Ramos stated Ms. Morrissey responded at that meeting that the school board uses their work plan to review for consistency, and that we need something in the VGMC rules to address what the school board uses. Ms. Morrissey stated there is specific language in the existing school board interlocal agreement that says exactly what the school board reviews, which is more than just the 20-year work plan. Following further discussion, Ms. Ramos stated this can be further addressed when the meeting occurs with the school board attorney.

Referring to page 7, item (4) of the 3-23-16 version of the rules, Mr. Romanik stated he understood we agreed to 21 days for a unit of local government to petition for hearing, not 28 as changed in the draft. Ms. Smith pointed out that this section of the rules relates to the notice requirements, particularly for the review of large scale amendments, not the expedited 21-day review process for small scale and JPA amendments. She stated presently, the notice is published in the News Journal and requires members of the public to petition for hearing within 21-days of the date of "publication". Under the proposed rules, notice will not be published in the newspaper, but rather will be provided to the local governments and posted on the VGMC website. The notice provides 28 days from the date of "receipt" of the application for a unit of local government to petition for hearing, which Ms. Smith stated is consistent with current rules. Mr. Romanik stated he recalled in the committee discussions that we wanted to attempt to stay within the 30-day time frame for raising issues or certifying an application as consistent. He raised concern that allowing 28 days for units of local government to comment or petition for hearing only allows VGMC staff 2 days to react to the objection. Mr. Storke pointed out that the 21-day review applies to the small scale streamline review process, but this section relates to the large scale reviews. He stated staff will have already received and reviewed the large scale applications, and this is not a change from the present large scale review process. Following further discussion, the committee agreed to leave this section as presently drafted.

There being no further discussion relating to the draft, Ms. Ramos stated she would like the commission to vote on Resolution #2016-02 at tonight's regular meeting, which includes the 3-23-16 version of the rules amendments, and also provides the ability for additional non-substantive changes to be made prior to it being forwarded to the County Council for

consideration. If substantive changes are necessary, she stated it would come back before the full VGMC for consideration. VGMC Chairman Wachtel concurred with Ms. Ramos' recommended course of action.

Robert Storke made a motion to approve the March 23, 2016 version of the Volusia Growth Management Commission Consistency Certification Rules subject to legal counsel for the VGMC and the designee of the VGMC's Chairman making necessary and non-substantive revisions to the rules to be consistent with the concepts outlined in VGMC legal counsel's memorandum of March 23, 2016. If subsequent revisions are substantive, such revisions will be brought before the VGMC POP Committee and VGMC Commission for review and approval. Motion was seconded by Sandy Lou Gallagher.

Ms. Smith asked to clarify if the motion is to recommend the full commission approve as outlined in the motion, which was confirmed. The motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

- 1) Approval of the minutes of the February 24, 2016 POP Committee meeting.

Don Romanik made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 24, 2016 POP Committee meeting as presented; seconded by Robert Storke. Motion carried unanimously.

- 2) Approval of the minutes of the March 3, 2016 POP Committee meeting.

James Wachtel made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 3, 2016 POP Committee meeting as presented; seconded by Robert Storke. Motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:59 p.m.


POP Committee Chairman

Date

407-244-5670

HEATHER.RAMOS@GRAY-ROBINSON.COM

MEMORANDUM

TO: VGMC POP Committee, VGMC Commission
FROM: Heather M. Ramos
DATE: March 23, 2016
SUBJECT: Revised Consistency Certification Rules – March 23, 2016 Version

The concepts in the March 23, 2016 revised version of the Consistency Certification Rules are as follows:

- 1. Small scale comprehensive plan amendments and large-scale comprehensive plan amendments subject to a joint agreement or other similar type of interlocal agreement which addresses land use or the provision of public services:**
 - Presumed consistent unless a unit of local government files an objection within 21 days,
 - Applicant jurisdiction still has duty to submit notice of amendment to VGMC and other jurisdictions.
 - In the case of an objection, VGMC reviews the application and prepares a staff report, and a hearing is held unless the objection is withdrawn.
- 2. All other large scale comprehensive plan amendments:**
 - No change, except that staff must issue an RAI within 14 days after receipt of the completed application.
- 3. Standing:**
 - Limited to “units of local government” defined as “county, municipalities and school board”.
 - Standing is automatic for adjacent jurisdictions and the “school board”.
 - Non-adjacent units of local government have to prove standing.
- 4. Notice of applications:**
 - Deleted newspaper ad notice provisions.
 - Added provision for posting application notice on VGMC website.
 - Actual notice of each application provided to each unit of local government.

VGMC POP Committee, VGMC Commission
March 23, 2016
Page 2

5. **VGMC's ability to call a public hearing:** only if an application is received by the commission and the plan element, amendment, or portion thereof is subject to a prior resolution adopted by the commission and it is inconsistent with the prior resolution.
6. **Intervention:** process has been removed.
7. **Commission member removal:** appointing governing body has the right to remove the appointed voting representative as set forth in the appointing body's code of ordinances.

Open issues:

- Need to work with the School Board attorney to determine the correct language regarding the "plans" of the School Board (school board has no comprehensive plan).
- Some open minor revisions requested by the business/local government community.
- Will be meeting with the county attorney next week.

Revised Resolution:

- Section 2 – added language that minor non-substantive revisions may be made to the Consistency Certification Rules without further review and approval by the VGMC Commission. Substantive revisions must be brought before the VGMC Commission.
- Section 3 – added language that the resolution (which includes the rules as an attachment) may be amended, revised, or repealed by the Commission prior to the referendum (November 8) or prior to the County Council approving the amended rules, whichever comes first.
- Section 4 -- revised effective date – November 9, 2016 (date after general election).
- Section 5 – if the Charter amendment is not approved by a majority of the electors of the county, the resolution shall expire and be repealed without further actions by the Commission.

Requested Motion: I move to approve the March 23, 2016 version of the Volusia Growth Management Commission Consistency Certification Rules subject to legal counsel for the VGMC and the designee of the VGMC's Chairman making necessary and non-substantive revisions to the rules to be consistent with the concepts outlined in this memorandum. If subsequent revisions are substantive, such revisions will be brought before the VGMC POP Committee and VGMC Commission for review and approval.

RESOLUTION 2016-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE VOLUSIA GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION REGARDING THE CONSISTENCY CERTIFICATION RULES; PROVIDING FOR FINDINGS; PROVIDING A RECOMMENDATION OF THE VOLUSIA GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION TO THE VOLUSIA COUNTY COUNCIL TO ADOPT AMENDMENTS TO THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION CONSISTENCY CERTIFICATION RULES AS CODIFIED IN CHAPTER 90, ARTICLE II, VOLUSIA COUNTY CODE; PROVIDING A RECOMMENDATION ON THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE AMENDMENTS TO THE CERTIFICATION RULES; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL UPON VOTER DISAPPROVAL OF THE CHARTER AMENDMENT; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE VOLUSIA GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION:

Section 1. Findings. The Volusia Growth Management Commission (Commission) makes the following findings:

(1) Section 202.3 of the Volusia County Home Rule Charter establishes a Growth Management Commission and provides “rules of procedure for the commission’s consistency review and for the manner in which this Section is to be enforced and implemented, and amendments thereto shall be proposed by the commission and shall not become effective until adopted by a two-thirds vote of the entire membership of the council.”

