

**MINUTES
LAKE COUNTY
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY**

AUGUST 18, 2005

The Lake County Local Planning Agency met on THURSDAY, AUGUST 18, 2005 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:

David Jordan	District 1
Anne Dupee	District 2
Michael F. Carey	District 3
Richard Dunkel	District 4
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

Staff Present:

Gregg Welstead, Deputy County Manager; Interim Director, Growth Management Department
Melanie Marsh, Assistant County Attorney
Amye King, AICP, Planning Manager, Comprehensive Planning Division
Jeff Richardson, AICP, Planning Manager, Planning & Development Services Division
Blanche Hardy, Director, Environmental Services
Terrie Diesbourg, Director, Customer Services Division
John Kruse, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Services Division
John Maruniak, Transportation Planner/Engineer II, Public Works
Alfredo Massa, Senior Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division
Amelyn Regis, Senior Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division
Shannon Suffron, Senior Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division
Francis Franco, Senior GIS Analyst, Comprehensive Planning Division
Thomas Wheeler, Comprehensive Planning Intern
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</u> <u>ITEM:</u>	<u>AGENDA DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
IV	New Business	
a	AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; AMENDING SECTION 3.01.01, LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, ENTITLED SCHEDULE OF PERMITTED AND CONDITIONAL USES, LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS; ADDING UNDER RECREATIONAL USES CLUB PRIVATE OR COUNTRY AND RIDING STABLE OR ACADEMY; ADDING LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION SECTION NUMBERS FOR CERTAIN USE CLASSIFICATIONS; FOR COMMERCIAL USES ADDING REFERENCE TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND MINOR GRAMMATICAL CORRECTIONS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.	4
b	AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; AMENDING SECTION 11.01.04(9), LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, TO REMOVE BUS SHELTER SIGNS FROM EXEMPT SIGNS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE	5
c	Small Scale Amendment Transmittal: Lake Susan Lodge - SLPA#05/8/1-2 Discussion of Comprehensive Plan Goals, Objectives & Policies	6
	New Business and Public Comment	13
	Old Business	17

Chairman Newman explained to the public how the meeting would be conducted and reminded the Local Planning Agency (LPA) members that it was important to limit discussion to the agenda topics and to work together. She said that there were no minutes for approval today and asked Ms. King if there were any changes to the agenda. Ms. King said she would like a discussion on the Wekiva legislation under New Business.

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; AMENDING SECTION 3.01.01, LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, ENTITLED SCHEDULE OF PERMITTED AND CONDITIONAL USES, LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS; ADDING UNDER RECREATIONAL USES CLUB PRIVATE OR COUNTRY AND RIDING STABLE OR ACADEMY; ADDING LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION SECTION NUMBERS FOR CERTAIN USE CLASSIFICATIONS; FOR COMMERCIAL USES ADDING REFERENCE TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND MINOR GRAMMATICAL CORRECTIONS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Terrie Diesbourg, Director Customer Services Division explained that 2 uses were omitted from the matrix chart of land uses. She said that in order to make it easier for the public to access this information on the Municipal Code website she included a reference to the section of the code.

Keith Schue asked about the words “crossed out” at the bottom of page 4, (“see also 313.09”). Ms. Diesbourg explained that it had been incorporated directly into the matrix.

MOTION by Michael Carey, SECONDED by David Jordan to approve the changes to AMENDING SECTION 3.01.01, LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, of the Land Development Regulations as presented by staff.

- FOR:** Newman, Foley, Schue, Carey, Parks, Dunkel, Dupee, Jordan
- ABSENT:** Elswick
- AGAINST:** None
- PASSED:** 8-0

AN ORDINANCE OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LAKE COUNTY, FLORIDA; AMENDING SECTION 11.01.04(9), LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, TO REMOVE BUS SHELTER SIGNS FROM EXEMPT SIGNS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE

Terrie Diesbourg, Director Customer Service Division said the purpose of this ordinance was to remove bench and bus signs. Ms. Diesbourg read an e-mail from Becky Elswick requesting the prohibition of the bus shelter signs.

In response to comments made by Michael Carey, Ms. Diesbourg stated that the wording on these bus shelters was in actuality paid advertising.

Ms. Dupee asked if bus shelters had to have lighting provided when they were in subdivisions. David Jordan said the subject today was the prohibition of this type of signs. Sean Parks said Ms. Dupee's idea was a good one and should be considered for inclusion in the regulations for subdivision design.

