

**MINUTES
LAKE COUNTY
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY**

FEBRUARY 16, 2006

The Lake County Local Planning Agency met on THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2006 at 9:00 a.m. in the Commission Chambers on the second floor of the Round Administration Building in Tavares, Florida. The Lake County Local Planning Agency considers comprehensive planning issues including amendments to Lake County's Comprehensive Plan.

Members Present:

Anne Dupee	District 2
Michael F. Carey	District 3
Nadine Foley, Vice-Chairman	District 5
Sean Parks	At-Large Representative
Keith Schue, Secretary	At-Large Representative
Barbara Newman, Chairman	At-Large Representative
Becky Elswick	School Board Representative

Members Absent:

David Jordan	District 1
Richard Dunkel	District 4

Staff Present:

Gregg Welstead, Deputy County Manager; Interim Director, Growth Management Department
Sanford A. Minkoff, County Attorney
Amye King, AICP, Deputy Director, Growth Management Department
Kitty Cooper, Director, Geographic Information Services Division
Terrie Diesbourg, Director, Customer Service Division
Alfredo Massa, Senior Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division
Shannon Suffron, Senior Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division
Francis Franco, Senior GIS Analyst, Comprehensive Planning Division
Thomas Wheeler, Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division
Donna Bohrer, Office Associate III, Planning & Development Services Division

Barbara Newman, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. and noted that a quorum was present. She confirmed that Proof of Publication was on file in the Comprehensive Planning Division and that the meeting had been noticed pursuant to the Sunshine Statute.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>AGENDA ITEM:</u>	<u>AGENDA DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
	Lady Lake Joint Planning Agreement (JPA)	4
	Rural Area Planning Presentation	5

MOTION by Michael Carey, SECONDED by Ann Dupee to approve the minutes of the November 17, 2005 meeting as submitted.

FOR: Newman, Foley, Schue, Carey, Parks, Dupee, Elswick

ABSENT: Dunkel, Jordan

AGAINST: None

MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Lady Lake Joint Planning Agreement (JPA)

Amye King, Deputy Director, Growth Management, introduced Bill Vance, Town of Lady Lake Manager, Sean Parks, Town Planner and Planning Director Lawrence Gegan.

Sean Parks said in Lady Lake's recently revised Comprehensive Plan they have instituted special area plans to direct growth into specific areas. He added that Lady Lake has incorporated some of the same future land use designations as the County.

Bill Vance discussed the need for balancing residential and commercial growth. A map was shown of the special area plans. Mr. Vance said the Town had recently completed improvements to their utilities and they are not planning on expanding their utilities further. He said utilities would be extended only with the agreement of the Town and at the builder's expense.

Mr. Parks said the Town's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) would be changed to support improved communications between Lady Lake and the County.

Mr. Vance said it was important that new development compliments what is on the ground. He said the JPA was generally an agreement to communicate.

Keith Schue asked what land uses the Town would like to see within their JPA. Mr. Vance said four units per acre outside the commercial corridor areas to accommodate mixed-use developments. Mr. Schue and Mr. Vance discussed areas of potential growth.

Nadine Foley liked the "higher standards" approach and said in general it looked like a good plan.

Mr. Vance emphasized their good relationships with the County, the Villages, the School Board and the Water Management District (WMD). He said those relationships are an important factor for responsible growth.

Mr. Schue complimented the JPA and said he likes the lower density in the areas in closest proximity to Lake Griffin. Mr. Parks said the densities would be higher closer to the Town.

Ann Dupee suggested including schools in "Whereas #18. Mr. Vance said he would like to have the Town meet with the school board to plan for schools in advance of the need. Ms. Foley said school concurrency should resolve those issues.

Becky Elswick said there have been situations in the past when capacity had not been reserved for schools.

MOTION by Michael Carey, SECONDED by Nadine Foley to recommend approval of the Joint Planning Area Agreement between the Town of Lady Lake and the County as presented.

Sean Parks left the room.

FOR: Newman, Foley, Schue, Carey, Dupee, Elswick

ABSENT: Dunkel, Jordan

RECUSED: Parks

AGAINST: None

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0

Mr. Schue said he would have preferred more detail regarding joint planning for land use in the JPA. Ms. King said the details can be addressed in the Future Lane Use Map (FLUM) and the LDRs.

Rural Area Planning Presentation

Frances Chandler-Marino and Nancy Roberts, Glatting, Jackson gave a presentation about planning for rural areas.