(2) The Volusia County Charter requires a citizen review every ten years. In July, 2015, the Volusia County Council appointed members to the Volusia Charter Review Commission. The Charter Review Commission will recommend Charter amendments to the County Council to be placed on the November 8, 2016 general election ballot.

(3) The Charter Review Commission appointed a subcommittee to review the operations of the Commission.

(4) The Commission met with stakeholders from Volusia County and determined that the Commission's Certification Rules should be reviewed and revised to more narrowly define and streamline the Commission's review process.

(5) At the direction of the Commission, the Personnel, Operations and Procedures (POP) Committee has met numerous times in noticed workshops to review and discuss whether amendments to the Charter were deemed necessary or if the Commission's Certification Rules could be amended to achieve the desired result, without an amendment to the Charter.

(6) All of the POP Committee workshops included substantial input from stakeholders, and during such workshops the POP Committee determined in conjunction with the stakeholders that the Commission's Certification Rules could be revised and streamlined with revisions to the Certification Rules and without an amendment to the Charter.

(7) The POP Committee met on March 3, 2016 and agreed to the form of the revision to the Certification Rules to be presented to the Charter Review Committee and the Commission.

(8) The Charter Review Committee held a noticed public hearing on March 14, 2016 to review the POP Committee's recommendation regarding the revisions to the Certification Rules and to take public input on the proposed amendments to the Certification Rules.

(9) The Charter Review Committee held a noticed public hearing on March 23, 2016 to discuss proposed amendments to the Charter. Based on such discussions, it appears that the Charter Review Committee will recommend that the Volusia Council place an amendment to Section 203.2 of the Charter on the general election ballot on November 8, 2016.

(10) The Commission held a noticed public hearing on March 23, 2016 to take public input on the proposed amendments to the Certification Rules.

Section 2. Recommendation of proposed amendments to the certification rules. The Commission hereby directs that this resolution be transmitted to the Volusia County Council and, in accordance with Volusia County Charter Section 202.3, hereby recommends and proposes that the Volusia County Council adopt amendments to the Growth Management Commission Consistency Certification Rules as codified in Chapter 90, Article II of the Volusia County Code, as those amendments are shown by strikethrough for deleted language and underlining for new language on **Attachment A** attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Commission understands that minor non-substantive revisions may be made to the attached version of the Consistency Certification Rules without further need for Commission approval. In the event that revisions are substantive, such revisions will be brought before the Commission for review and approval.

Section 3. Prior to charter amendment referendum or approval by the Volusia Council. This Resolution may be amended, revised, or repealed by the Commission at any time prior to the referendum called for to amend Section 202.3 of the Charter, or prior to the Volusia County Council approving the amended Certification Rules, whichever comes first.

Section 4. Recommendation on the effective date of the proposed amendments. The Commission recommends to the Volusia County Council that the effective date of the amended Certification Rules be November 9, 2016, or as soon thereafter as possible. Further, the Commission recommends to the Volusia County Council that any application for Certification of a comprehensive plan or amendment thereto which was filed with the Commission prior to the effective date shall be processed and completed under the Certification Rules as such Certification Rules existed prior to the effective date.

Section 5. Repeal upon voter disapproval. If the proposed Charter amendment is not approved by a majority of the electors of the county voting in the referendum, this Resolution shall expire and shall be deemed repealed in its entirety on November 9, 2016, without further action by the Commission.

Section 6. Effective date. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

RESOLVED this 23rd day of March, 2016.

VOLUSIA GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

By: _____
James Wachtel, Chairman

ATTEST:

Debbie Connors, Secretary

FILED WITH THE SECRETARY THIS ___ DAY OF _____, 2016.

ARTICLE II. VOLUSIA GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION CONSISTENCY CERTIFICATION RULES AND ORGANIZATION

DIVISION 1 – DEFINITIONS AND INTERPRETATION OF ARTICLE

Sec. 90-31. Definitions.

The following words, terms and phrases, when used in this article, shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section, except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning:

Adjacent jurisdiction means a unit of local government whose territorial boundaries are physically contiguous to the land to be affected by a comprehensive plan or amendment thereto for which an applicant jurisdiction has applied to the commission for a certification or certificate. ~~Notwithstanding any other provision of this article, which requires the commission to publish notice of receipt of an application pursuant to section 90-35(c),~~ For purposes of these consistency certification rules, the School Board of Volusia County is considered an adjacent jurisdiction, ~~as defined in this subsection, shall have 28 days after receipt of an application by the commission to file any objections or comments on or request that a public hearing be held to consider an application.~~

Applicant jurisdiction means a unit of local government which has applied to the commission for a certification or certificate regarding a comprehensive plan or amendment thereto.

Area and *area of jurisdiction* mean the total area qualifying under the provisions of F.S. § 163.3171, as amended from time to time, whether this be all of the lands lying within the limits of an incorporated municipality, lands in and adjacent to an incorporated municipality, unincorporated lands within the county, or areas comprising combinations of lands in incorporated municipalities and unincorporated areas of the county.

Certification and *certificate* mean a letter, resolution or other written document from the commission determining consistency or inconsistency of a comprehensive plan, element, plan amendment or portion thereof with other applicable plans.

Charter means the county Home Rule Charter, as amended.

Commission means the Volusia Growth Management Commission, a governmental entity created by the Charter.

Comprehensive plan means a plan that meets or is intended to meet the requirements of F.S. §§ 163.3177 and 163.3178. For purposes of these consistency rules, the School Board of Volusia County's 20-year work plan serves as the School Board's "comprehensive plan".

Large scale comprehensive plan amendment means any plan amendment that requires a transmittal and adoption hearing and does not qualify for adoption pursuant to F.S. § 163.3187 (small-scale comprehensive plan amendments) as amended from time to time.

Unit of local government means Volusia County, each municipality within Volusia County and the School Board of Volusia County.

Small scale comprehensive plan amendment means any plan amendment that only requires an adoption hearing and qualifies for adoption pursuant to F.S. § 163.3187(1)(c) as amended from time to time.

Written or in writing means a piece of correspondence or document, as context dictates, that must be provided on paper and delivered by either hand delivery, U.S. Mail or courier service. Electronic transmissions ~~by themselves~~ are ~~not~~ sufficient to be deemed "written" or "in writing" ~~and must be~~ followed up as soon as possible with a hard copy transmittal delivered by ~~either~~ hand delivery, U.S. Mail or courier service.

(Ord. No. 87-24, § 2, 7-23-87; Ord. No. 92-87, § 1, 10-8-92; Ord. No. 93-13, § 1, 5-20-93; Ord. No. 2007-05, § 1, 2-22-07; Ord. No. 2012-16, § 1, 10-4-12)

Sec. 90-32. Interpretation of article.