Keith Schue referred to number 9 under 11.01.04, and asked whether the ordinance would not allow bus signs or if they are not exempt from the normal approval process. Ms. Diesbourg said those signs would not be allowed.

MOTION by Michael Carey, SECONDED by David Jordan to approve the changes to AMENDING SECTION 11.01.04(9), LAKE COUNTY CODE, APPENDIX E, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, as presented by staff.

FOR: Newman, Foley, Schue, Carey, Parks, Dunkel, Dupee, Jordan

ABSENT: Elswick

AGAINST: None

PASSED: 8-0

Becky Elswick arrived at 9:25

CASE NO: SLPA #05/8/1-2
OWNER: Wolfgang Dueren/Lake Susan Lodge Trust **PAGE 1**
AGENT: Jimmy Crawford/Gray Robinson/Steven J. Richey, P.A.

John Kruse, Senior Planner, Planning and Development Services presented the staff report on the Small Scale Amendment Transmittal for Lake Susan Lodge, number SLPA#05/8/1-2.

Mr. Kruse said this was a request to change the Future Land Use Designation from Transitional Green Swamp Area of Critical State Concern (GSACSC) to Ridge (GSACSC). He explained this change was requested under the direction of a Special Master's Recommendation (SM-11-01). He said the fishing lodge was a non-conforming use and gave an explanation of the buildings and uses on the site. The owners have proposed replacing the rental cottages with 18 townhouses and to include 3 additional units on the adjacent property, owned by Mr. Dueren for a total of 21 units on 6.6 acres. They would also like to keep the existing restaurant.

Mr. Kruse said the transitional future land use category limits the density to one dwelling per five acres, unless timeliness is met, in which case the density could be one dwelling per acre without the restaurant. The requested Ridge Future Land Use designation would allow up to four units per acre. The Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis shows 1.3 acres of wetlands and 2.1 acres within the 100-year floodplain. The current Land Development Regulations (LDRs) applicable in the Clermont Joint Planning Area (JPA) prohibit any alteration in the 100-year flood plain, which leaves a little over four acres available for development. After deducting land for roads and stormwater systems the average lot size would be one-half acre.

Mr. Kruse said neighboring development is on lots approximately one-half acre in size. He said the surrounding area is all single-family dwellings and the owner is requesting townhouses. The owner is proposing a Planned Unit Development (PUD). According to the LDRs, a PUD must have a minimum size of at least 10 acres and 60% of that is to be reserved for open space, which would leave a significantly diminished area available for development.

Mr. Kruse said if the future land use were changed to Ridge, it would be the only parcel so designated in this section or any of the adjoining sections. In addition, the Ridge designation is a land use that is scientifically based.

The only items not agreed upon in the Special Master's Recommendation are those which propose to construct 21 age-restricted town home units on the Lodge property and that of Dueren. The agreement states that density remains to be resolved and staff is opposed to the number and the type of dwellings proposed.

In addition, Mr. Kruse said this request is inconsistent with Policy 1-1.14 General Land Use Location Criteria because there is no commercial development adjoining the subject parcel. It is also inconsistent with Policy 1-12.4 titled Density Allocations.

CASE NO: SLPA #05/8/1-2
OWNER: Wolfgang Dueren/Lake Susan Lodge Trust **PAGE 2**
AGENT: Jimmy Crawford/Gray Robinson/Steven J. Richey, P.A.

Mr. Kruse said development of the property under the current land use designation of Transitional, with the subject parcel meeting timeliness, would be the best use. If the future land use was changed to Ridge, then the density and intensity of this project would be greater than the surrounding area. The staff recommendation is for denial.

Mr. Kruse said a letter had also been received from Peggy Cox in opposition to this request.

Sean Parks asked how the minimum PUD acreage requirement could be waived. Mr. Kruse said the size requirement for PUDs was in the Land Development Regulations.

In response to a question from Mr. Parks, Mr. Kruse thought the property must have been zoned R-3 before the current Comprehensive Plan was adopted.

Mr. Parks asked about the Level of Service (LOS) rating on Lakeshore Drive. John Maruniak, Traffic Engineer, Public Works, said the LOS was between C and B on capacity.

Mr. Schue asked if the acreage requirement for a PUD could be waived. Ms. Marsh said the Board could waive that requirement because a PUD was a conditional zoning.

In response to questions from Mr. Schue about the Special Masters Agreement, Sanford Minkoff, County Attorney, said under the Property Rights Act, the County doesn't have the right to deny a petition from a landowner stating that their property is being overly burdened. He added that this Special Master was never approved or adopted by the County or the Department of Community Affairs (DCA).