Francis enumerated some of the differences between urban and rural places. In urban areas the natural environment tends to be more organized. She said there are differences in street lighting, road design, parking, traffic speed and type.

She said Pasco County had an over allocation of approved residential development. There were no rural boundaries to delineate urban and rural areas. Seminole County will reach build-out within the time frame of their Comprehensive Plan and needed to have transition areas between rural and urban uses. Sarasota County was reaching build out and needed to protect rural areas and yet allow for more growth. She said different planning techniques are needed to address each county. She discussed how to extend the planning time frame.

She described some of the policies in the Pasco County plan, including making the time frames consistent with those of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the long-range transportation plan. She said there would be no “down planning”. Their aim was to protect rural neighborhood areas. She emphasized that rural planning is more than just densities and described in general the policies for each area of Pasco County. She said any request for increased density could result in the County requesting a concession from the landowner such as utilization of conservation subdivision design.

She said Seminole County needed to create transition areas. A high priority was the protection of regionally significant wildlife corridors and creating a permanent edge for rural areas.

In Sarasota County the challenge was to expand urban uses into rural areas while maintaining sustainability. They included policy for urban village design and developed a Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) to permanently protect greenways.

Mr. Parks asked about community based planning systems and incentives for conservation designs. Ms. Marino said the land owners must be involved in the planning process and she thought it was important to look at areas in smaller pieces. Mr. Parks commented that this plan would require a large effort from staff, however the benefit would be large.

Ms. Marino said the whole suburban model had been driven by developers pitching their ideas, and some communities want to reclaim planning for their communities. She thought planning should be a public effort instead of a private effort and it should include broad public participation.

Ms. Foley asked about the basis of the litigation in Sarasota County. Ms. Marino and the rural community wanted five-acre lots but the County didn't think five-acre lots covering 70,000 acres could be sustained by infrastructure. She said by using the urban village design, that out of 60,000 acres, 3,000 acres was built on and the remainder was preserved in open space or greenway.

Mr. Schue was impressed and asked about the differences between Seminole and Sarasota Counties. Ms. Marino said Seminole County is more suburban, and much smaller and they haven't addressed redevelopment of urban areas. Sarasota is currently redeveloping and has larger areas of agricultural lands. She pointed out that there are degrees of rural areas and degrees of rural planning.

Mr. Carey said this rural planning presentation offered options for every lifestyle without harming others. He agreed that short term planning doesn't work very well. He discussed the rapid population growth in the US, and the effort of trying to control and plan for the increasing population. Ms. Marino said longer planning time frames are becoming more common. She said this area is growing faster than a twenty-year plan can accommodate.

Ms. Foley said that the plan described for Sarasota is similar to the rural lands stewardship program. Ms. Marino said the programs were very similar. Sarasota thought that allowing land use changes was in effect "just giving away" valuable development rights and that the community at large paid the cost. Developers have density incentives but they have to pay to develop at the maximum density.

Mr. Parks said many citizens in Lake County are very concerned about the preservation

of rural lands and lifestyles. There was discussion on the amount of rural land in Lake County.

Mr. Schue commented on the characteristics of the different types of rural areas and the sound geographic areas used in these plans. He asked about policies set up to modify rural areas.

Ms. Marino said that policies for Pasco had over-allocated (approved) residential for their planning horizon. That situation was addressed through policies requiring demonstration of need, the compatibility of uses and contiguous development.

Ms. Dupee commented that the core urban area for Central Florida is right on Lake County's border. Ms. Marino said geography plays a large role in planning. She said the larger context, including the environment and existing development, has to be considered so urban boundaries make sense. Ms. Marino said the transportation network needed to be considered in all areas regardless of densities.

Mr. Parks said that community based planning would yield customized plans for each area. Ms. Dupee said there wasn't enough time to do community planning. He said a timeline for community based planning could be done and the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) process could help with that. He asked about policies to guide community based planning.

Ms. Marino said comprehensive plan policies can provide policy guidance and that LDRs can be created to execute an idea or comprehensive plan policies can establish programs. She suggested policy to set up a program for community based planning and to prioritize areas for review.

Mr. Schue commented that community planning in areas such as Yalaha is different from rural area planning. He thought rural planning could be done and said they had an opportunity to merge citizen input with professional recommendations and plan for rural areas.

Mr. Carey emphasized the importance that the plan must have enough flexibility to accommodate various interests without being a threat to other interests.