In the interpretation and application of this article, all provisions shall be:

- (1) Considered as minimum requirements;
- (2) Liberally construed in favor of the commission;
- (3) Deemed not to limit or repeal any other powers granted by other state statutes, the Charter, county ordinances or commission resolutions; and
- (4) Interpreted in a manner consistent with Section 202.3 of the Volusia County Charter and the Community Planning Act (F.S. § 163.3161 et seq.).

(Ord. No. 87-24, § 14, 7-23-87; Ord. No. 2012-16, § 1, 10-4-12)

**DIVISION 2 – Volusia Growth Management Commission
Consistency Certification Rules**

Sec. 90-33. Findings, purpose and intent.

In adopting this article, the county council makes and expresses the following findings, purpose and intent:

- (1) In accordance with section 1303 of the county Charter, the 1985-1986 county Charter review commission was formed to prepare necessary amendments to the Charter.
- (2) In consideration of the rapid growth of the county in recent years and the adoption of landmark comprehensive planning legislation in the state, the Charter review commission determined that growth management was a top priority among its objectives.
- (3) As a result of information, evidence and testimony received at numerous public meetings and hearings, the Charter review commission proposed the creation of the Volusia Growth Management Commission to determine the consistency of the municipalities' and the county's comprehensive plans and any amendments thereto with each other.
- (4) The citizens of the county voted at a referendum held on November 4, 1986, to adopt Charter amendments creating the commission and granting certain powers to the commission.
- (5) The ~~main~~ purpose of the commission is to provide an effective means for coordinating the plans of municipalities and the county, in order to provide a forum for the ~~several units of local governments~~ government in the county to cooperate with each other in coordinating the provision of public services to and improvements for the citizens of the county, and create incentives to foster intergovernmental cooperation and coordination.
- (6) The commission held an organizational meeting on February 25, 1987, and then, through its committee on growth management related issues, duly noticed and held further public hearings on May 18, 1987, and May 21, 1987, and held commission hearings on June 10, 1987, and June 24, 1987, to develop rules of procedure for and enforcement of the commission's consistency review within the time provided for under the Charter amendment.
- (7) On June 24, 1987, the commission adopted Resolution No. 87-5, which recommended that county council adopt this article, which contains the rules of procedure for consistency review and enforcement as required by the Charter amendment.
- (8) Since the Volusia County Council adoption of Ordinance No. 87-24, the Commission has undertaken a diligent process with numerous public hearings to consider amendments to the Commission's certification rules as codified in Volusia County Code Chapter 90, Article II. The ~~Commission~~ commission has addressed revisions to the procedures for submitting and processing applications and has ~~acknowledge~~ acknowledged advances in technology recognizing the use of electronic communications in defined circumstances.

(9) For clarification of the statement in the Volusia County Charter Section 202.3 which, in part, reads “The commission may perform such other directly related duties as the commission from time to time deems necessary”, the commission has recommended to the council and the council hereby agrees that “other directly related duties” is limited to the following:

- (a) Analysis and studies needed for the commission or commission staff to determine consistency or inconsistency of a comprehensive plan, element of a comprehensive plan, or amendment.
- (b) Administrative duties for the operation of the commission.
- (c) The commission acting as a mediator when requested by two or more units of local government to address an issue between such units of local government.
- (d) Those duties necessary to meet the requirements of F.S. § 163.3177(6)(h).

(Ord. No. 87-24, § 1, 7-23-87; Ord. No. 2012-16, § 1, 10-4-12)

Sec. 90-34. Certificate of plan consistency required.

A certificate of consistency is hereby established. No comprehensive plan, element of a comprehensive plan or amendment of a comprehensive plan adopted after November 4, 1986, shall be valid or effective unless and until such comprehensive plan, element of a comprehensive plan or amendment has been reviewed by the commission and has been certified consistent in accordance with this article. This certificate of consistency will be required in addition to any other necessary licenses, permits and/or approvals applicable to land development.

(Ord. No. 87-24, § 3, 7-23-87)

Sec. 90-341. Application for certificate under the “streamlined” review process; procedure for issuance; public hearing requirements.

(a) For applications received after November 8, 2016, commission staff shall utilize a “streamlined” review process for the following types of comprehensive plan amendments:

- (1) a small scale comprehensive plan amendment (upon adoption), and
- (2) a large scale comprehensive plan amendment subject one of the following types of agreements entered into among the applicant jurisdiction and adjacent jurisdiction(s):
 - i. a joint agreement pursuant to F.S. § 163.3171, or

- ii. other similar type of interlocal agreement which addresses land use and/or the provision of public services.

(b) A copy of an application form as prescribed by the commission shall be forwarded to the commission by the applicant jurisdiction for foregoing types of comprehensive plan amendments. The application form will be reviewed by the commission staff for completeness, and such comprehensive plan amendment shall be deemed to be consistent twenty-one (21) days after receipt by the commission, unless a written objection is filed by a unit of local government. Notice of the comprehensive plan application shall be provided in accordance with Section 90-35(c), below, with the dates modified to accommodate the 21-day review period. If an objection is filed, the commission staff shall conduct a review of the comprehensive plan amendment and a hearing shall be held in accordance with Sections 90-35 and 90-37. The review and hearing shall be limited to the subject matter of the objection that was filed. If an objection is filed but withdrawn prior to the hearing, the review and hearing shall be deemed complete as of the date the objection is withdrawn. If no objection is filed, the commission's written acknowledgment of receipt of the complete application form shall serve as the certificate of consistency, effective twenty-one (21) days after receipt by the commission.

Sec. 90-35. Application for certificate for large-scale comprehensive plan amendments; procedure for issuance; public hearing requirements.

(a) ~~(a)~~—After November 4, 1986, all units of local governmentsgovernment who desire to adopt or amend a comprehensive plan or element or amendment thereof, in accordance with this article, shall submit an application on forms as the commission may prescribe, and shall submit such information as the commission may require. ~~The commission may require such local government to submit any additional information reasonably necessary for~~ for the proper evaluation of the application.

(b) ~~(b)~~—~~An~~Unless an applicant jurisdiction is eligible to utilize the process outlined in Sec. 90-341, above, an applicant jurisdiction shall, at a minimum, submit the following information and documents with any application filed under this section with the commission:

(1) ~~(1)~~ Information required by rule or order of the commission, which shall include, at a minimum, a detailed inquiry into:

a. ~~a.~~—The extent to which any plan, element, or plan amendment submitted proposes to create adjacent, incompatible land uses and the manner in which the adverse impact of these incompatible uses may be eliminated or mitigated; and

b. ~~b.~~—The extent to which any plan, element, or plan amendment proposes policies and/or physical improvements which may adversely

impact the objective of promoting the coordination of infrastructure affecting more than one area of jurisdiction.