When Richard Dunkel asked about the availability of central utilities, Mr. Kruse said the County did not have confirmation on the availability of sewer. Because this property is within the Clermont Joint Planning Area (JPA), Mr. Dunkel asked if the City of Clermont had made comment on this request. Mr. Kruse said comments from them had not been received.

Ann Dupee asked how close this property would be to the southern connector roadway. Mr. Kruse said he did not know what the location of that road would be.

Jimmy Crawford, Gray Robinson P.A. said he was representing the applicant along with Steve Richey, Esq. He gave a brief history of the Lake Susan Camp including some of the uses that have been on the site. (Exhibit "A" & "A-1") It was built before zoning and environmental regulations existed. He said that it has deteriorated recently because as a legally existing nonconforming use renovations are restricted. He said the surrounding area has

CASE NO: SLPA #05/8/1-2
OWNER: Wolfgang Dueren/Lake Susan Lodge Trust **PAGE 3**
AGENT: Jimmy Crawford/Gray Robinson/Steven J. Richey, P.A.

changed greatly and the Lodge is now surrounded by platted subdivisions (Exhibits “B” & “C”).

Mr. Crawford discussed the legal history of the Lodge and presented an Affidavit of Thomas R. Ison, a deceased past owner of the property. (Exhibit “D”) He said a Special Master hearing had been recommended by a former Director of Growth Management.

Mr. Crawford explained that the DCA was involved in this process from the beginning. He said the Lodge was an “environmental mess”, with storm water running directly into Lake Susan, an Outstanding Florida Water (OFW). The restaurant is on sewer but the cottages are not. He said sewer capacity for this project had been reserved through a nearby development.

Mr. Crawford explained the environmental improvements that would be made if this request was approved. He said all the buildings would be on central sewer, all the current code regulations would have to be met, all nonconforming landscaping and driveways would be corrected and, the boat dock would be removed. The plan is to construct 18 townhouses on the Lodge property and 3 townhouses on the Dueren property. All the residences would be age restricted and have no impact on schools. He stated that all the landscaping would be drought resistant, and all pavement within 50’ of Lake Susan, would be removed.

Mr. Crawford discussed some of the communications with DCA including an e-mail from Rebecca Jetton. (Exhibit “E”) Because an agreement had not been reached after 3 years the Special Master wrote the recommendation presented today. Mr. Crawford said that although the agreement was not binding Special Master recommendations are to be considered data in comprehensive plan amendments. He said this application met the conditions of the Special Master agreement. He said the agreement had been approved by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and he presented a letter from the DCA. (Exhibit “F” & “G”)

Mr. Crawford said Knight Engineering had completed a traffic study, which showed the traffic generated by the townhouses would be less than the current traffic generated by the convenience store, and the motel units. (Exhibit “H”)

David Jordan was bothered that all land use requests were always for increases in density. He said 15 units would be acceptable to him because it would not be an increase in density. He acknowledged it would increase the tax base, there would be no school impacts and, the environmental benefits were considerable. He was concerned how it could be guaranteed that the plan would go forward as presented.

Mr. Crawford explained the PUD would have mandatory conditions attached to it. He

CASE NO: SLPA #05/8/1-2
OWNER: Wolfgang Dueren/Lake Susan Lodge Trust **PAGE 4**
AGENT: Jimmy Crawford/Gray Robinson/Steven J. Richey, P.A.

discussed the requested densities.

There was discussion about the Land Plan Amendment and the PUD processes.

Ms. Marsh said all statements made by the Special Master are inadmissible in any judicial or administrative hearing. Clarifying a previous statement, she said waiving the minimum 10-acre requirement for a PUD would probably require the Applicant to appear before the Board of Adjustment (BOA) for a variance.

Mr. Schue was concerned that this application had in some fashion already been reviewed previously by DCA and the BCC rather than first going through the normal application process including recommendation by the Local Planning Agency. It was his preference not to have these types of procedural changes in the future.

Mr. Schue said his most urgent concern was that this request for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment is within the Green Swamp Area of Critical State Concern (GSACSC). He was concerned this decision would be a precedent. He said the Green Swamp area had been scientifically determined and he did not want that scientific methodology to be undermined.

Mr. Schue said incompatibility with the density of the surrounding area was also a serious concern. He thought the environmental improvements should be done and would have to occur with any new development on the property.

Nadine Foley said she was in agreement with Mr. Schue. This parcel is not Ridge and the only reason for that land use to be requested was to increase the density. She would like to see this part of "old Florida" preserved but with the number of units allowed under the current zoning.