Public Comment

Rob Kelly, Citizens Coalition, said he wanted it to be very clear that they are not advocating a density of one unit per five acres in all rural areas. He said that figure was chosen because it was the only current land use that would protect rural areas. He commented that Lake County has already over-allocated future land use for the time frame of this plan. He said there was no need to push higher densities into the cities because the current densities defined on the FLUM exceeds the population projections for 2025. He suggested protecting the rural areas that are here for the time frame of this plan and to provide for community based planning in the future.

Robert Curry, Lake County Conservation Council, said he was in favor of community based planning and said the County needs to reserve density incentives. He asked about annexations and JPAs.

Ms. Marino said Sarasota had annexation issues with one city, as the city annexed into areas the County considered for the next tier of development. The village plans in Sarasota County are required to incorporate New Urbanism principles. She said in Seminole County there is litigation regarding cities planning for rural areas. In Pasco County there is a JPA with Dade City to deal with those issues.

There was a five-minute break.

There was discussion regarding the deadline for written comments on all policies which will be Wednesday of next week. Mr. Schue said he would be submitting written comments on the Conservation Element and he had met with County staff regarding the Stormwater Element. He said he would submit suggestions to make the language on density and the TDRs in the Wekiva area clearer.

Ms. King said the consultants have found everything to be consistent with the Wekiva legislation. She said staff is satisfied in regards to what the LPA wants and said staff didn't see the need for more discussion. She said it was important to make sure that the definitions are correct.

Ms. Foley asked if the Rural Lands Stewardship Program would be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. King said that was the direction of the BCC and said staff is reviewing that data. She said policies would direct that program as opposed to having the program specifically written into the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Foley thought that Objective 4 would be an appropriate place to state that the County is considering the implementation of the Rural Lands Stewardship Program. Mr. Parks said he would like to have draft language to review for community-based rural planning that would be customized to different areas.

Ms. King referred to the Objective on overlays and the Community Enhancement Area that are included in the proposed plan.

Mr. Parks said he would like to have a customized approach to the Rural Lands Stewardship program to review instead of an overlay.

Ms. Foley suggested including language similar to 'have the County consider options for planning that would include the Rural Lands Stewardship Program and/or other community based planning'. There was no objection to Ms. Foley's suggestion.

Mr. Schue said he was confused because in the overlay section of the FLUE there are overlays for community based planning. Ms. King said that the Rural Lands Stewardship Program is different than community based planning. Language in Objective 4 for options will include the Rural Lands Stewardship Program and community-based

planning.

Mr. Carey cautioned that the LPA needs to be very careful of defining things in an episodic way and said they often don't finish the discussions they start. He thought they should review the definitions of open space and net versus gross.

Mr. Schue said he would like to take action on the presentation today. He suggested they develop a rudimentary framework to bring some of those ideas into the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. King suggested the LPA take this presentation under consideration and discuss it at the next meeting.

Mr. Schue said he thought they should be reviewing this information and work toward developing their own plan for Lake County. He thought it was important to have policies that explain why the FLUM looks the way it does. He said there were policies in the current Plan that referred to rural character and he would like to see that information included in the new Plan.

Ms. King said written comments had been requested because some issues may not have been decided. She added that "hot links" are being included on the website. Once the policies are 'set', then staff can begin work on the FLUM.

Ms. Dupee said she was frustrated because there is not yet a FLUM and she remained concerned about the economic impacts of the proposals.

Ms. King said it was important to move one step at a time and that writing a good plan was more important than any deadline. Everyone agreed it was important to work efficiently.

Robert Curry commented that statements regarding the Rural Planning are currently included in Objectives 10 and 4. He thought those statements gave the County a way to deal with those areas without having to revise the Comprehensive Plan.

Rob Kelly, Citizens Coalition, wanted to clarify that statements regarding the over-allocation of density is based on data. He would like to see an economic study on the costs of increasing densities in rural areas.

Mr. Carey thought written comments from the LPA members should be incorporated in the draft if staff has no objection to them.

Old Business

Ms. King discussed a deadline for accepting requests from the public for increased densities that were received after the previous deadline. Ms. Foley said the period had been long and generous. Ms. King said staff was suggesting after the deadline that the land owners should address the LPA individually. There was a consensus of the LPA to

support staff and to be consistent by adhering to the previously set deadline.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:55 a.m.

Donna R. Bohrer
Office Associate III

Keith Schue
Secretary