(2) ~~(2)~~—An application shall, at a minimum, contain the following information in addition to that required in subsection (b)(1) of this section:

a. ~~a.~~ The application shall contain a list of all adjacent ~~governments~~ jurisdictions and units of local government.

b. ~~b.~~ For each entity listed in subsection (b)(2)a of this section, the application shall indicate the following:

1. ~~1.~~ Existing coordination mechanisms used in preparation of the plan, element, or plan amendment being submitted.

2. ~~2.~~ Any recommendations contained in the proposed plan, element, or plan amendment which affect the plans for land use or infrastructure contained in the plans of ~~adjacenta~~ a unit of local ~~governments within the county~~ government.

3. ~~3.~~ The facts supporting the recommendations contained in subsection (b)(2)b.2 of this section and the identification of recommended measures which may be used to mitigate or eliminate any adverse impacts resulting from these recommendations.

4. ~~4.~~ Identification of specific problems and needs within the comprehensive plans of said adjacent ~~governments~~ jurisdictions which would benefit from improved or additional intergovernmental coordination, and recommended solutions for resolving these potential problems and needs.

(c) The applicant jurisdiction shall submit one original and five copies of each application. The original application and two copies of each application and all supporting documents filed with the commission's administrative staff must be a hard copy in writing; the remaining copies may be in either hard copy or electronic format. The commission shall process all applications and shall cause public notice of receipt of all applications to be given as provided in this article. When the commission receives an application for approval of a comprehensive plan or amendment thereto, its administrative staff shall date-stamp the application. Within two days on which the VGMC office is open for business, the administrative staff shall conduct a completeness review of the application to ensure: the application is completely filled out; required signatures are present and notarized; required number of copies are included; notification to required jurisdictions and agencies as indicated on application has been accomplished; summary of amendment(s) is provided; verification of the acreage and location for map amendments; verification that staff reports, and current and proposed land use maps, where applicable, are included. If any of the foregoing information is

incomplete, the administrative staff shall contact the applicant jurisdiction to obtain the necessary information. An application shall be deemed complete once all information is provided, either at the initial submission of the application or after receipt of all of the minimum requirements described in this subsection (c) based upon the determination of the administrative staff and such application shall have placed upon the written application an additional date designating such application as a complete application (the "complete application"). The administrative staff shall thereafter send a dated cover letter and a notice of the complete application to the applicant jurisdiction and direct that electronic versions of the complete application be sent by the applicant jurisdiction to all ~~adjacent jurisdictions, and to such other persons and in such other manner as may be prescribed by the commission~~ units of local government. The administrative staff shall also send a copy of the complete application to the commission's professional staff, ~~and, within 10 days of the date, Notice~~ of receipt of the complete application to be published one time only in a newspaper of general circulation in Volusia County shall be provided by commission administrative staff by US Mail to each unit of local government and posted on the commission's website. Such notice shall be in substantially the form provided below:

VOLUSIA COUNTY
VOLUSIA GROWTH MANAGEMENT
COMMISSION
Notice of Application

- (1) The type of application (e.g., adoption of or amendment to a comprehensive plan);
- (2) A description and location of the subject matter or activity covered by the action, and the commission's case number, and the name and address of any person at the applicant jurisdiction to whom comments should be directed;
- (3) A copy of the complete application and accompanying material are available for public inspection at the commission's offices at (commission's address);
- (4) The notice shall contain paragraphs which read substantially as follows:
 - a. Any ~~substantially affected or aggrieved party~~ unit of local government shall have a right pursuant to the Volusia Growth Management Commission Comprehensive Plan Consistency Certification Rules to petition for a public hearing on the application. The petition must contain the information set forth below and must be received by the commission at the address set forth above within ~~21~~ 28 days of ~~publication of this notice~~ the receipt of the application with such date being [insert date]. A copy of the petition must also be mailed at the time of filing with the commission to (the named contact person at the address indicated to whom comments should be directed at the applicant jurisdiction).
 - b. Failure to file a petition within ~~21~~ 28 days of ~~publication of this notice~~ the receipt of the application, that date being [insert date], constitutes a waiver of

any right any ~~person~~unit of local government may have to a public hearing pursuant to the Volusia Growth Management Commission Comprehensive Plan Consistency Certification Rules ~~and to participate as a substantially affected or aggrieved party. Any subsequent intervention will only be as allowed pursuant to section 90-38 of the Volusia County Code which codifies the Volusia Growth Management Commission Comprehensive Plan Consistency Certification Rules.~~

c. The petition shall contain the following information:

i. The name, address and telephone number of ~~each petitioner~~the petitioning unit of local government; the commission's case number and the location of the proposed activity;

ii. A statement of how and when each ~~petitioner~~petitioning unit of local government received notice of the application;

iii. A statement of how ~~each petitioner's~~the petitioning unit of local government's substantial interests are affected by the proposed application;

iv. A statement of the material facts disputed by ~~each petitioner~~the petitioning unit of local government, if any;

v. A detailed statement outlining the reasons why the proposed amendment violates the criteria for evaluating compatibility in Sec. 90-37; and

vi. A statement of relief sought by the ~~petitioner~~petitioning unit of local government, stating precisely the action the ~~petitioner~~petitioning unit of local government wants the commission to take with respect to the pending application.

d. Any person who believes the unit of local government in which they reside could be substantially affected or aggrieved by the application is directed to address that concern with the elected governing body of the unit of local government in which they reside. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit or prevent members of the public from being heard at the public hearing required by section 90-35 pursuant to § 286.011 of the Florida Statutes.

(d) ~~All applications~~Applications received by the commission under this section shall be processed and all determinations of consistency shall be made as provided in this subsection unless a public hearing is held on an application. If the commission holds a public hearing on an application as allowed pursuant to this subsection, the commission shall determine consistency pursuant to the criteria provided in section 90-37.

(1) Review by commission.

a. Within 30 days after the date of the complete application, the commission's professional staff shall examine the complete application; determine whether any adjacent jurisdiction or any other ~~person, including a substantially affected or aggrieved party as defined in this article,~~ unit of local government has commented or requested a public hearing; notify the applicant jurisdiction of any apparent errors or omissions; request any additional information pertinent to the application; and determine whether the applicant jurisdiction has addressed the conditions of approval of past commission resolutions and whether the application meets the consistency test as set forth in this article.

b. If the commission's professional staff needs additional information to review the application, a request for additional information (RAI) shall be forwarded in writing to the applicant jurisdiction. ASuch RAI shall be forwarded within 14 days after the date of the complete application. The written request for additional information shall toll the running of the time provided by this article for the commission to act on the application until either: (i) the RAI response is deemed complete by the commission's professional staff; or (ii) the applicant jurisdiction provides written notice that no further information in response to the RAI will be provided ~~and that the applicant jurisdiction desires to proceed to public hearing on the application. An applicant jurisdiction's failure to supply additional information shall not be grounds for denial of certification unless the~~ .

c. The commission's professional staff ~~timely requests the additional~~ shall prepare a written report regarding the application, which may include information from regarding whether the applicant jurisdiction in writing within 30 days after the has (i) provided a complete application date on the application.