Mr. Carey was concerned about improvements that could be made under the current Transitional zoning classification.

Mr. Crawford said some improvements could be made in PUD with less density. He said the Ridge designation was chosen because a PUD is inconsistent with the Transitional Land Use. It is his understanding, that without the increase in densities the businesses on this site would continue to operate as they are now.

Mr. Carey did not want to see the Lodge continue as it is. Mr. Crawford said the County Code prohibits structural alterations to legally existing nonconforming uses and; therefore, allowed renovations are very limited. Mr. Carey said some refurbishing could be done. Mr. Crawford said the current Conditional Use Permit (CUP) requires the Lodge be operated just as it is and because of that requirement, it is not economically

CASE NO: SLPA #05/8/1-2
OWNER: Wolfgang Dueren/Lake Susan Lodge Trust **PAGE 5**
AGENT: Jimmy Crawford/Gray Robinson/Steven J. Richey, P.A.

feasible to do extensive improvements.

Ann Dupee commented on the history of Lake Susan Lodge and on the compatibility issue. She asked about the boat ramp. Mr. Crawford said the boat ramp could be reopened at this time. However, under the PUD, they were agreeing to close the ramp.

Mr. Parks asked what was the Applicants lowest acceptable number. Mr. Crawford did not have a number from the owner but thought perhaps 15 plus 1 unit, for timeliness.

Mr. Dunkel said this property was in the Joint Planning Area (JPA) of Clermont and he was concerned that they had not made any comments. Mr. Crawford said the City of Clermont had been notified of this proposed amendment and, no comment is in effect, a comment. Ms. Newman agreed with Mr. Crawford's statement, regarding the lack of comment from Clermont.

Mr. Minkoff said Mr. Crawford was correct and, the BCC had considered the Special Master Agreement. He said, when properly read, the Special Master agreement stated that no relief was warranted to the property owner.

Mr. Minkoff stated that he didn't believe it was correct to portray the property owner as victimized by the Special Master process. He said, Lake County makes good use of this process to mediate disputes and, it has been very successful. The Special Master process is set up to help property owners. In response to concerns expressed by Mr. Schue about how the normal review process was bypassed, Mr. Minkoff acknowledged that the manner in which the Special Master process had been used in this case is not how the county would proceed today.

Public Comment

Egory Emory, Lake County Conservation Council appreciated the history of the Lake Susan Lodge and, thought the presence or absence of Clermont, should not be open to interpretation. He said the property was not on a ridge, it was lakefront and included wetlands. He referred to the staff report comments on the incompatibility with the surrounding area. He believed the Comprehensive Plan should not be changed, unless there is compelling reason for community benefit.

Nancy Fullerton speaking on behalf of Alliance to Protect Water Resources (APWR) requested this application be denied. She said the number of questions asked by the LPA was evidence, regarding the "number of holes" in this plan. She questioned why timeliness had not been done. Ms. Fullerton thought that changing a land use designation in the Green Swamp would be an unfortunate precedent. She commented, the environmental gains could be tremendous but, thought more consideration should be

CASE NO: SLPA #05/8/1-2
OWNER: Wolfgang Dueren/Lake Susan Lodge Trust **PAGE 6**
AGENT: Jimmy Crawford/Gray Robinson/Steven J. Richey, P.A.

Given to this issue. She thought the council members of Clermont were concerned about this application. Ms. Fullerton said, no matter what the traffic study showed, the traffic on Lakeshore Drive was bad. She encouraged the LPA to follow the staff recommendation.

John Ryan said he had been a participant in the State study for this land use designation.

He worked with DCA mapping the Green Swamp. He said the Ridge designation is based on a unique characteristic on the east side of the swamp; where water falling on the Ridge flows into the Green Swamp. They had traveled extensively in Lake and Polk Counties to define the boundary of the Ridge area. He explained, this parcel does not have the definitive geological landform required under the Ridge designation and, there is no scientific basis to award this property a Ridge designation. He said this property should not be designated Ridge just so the owner can get the density he wants to have.

Vicky Zaneis believed the staff report should be followed. She said this didn't seem to be a common sense location for this type of use.

Rob Kelly, Citizen's Coalition of Lake County, discussed the flood plain issue and the surrounding residential densities. He referred to Exhibits "A", "B" & "C". He said the Citizen's Coalition has been very active in protecting the Green Swamp. Mr. Kelly thought using economic consideration, as a reason to change the land use designation would set a very unfortunate precedent. He asked that this request be denied.