, (ii) complied with one or more RAIs, if applicable, and (iii) addressed the commission's professional staff's conditions of approval, if any. Further, the written report shall set forth ~~b. If the commission's professional staff determines that the applicant jurisdiction has not addressed the conditions of approval of outstanding commission resolutions, the commission shall hold a public hearing.~~

e. ~~If the commission's professional staff determines that~~ staff's determination regarding whether an application may be inconsistent under the test set forth in section 90-37, ~~the commission shall hold a public hearing.~~ Such written report shall be sent electronically to all units of local government.

d. ~~[Reserved]~~

(2) Units of local government.

~~a. (2) Adjacent jurisdictions.~~ Within 28 days after the date of the complete application, any adjacent jurisdiction unit of local government may:

~~a.(i)~~ Submit written comments regarding the merits or the sufficiency to the commission regarding the complete application; or

~~b.(ii)~~ Request a public hearing; ~~or~~ in accordance with Section 90-35(c).

~~e. Request, for good cause shown in writing and submitted to the chairman of the commission with a copy to the applicant jurisdiction, one 21 day extension of time to comment on the complete application.~~

b. If the unit of local government requesting the hearing is an adjacent jurisdiction then the unit of local government shall participate as a party and is deemed to be substantially affected and aggrieved upon requesting a public hearing.

~~The chairman of the commission shall acknowledge in writing such 21 day extension requested by an adjacent jurisdiction. Once one adjacent jurisdiction has requested a 21 day extension, that extension shall apply to all adjacent jurisdictions and no additional extensions of time by any other adjacent jurisdiction to comment on the pending application shall be honored. However, once one request for an extension of time has been made that request shall toll all time periods provided in this subsection.~~

(3) When a public hearing is requested by ~~either the commission's professional staff or by~~ the applicant jurisdiction pursuant to subsection (d)(1)a. of this section or by ~~an adjacent jurisdiction or a substantially affected or aggrieved party~~ a unit of local government, the commission shall hold a public hearing on the complete application within 60 days after the public hearing is requested but in no event more than 90 days from the date of the complete application (less any tolled time), unless the commission shall not have a regular meeting scheduled or a quorum of the members of the commission shall not be obtained for the regular meeting, which shall by necessity extend the date of the public hearing beyond 90 days. At any public hearing held by the commission to determine whether the adoption of a comprehensive plan or amendment thereto is or can be made to be consistent through conditions, the commission shall comply with the criteria of section 90-37.

(4) Unless a public hearing is otherwise required pursuant to this article, no public hearing shall be held on any complete application received by the commission unless timely requested by ~~the staff, by an adjacent jurisdiction or by a substantially affected or aggrieved party~~ a unit of local government. If no public hearing is requested ~~by any adjacent jurisdiction~~, it shall be presumed that all

~~adjacent jurisdictions~~ units of local government approved the adoption of or amendment to the comprehensive plan of the applicant jurisdiction.

(5) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the submission of relevant evidence to the commission at any time up to and including a public hearing called by the commission pursuant to this article.

(e) Nothing contained in this article shall preclude the concurrent processing of applications for certification and the state's related review pursuant to the Community Planning Act (F.S. § 163.3161 et seq.), as amended from time to time. For large scale comprehensive plan amendments the application for certification by the commission shall be submitted to the commission simultaneously with, or prior to, transmittal of a proposed plan amendment to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity ("DEO"). ~~For small scale comprehensive plan amendments the application shall be submitted by the local government concurrent with the forwarding of the recommendations of the Local Planning Agency to the local governing body pursuant to F.S. § 163.3174(4)(a) as amended from time to time.~~ The commission shall have 30 days from receipt of any large scale comprehensive plan application to make comments to the DEO. The commission shall have 30 days from the date of the complete application to make comments to the applicant ~~local government.~~ The jurisdiction. For all comprehensive plan amendments other than those listed in Sec. 90-341, the commission certification shall be a prerequisite to any final public hearing on a comprehensive plan amendment by the applicant ~~local government jurisdiction.~~ The applicant ~~local government's jurisdiction's~~ response shall be to both the commission and DEO and shall occur simultaneous with or prior to the applicant local government's response to the objections, recommendations and comments report by the DEO for the comprehensive plan amendment, if applicable.

(f) Every application under this section shall be approved, conditionally approved, or denied within 90 days after the date of the complete application by the commission unless either: (i) the 90-day time period on a complete application has been tolled pursuant to subsection (d)(1) of this section ~~or extended pursuant to subsection (d)(3),~~ in which case the 90-day time period does not include that period from the date of commencement of the tolling until the tolling is stopped; or (ii) ~~an extension is requested and granted as provided in subsection (d)(2) of this section;~~ or (iii) if anytime on or after 60 days from the date of the complete application there occurs a force majeure event/emergency/natural disaster which disrupts normal governmental functions within any part of the county then there shall be an automatic extension of the 90-day time period for an additional 30 days. The chairman of the commission shall provide written notice to the applicant of implementation of an automatic extension under subsection (iii) above. Within 15 days after the conclusion of a public hearing held on the complete application, the applicant jurisdiction shall be notified if the complete application is approved, conditionally approved or denied. Failure of the commission to approve, conditionally approve or deny an application within the time period set forth in this subsection shall be deemed an approval of the application. For every conditional approval, the applicant ~~local government jurisdiction~~ shall comply with the requirements

set forth in the conditional approval including, but not limited to, incorporating into the proposed comprehensive plan amendment referenced in the application those changes recommended by the commission. Failure to incorporate the commission's recommended changes shall result in automatic revocation of the certificate thereby rendering both the complete application and the proposed comprehensive plan amendment of the applicant ~~local government~~ jurisdiction invalid and ineffective. For those conditional approvals granted prior to the effective date of this ordinance, revocation where provided shall occur in accordance with the terms of the resolution of certification. Continuances of hearings may be granted upon a request for a waiver by the applicant jurisdiction of the 90-day period referred to in this subsection, for up to an additional 90-day period as determined by the chairman of the commission. Any requests for continuances totaling longer than 90 days may only be granted by the commission at a noticed hearing.

(g) Within 30 days after final adoption pursuant to state law of any plan, element, or plan amendment previously certified by the commission, the local government adopting said plan, element, or plan amendment shall transmit a true and correct copy of said plan, element, or plan amendment to the commission.

(h) For any unit of local government, other than an adjacent jurisdiction, asserting that it is a substantially affected or aggrieved party pursuant to section 90-35(c) as the first item of business at the public hearing pertaining to the certificate of consistency of a comprehensive plan or element or amendment thereof, the commission shall render a determination of such unit of local government's status as a party to the public hearing based upon the contents of the required petition under section 90-35(c) as applicable and testimony and evidence presented at the hearing. In the event party status is denied by the commission, the unit of local government denied party status shall be entitled to be heard at the public hearing as a member of the public. As used in this section, the term "substantially affected or aggrieved party" means any unit of local government that will suffer an adverse effect to an interest protected or furthered by its comprehensive plan when compared to the applicant jurisdiction's local government comprehensive plan, element or amendment thereof based on the review criteria set forth in Section 90-37(c).

(Ord. No. 87-24, §4,7-23-87; Ord. No. 89-39, § 1,9-7-89; Ord. No. 91-39, § 1,11-21-91; Ord. No. 92-87, § 2, 10-8-92; Ord. No. 93-13, § 2, 5-20-93; Ord. No. 98-17, § I, 9-3-98; Ord. No. 99-16, §§ 1--3, 5-13-99; Ord. No. 2007-05, § 2, 2-22-07; Ord. No. 2012-16, § 1, 10-4-12)

Sec. 90-36. Consultation with commission regarding application for certificate.

The applicant or his representative may consult with the staff of the commission concerning the application for certificate under this article. However, any representation by the staff of the commission shall not relieve any person of any requirement of applicable special acts, general laws, articles, the Charter, this article or any other commission rules, regulations or standards, or constitute approval, express or implied.

(Ord. No. 87-24, § 5, 7-23-87)

Sec. 90-37. Criteria for issuance of certificate.

(a) Consistency shall be determined and a certificate shall be issued to the applicant, upon such conditions as the commission may direct, if the applicant jurisdiction affirmatively provides the commission with reasonable assurance based upon competent, substantial evidence that the proposed plan, element, or plan amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plans of ~~(a) all other units of local governments which are adjacent to the land to be affected by the applicant's proposed plan, element, or plan amendment, and (b) all other substantially affected and aggrieved local governments whose substantial interests are or will be affected by issuance of the certificate.~~

(b) For the purpose of subsection (a) of this section, a plan, element, or plan amendment shall be consistent if it is compatible with and in furtherance of such adjacent and substantially affected comprehensive plans when all such plans are construed as a whole. For purposes of this section, the phrase "compatible with" means that the plan, element, or plan amendment is not in conflict with such adjacent and substantially affected comprehensive plans. The phrase "in furtherance of" means to take action in the direction of realizing the goals or policies of such adjacent and substantially affected comprehensive plans. In addition to such requirements, consistency shall not be deemed to exist if the commission affirmatively determines that the plan, element, or plan amendment adversely affects intergovernmental cooperation and coordination.

(c) In determining whether a plan, element, or plan amendment adversely affects intergovernmental cooperation and coordination, the commission may, in its sole discretion, consider one or more of the following factors:

- (1) The extent to which the plan, element, or plan amendment provides for areawide or central utility service solutions;
- (2) The extent to which the plan, element, or plan amendment provides for areawide or regional transportation solutions;
- (3) The extent to which the plan, element, or plan amendment causes or may reasonably be anticipated to cause significant adverse impacts on infrastructure beyond the boundaries of one jurisdiction;
- (4) The extent to which the plan, element, or plan amendment causes or may reasonably be anticipated to cause significant adverse impacts on natural resources which extend beyond the boundaries of one jurisdiction;

(5) The extent to which the plan, element, or plan amendment provides for the coordination of the timing and location of capital improvements in a manner to reduce duplication and competition; and

(6) The existence of an agreement among all substantially affected units of local governments, ~~substantially affected parties (if any)~~ and the applicant ~~local government~~ jurisdiction which provides for all said governments' consent to the application. If the commission determines that such an agreement exists for any given application, then it shall be rebuttably presumed that said application does not adversely affect intergovernmental cooperation and coordination.

(d) For purposes of determining consistency under this section, the plan, element, or plan amendment and the comprehensive plans against which it is compared and analyzed shall be construed as a whole and no specific goal and policy shall be construed or applied in isolation from the other goals and policies in the plans. The commission and its professional staff shall not evaluate or make consistency determinations on whether a proposed comprehensive plan amendment is internally consistent with the comprehensive plan of the applicant jurisdiction.

(e) The commission may deny certification where ~~any applicant has failed to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, its entitlement under this article to the certificate as determined by the Commission, establishes that the proposed plan, element or plan amendment is not consistent with other comprehensive plans and adversely affects intergovernmental cooperation and coordination based on the criteria contained in Section 90-37(c) above.~~

~~(f) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this article, for any small scale comprehensive plan amendment which meets the review by commission requirements of section 90-35(d)(1)(a) shall be deemed consistent by the commission and a certification to this effect shall be issued within 40 days of the date of the complete application by the commission without the need to hold a public hearing, provided no written objections are timely issued or received by the commission. If a 21-day extension is requested pursuant to section 90-35(d)(2)c, then the small scale comprehensive plan amendment shall be deemed consistent by the commission if it meets the review by commission requirements of section 90-35(d)(1)(a), and a certificate issued within 60 days of the date of the complete application without any need to hold public hearing, provided no written objections are timely issued or received by the commission.~~

(f) [Intentionally left blank]

(g) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this article, for any small scale comprehensive plan amendment the failure to file a written objection to any such small scale comprehensive plan amendment shall be deemed a waiver of any right to ~~intervene pursuant to section 90-38a~~ review by the commission. If a written objection to any such small scale plan amendment is issued or received, then that plan amendment

application shall be processed and reviewed in the same manner and subject to the same requirements as set forth in sections 90-35, 90-36 and 90-37.

(h) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this article, any modifications to the capital improvements element of a comprehensive plan done pursuant to F.S. § 163.3177(3)(b), which would otherwise be reviewable by the commission, and are not deemed to be amendments to the comprehensive plan pursuant to that statute, shall be exempt from further review by the commission.

(i) Each applicant has a continuing affirmative duty to submit the objections, recommendations and comments (ORC) report and any and all additional correspondence, notices, documentation, orders, proposed orders, agreements or other information except ~~adversarially~~ adversarial administrative pleadings in formal F.S. § 120.57(1) proceedings (collectively referred to in this section as “additional information”) prepared by, transmitted by, received from or agreed to by either the State of Florida Department of Economic Opportunity or the applicant, related to any comprehensive plan, element, or amendment previously certified as consistent by the commission. The commission shall have the right, power and authority to reopen and reconsider its decision to certify consistency and change or modify its conditions of certification applicable to any such plan, element, or amendment should the commission determine in its sole discretion that the additional information changes the facts and circumstances related to its prior certification until a final determination as to the validity of the plan, element of a plan, or plan amendment is made pursuant to the Community Planning Act (F.S. § 163.3161 et seq.), as amended from time to time. Should the applicant fail to submit to the commission a copy of any and all additional information within 30 days after receipt, transmittal, execution or creation (as applicable) by the applicant, the commission shall likewise have the right, power and authority to reopen and reconsider said certificate of consistency. The commission may initiate any such reconsideration proceeding by sending written notice to the applicant/certificate holder, shall schedule and advertise such reconsideration proceeding as a public hearing no less than 60 days after the date of said notice, and may consider any issue and receive such evidence in said public hearing and its subsequent decision that it deems relevant. The commission shall render a written decision by resolution within 30 days from the date of said public hearing. Appeal from said decision shall be in the manner provided in this article for appeal of certifications of consistency.