Mr. Dunkel asked for clarification on the flood plain issue. Mr. Kruse explained the map presented by Mr. Kelly.

Mr. Crawford said the restaurant is currently on sewer provided by the Ladd development to the south. The motel cottages are on septic. He said he did not understand how people, concerned about protecting the Green Swamp, would be against this project because of the environmental benefits from this proposed change. He admitted the soils are not Ridge soils. Mr. Crawford thought the primary reason for the Green Swamp designation was based on its recharge value and yet the area that recharges the Green Swamp is Ridge, which has higher allowable densities. He said this designation was requested for the density. The basis for it was economic, and he stated that the only way to get the cottages off septic is for there to be a reasonable return to the investors.

Mr. Jordan said the public had made great comments, including those regarding a precedent being set. Another was the unsuitability of changing a technical designation to allow increased density in the Green Swamp. He did not want to see any density increase in the Green Swamp. He said that consideration of an application is not a precedent. He would like to see the cottages off septic tanks and, that making money is not a sin unless

CASE NO: SLPA #05/8/1-2
OWNER: Wolfgang Dueren/Lake Susan Lodge Trust **PAGE 7**
AGENT: Jimmy Crawford/Gray Robinson/Steven J. Richey, P.A.

someone else is being damaged.

MOTION by Sean Parks, SECONDED by Michael Carey to deny the land use designation from Transitional to Ridge with the condition that a maximum density of 9 townhouses is appropriate for the site because of the historical uniqueness of the site.

Mr. Schue asked if it was possible to condition the motion.

Ms. Marsh confirmed that an increase in density would require a land use change; interpreting that Mr. Parks intention was to limit the site to 9 townhouses if the BCC voted to allow the land use change. She explained the BCC could not condition the land use change. She said that would be a zoning issue not a Comprehensive Plan issue.

Mr. Schue suggested amending motion to be for denial.

Mr. Parks asked how the LPA recommendation for a maximum 9 units could be transmitted to the BCC. Ms. Marsh said it would appear in the minutes and it could also be incorporated into a second motion. Mr. Parks said his rational was to get the improvements started on the site.

Mr. Parks withdrew his motion and Mr. Carey withdrew his second.

MOTION by Sean Parks, SECONDED by Michael Carey to deny the request to change the land use designation from Transitional to Ridge.

Mr. Schue said he was in support of the motion and, this site does not have the Ridge soil characteristics. He added that the economic issues could be addressed in another manner.

Mr. Carey could not support the change from Transition to Ridge. However, he recognized some advantages to this plan and would like to see the plan modified.

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

AGAINST: Dupee, Jordan

PASSED: 7-2

Mr. Parks said the number of townhouses was important to him and he would like to see the positive environmental changes.

There was a 5-minute break.

New Business

Amye King, Planning Manager said the deadline for the Wekiva based Comprehensive Plan amendments is December of 2005. Orange and Seminole Counties will be submitting their amendments soon. She asked if the LPA thought those particular amendments should be incorporated into the new plan, recognizing that they will be late. Or should those amendments be transmitted separately. She was concerned if the Wekiva amendments were sent independently of the new comprehensive plan, DCA might be confused because those amendments would be based on the old comprehensive plan.

MOTION by David Jordan, SECONDED by Michael Carey to discuss the timing of the Wekiva regulation transmittal to the next agenda.

In response to a question from Mr. Dunkel, Ms. King said information would be provided at the next meeting regarding ongoing Wekiva studies that might affect the Comprehensive Plan.

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

AGAINST: None

PASSED: 9-0

Ms. King reviewed with the LPA, the public comments from the second round of public meetings. She said those comments had been posted on the County’s website.

Chairman Newman complimented staff for their hard work and said she appreciated all the input from the public.

Ms. King, said at the last public meeting, comments had been made on the importance of continuing to solicit public opinion. She said that they were working on the best way to do that.

There was some discussion regarding public comments. Mr. Carey that he thought age-restricted communities should not be exempt from school impact fees.

Public Comment

Patty Donahue said she wanted to express her appreciation to the LPA and to the Comprehensive Planning staff for all of their hard work. She lives in the Grassy Lake Road area and spoke about the beauty of the area. She asked that the habitat of the Scrub Jays and Gopher Tortoises be protected. Ms. Donahue discussed how beautiful the “Emerald Necklace” surrounding Cleveland was and, how access to that area has contributed to the quality of life in that area. She would like to see the Grassy Lake area protected for everyone’s enjoyment.