(j) Notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary, an application for a certificate of plan consistency shall not be reviewed at a public hearing except as provided in section 90-35(d). When no public hearing is held, the chairman of the commission, based upon the recommendation of the professional staff of the commission, shall issue by letter a certificate of plan consistency as provided in section 90-35(d). This issuance of the certificate of plan consistency by letter is the final administrative action by the commission on the application. However, if a public hearing is ~~called by the commission or is~~ held pursuant to the request of ~~an adjacent jurisdiction or a substantially affected or aggrieved party~~ a unit of local government, the commission shall determine consistency pursuant to the criteria contained in this section; and ~~the~~

~~applicant jurisdiction shall be required to establish by~~ based upon a preponderance of competent, substantial evidence that its presented at the hearing to determine whether the application meets the criteria specified in this section.

(Ord. No. 87-24, § 6, 7-23-87; Ord. No. 90-46, § I, 12-20-90; Ord. No. 91-39, § 2, 11-21-91; Ord. No. 92-87, § 3, 10-8-92; Ord. No. 93-13, § 3, 5-20-93; Ord. No. 2007-05, § 3, 2-22-07; Ord. No. 2012-16, § 1, 10-4-12)

Sec. 90-38. ~~Intervention~~ Application for certificate subject to a resolution of the commission.

~~Persons other than the original parties to a pending complete application under this article who are or may be substantially affected and aggrieved by the outcome of the proceeding may petition the commission for leave to intervene. Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed in writing at least five days before the date of the public hearing, and should, at a minimum, contain the following:~~

The commission's staff may request a public hearing in the event an application is received by the commission and the comprehensive plan element, amendment, or portion thereof (i) is subject to a resolution adopted by the commission, and (ii) the proposed plan element, amendment, or portion thereof is inconsistent with some or all of the conditions in the resolution adopted by the commission.

~~(1) The name and address of the intervenor, and an explanation of how its substantial interests may be substantially affected by the commission's determination;~~

~~(2) If the intervenor intends to object to certification of consistency, a statement of all disputed issues of material fact, including specific objections to the pending application;~~

~~(3) A demand for relief to which the intervenor deems itself entitled; and~~

~~(4) Other information which the intervenor contends is material and relevant.~~

~~Furthermore, the petition shall include allegations sufficient to demonstrate that the intervenor is entitled to participate in the proceeding as a matter of constitutional or statutory right, or that the substantial interests of the intervenor are subject to determination or may be affected by the outcome of the proceeding. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit or prevent members of the public from being heard at the public hearing required by section 90-35.~~

~~(Ord. No. 87-24, § 7, 7-23-87; Ord. No. 2012-16, § 1, 10-4-12)~~

Sec. 90-39. Revocation of certificate.

If the commission's professional staff advises the commission that the applicant jurisdiction or its agent submitted false or inaccurate material information in its complete application or at a public hearing, the commission shall hold a public hearing and if the Commission shall vote to revoke a certificate of plan consistency such action shall invalidate the plan, element, or plan amendment certified thereby.

(Ord. No. 87-24, § 8, 7-23-87; Ord. No. 2012-16, § 1, 10-4-12)

Sec. 90-40. Appeals.

(a) Any ~~substantially affected and aggrieved~~ unit of local government ~~or other substantially affected and aggrieved party which has previously timely intervened~~ which is either the applicant jurisdiction or unit of local government which has requested a public hearing pursuant to section 90-~~38~~35(d)(2)(a)(ii), may contest the issuance, denial or revocation of a certificate of consistency by filing a petition for writ of certiorari along with a complete record of the proceeding(s) from which said certificate emanated so certified by the commission's records custodians, in the manner prescribed by the state appellate rules to the circuit court of the county, within 30 days after the date the commission's decision is filed with its secretary. The court shall not conduct a trial de novo. The proceedings before the commission, including the testimony of witnesses, and any exhibits, photographs, maps or other documents filed before them, shall be subject to review by the circuit court. The petition for writ of certiorari shall state how the commission erred and shall include all of the documents, papers, photographs, exhibits and transcripts constituting the record upon which the action appealed from was taken, or properly certified copies thereof in lieu of originals. The petition, along with the record, shall be filed in the circuit court within 30 days after the filing of the decision by the commission to which such petition is addressed. The court may extend the time for filing the record, including the transcript and exhibits, for good cause shown. The ~~person~~ unit of local government filing the petition for certiorari shall be responsible for filing a true and correct transcript of the complete testimony of the witnesses.

(b) The petition for writ of certiorari shall be furnished to the original applicant, the owner of record of the subject property, to each attorney at law appearing for any person at the hearing before the Volusia Growth Management Commission, and to the Volusia Growth Management Commission. The commission shall suspend the issuance of its permit until the court has ruled upon the petition.

(c) The Volusia Growth Management Commission shall be a necessary and indispensable party to any appeal of its decisions. Any ~~other person including but not limited to an adjacent~~ unit of local government may intervene, pursuant to Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.230, as a respondent in the certiorari proceeding authorized by this section.

(Ord. No. 87-24, § 9, 7-23-87; Ord. No. 99-16, § 4, 5-13-99)

Sec. 90-41. Enforcement.

The commission may institute a civil action in a court of competent jurisdiction to seek injunctive relief to enforce compliance with this article or any certificate issued pursuant to this article.

(Ord. No. 87-24, § 10, 7-23-87)

Sec. 90-42. Waiting period for reapplication for certificate.

No unit of local government shall have the right to file an application for certification pursuant to section 90-35 if the same plan, element, or plan amendment for which certification is applied has been the subject of an application before the commission within a period of six (6) months prior to the filing of the application. However, the applicant jurisdiction has the right to withdraw, without the penalty of the six (6) month waiting period, an application at any time up to fifteen (15) days before either (i) the issuance of a letter of certificate of plan consistency pursuant to section 90-37(j) or (ii) the date of the scheduled public hearing on the application pursuant to section 90-35(e). Such withdrawal of the application shall be made either electronically or in writing and delivered by ~~either~~ hand delivery, U.S. Mail or courier service to the commission. Electronic transmissions must be followed up by the applicant jurisdiction with a hard copy transmittal delivered to the commission as soon as possible.

(Ord. No. 87-24, § 11, 7-23-87; Ord. No. 2012-16, § 1, 10-4-12)

Sec. 90-43. Article not to affect preexisting rights.

Nothing in this article shall alter or affect rights previously vested or plans, elements, or plan amendments previously, finally and completely adopted in accordance with applicable state law prior to November 4, 1986.

(Ord. No. 87-24, § 12, 7-23-87; Ord. No. 2012-16, § 1, 10-4-12)

Sec. 90-44. Ratification of past agreements.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this article, the following agreements are hereby ratified and confirmed and the plans, elements, and plan amendments involved therein are certified consistent for purposes of this article:

- (1) Agreement between the City of Daytona Beach, Florida, and Gerald Berson dated March 1987.
- (2) Agreement between the City of Port Orange, Florida, DSC of Newark Enterprises, Inc., and the County dated January 8, 1987.
- (3) Agreement between the City of Port Orange, Florida, S.C.B. Development Inc., and the County dated January 8, 1987.
- (4) Agreement between the City of Edgewater, Florida, Radnor/Edgewater, Inc., and the County dated January 12, 1987.
- (5) Agreement between the City of Port Orange, Sandalwood Inc., and the County dated January 5, 1987.

(6) Agreement between the City of Port Orange, Jennie M. Krol and the County dated January 5, 1987.

(7) County Council Ordinance No. 87-19, approving, among other things, amending the County comprehensive plan amendments related to Mosquito Lagoon, Hontoon Island and the North Peninsula.

(Ord. No. 87-24, § 13, 7-23-87)

Secs. 90-45 thru 90-50 – Reserved

DIVISION 3 – VOLUSIA GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION ORGANIZATION

Sec. 90-51. Member Appointments

There shall be one voting member from each municipality within the county and five voting members from the unincorporated area of the county. The appointment of each voting representative shall be made by the governing body of each respective jurisdiction. A voting member of the ~~Commission~~commission may be appointed to the ~~Commission~~commission so long as the voting member at such time of the appointment: (i) is not a candidate for elective office and does not hold elective office with respect to any municipality in Volusia County or Volusia County; (ii) would not violate the dual-office holding provision of the Florida Constitution, and (iii) maintains a residence within the boundary of the appointing jurisdiction or the unincorporated area of Volusia County. In the event clause (i) or (ii) shall apply to a voting member during the term of appointment, there shall be declared an immediate vacancy on the date such voting member officially files the paperwork as a candidate for elective office or the date the voting member assumes the position creating the dual-office. The Volusia County School Board and the St. Johns River Water Management District shall each designate one nonvoting member to serve on the ~~Commission~~commission. All members will serve until successors are appointed and qualified. Nonvoting members shall serve at the pleasure of their appointing authorities. Any voting or nonvoting member may be reappointed.

Sec. 90-52. Membership Term

All terms of the current members appointed by a municipality and Volusia County shall expire based upon the original three year term of appointment previously designated by the ~~Commission~~commission. For the period July 1, 2013, to and including July 1, 2015, the term for members of the ~~Commission~~commission appointed by a municipality and Volusia County shall be transitioned so that the terms shall expire on a bi-annual basis and the approximately one-half of the current weighted vote shall be subject to appointment on a bi-annual basis. Members appointed by a municipality to a term

beginning on July 1, 2012, shall be appointed to a three year term expiring on June 30, 2015. Members that are appointed by a municipality, other than the City of Deltona, for a term beginning July 1, 2013, shall be appointed for a four year term, expiring on June 30, 2017. The member appointed by the City of Deltona for a term beginning July 1, 2013, shall be appointed for a two year term expiring on June 30, 2015. Members that are appointed by a municipality for a term beginning July 1, 2014, shall be appointed for a three year term expiring on June 30, 2017. All members that are appointed by a municipality for a term beginning on and after July 1, 2015 shall be appointed to a four year term. The current terms for the two Volusia County members expiring on June 30, 2013, shall initially be for two years expiring on June 30, 2015, and thereafter shall for a four year term. The current terms for the three Volusia County members expiring on June 30, 2014, shall initially be for three years expiring on June 30, 2017, and thereafter shall be for a four year term.

Sec. 90-53. Member Removal, Attendance and Vacancies

(1) Action by the Commission.

- a. A member or officer may be removed by a weighted vote of two-thirds of the ~~Commission~~commission for the intentional failure to disclose a voting conflict of interest as required by ~~Section 112.3143 of the~~ Florida Statutes or ~~other applicable law,~~ for misfeasance or malfeasance. Misfeasance shall be any lawful action which is performed on behalf of or in connection with the ~~Commission~~commission which is found to have been done in an illegal or improper manner. Malfeasance shall be any action which is performed on behalf of or in connection with the ~~Commission~~commission which is found to be an act of wrongdoing or intentional misconduct.
- b. ~~In order for the Commission to carry out its duties and responsibilities to the best of its abilities, attendance~~Attendance at all regular meetings of the ~~Commission~~commission is mandatory. If any member fails to attend three regularly scheduled ~~Commission~~commission meetings during any calendar year ending December 31, the member's seat shall be deemed vacant. The ~~Commission Chairman~~chairman of the commission shall notify the member and appointing jurisdiction after two missed regular meetings. A vacancy on the ~~Commission~~commission shall also occur upon the death of the ~~Commission~~commission member, upon the member's resignation, upon the refusal of an appointee to accept a position as a member of the ~~Commission~~commission, upon conviction of a felony, or upon adjudication of the member by a court to be mentally incompetent.
- c. Upon such removal or vacancy, the member's seat shall be deemed vacant and the ~~Chairman~~chairman of the ~~Commission~~commission shall send written notification of the vacancy to the member and their

appointing jurisdiction. A member may be reappointed by their respective jurisdiction if the seat is deemed vacant due to the failure to attend meetings of the ~~Commission~~commission. Appointments to fill any vacancy shall be for the remainder of the unexpired term. The weighted vote apportioned to a vacant seat shall not be counted in determining whether or not a majority of the weighted vote is present and voting at a meeting of the ~~Commission~~commission.

(2) Action by the Appointing Unit of local government.

The appointing governing body of each jurisdiction of a voting representative shall retain those rights, if any, to remove the appointed voting representative as contained in the appointing governing body's code of ordinances. If the appointing governing body's code of ordinances does not provide for removal of an appointed voting representative from office then such appointee shall have the right to carry out his or her full term. In the event an appointed voting representative is removed from office, then the replacement appointed voting representative shall serve for the remainder of the prior appointed voting representative's term.

(Ord. No. 2012-16, § 1, 10-4-12)

Sec. 90-54. Staff.

The commission may retain attorneys, planners and other experts only as independent contractors. The commission with the approval of the county manager may employ administrative staff who shall be employees of the county; otherwise any administrative staff of the commission shall be leased employees. Any such county employee shall serve at the direction and pleasure of the commission; shall be unclassified under the provisions of the merit system; shall be paid according to the county compensation and classification plan in a range designated by the county personnel director; shall receive only those pay increases to which other county employees would be entitled or eligible; shall ~~accrue~~accrue leave and benefits otherwise applicable to a county employee; and shall comply with all rules and policies applicable to county employees not inconsistent with the direction of the commission. The commission shall select any such county employee under a competitive application process administered by the county personnel director who shall approve the starting salary of the employee. The commission shall adhere to the advice of the personnel director regarding the law governing the county as an employer and rules and policies applicable to county employees.

(Ord. No. 2014-02, § 1, 2-20-14)

Secs. 90-55 – 90-70. – Reserved.