Ms. Foley invited Ms. Donahue to attend the Public Land Advisory and Acquisition Committee (PLAAC) meetings.

Mr. Schue commented on the connectivity issues raised by Ms. Donahue. He referred to the value of a recent report completed regarding the Central Florida area by the University of Pennsylvania, with the help of the University of Central Florida Metropolitan Center for Regional Studies. He said the report had a regional planning base. It included important information on the economic and environmental benefits of environmentally sensitive lands. He also recommended another document, titled "Naturally Central Florida", produced by the University of Central Florida and MyRegion.org, which describes the value of protecting the essential key ecosystems within the Central Florida area.

Susan Hilldenbrant-Fries suggested a new land use category like Rural Preservation. She was concerned about the boundaries of some of the Joint Planning Areas (JPA) and possible annexation into Minneola. She spoke about the personal investments made by local residents with homes on larger lots. She referred to a real estate advertisement stating the potential value of a parcel if annexed into Minneola. Ms. Hilldenbrant suggested using the Rural Preservation Land Use as a way to protect rural areas, particularly against annexations.

Ms. King said the JPA boundaries have not been adopted and that the rural series is no longer limited to the areas outside of the JPAs.

Mr. Dunkel talked about a discussion at a recent Mt. Dora City Council meeting that was inconsistent with the land uses within their JPA. He thought it would be necessary to meet with each municipality to discuss, and agree upon, Future Land Uses within each JPA.

Mr. Parks agreed with Mr. Dunkel, that each individual JPA should be reviewed with the municipalities, because those areas encompass a large amount of the developable land in the County.

Ms. King said the Land Use memo would be rewritten and posted on the website.

Greg Beliveau, Local Planning Group (LPG) said the municipalities he worked with were not interested in annexing large areas of the County. In addition some have reduced the densities within their JPA. He said those cities are concerned with the cost of providing services.

Mr. Welstead said the JPA map, which everyone is looking at, is several years old and it will be revised. He said the annexation process is frequently misunderstood. He said he would investigate putting some accurate annexation information on the website.

Mr. Schue said, definition of the Future Land Use within the JPAs is very important. He suggested an agreement be reached on the Future Land Uses within each JPA. He said

Orange County has a Rural Preservation District, which precludes annexation.

Nancy Fullerton said, she has been concerned for years about development along Hartwood Marsh Road in what is a rural area. She hoped as the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) was revised that rural areas are kept rural to help protect recharge areas. She referred to a Lake County Water Authority (LCWA) study done on property referred to as Lexington Place. That study showed, that if only 5% more recharge was compromised in that area, it would have a definite hydrological effect on the Green Swamp. She also referred to the Karlton Place, a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) and, asked how this and other proposals would affect the FLUM. She commented that the public didn't hear about Dries, until they were done.

Mr. Parks said Ms. Fullerton was correct about public involvement in DRIs and, he would encourage public participation at earlier stages, than is currently being done.

Mr. Schue asked if Comprehensive Plan policies could be written to provide for LPA involvement early in the DRI process, to help address this issue.

Rob Kelly agreed with Mr. Beliveau, stating some municipal officials told him they wanted to protect their boundaries from other cities. Some cities want to control growth through the JPAs. He thought agreements between the cities and, the County regarding the FLUMs in their JPAs, was good. He said JPAs are more than communication tools; they should control the way those areas will develop.

Vicki Zaneis said she would like to see the rural areas preserved not just for wildlife but also for the economic value of rural areas. She presented information on the economic benefits of the equestrian community. She stated the Florida equestrian industry generates more money than that of Kentucky.

Mr. Jordan spoke about the valuable public input that they had received. He would like to see if the amount of public input could be increased. He discussed the history of the Land Planning Agency and the division between planning and zoning. He said the purpose in the enacting ordinance states the LPA is responsible for the conduct of the comprehensive planning program among other specified responsibilities. He thought the LPA had been more successful with the Comprehensive Plan amendments than with the large documents that they are working on now. He thought the process of rewriting the Comprehensive Plan was being slowed down and possibly jeopardized by the passion of its members. He said before the FLUM and FLUE are considered, there should be a meeting to discuss how to best handle the voluminous amount of materials involved. He said it was important to remember that they are responsible for the "conduct of the program" and they should make comment or recommendations to staff. He said staff could incorporate those suggestions if appropriate and, if there was a disagreement among the members, a vote should be taken and the process should move forward from that point. He thought that the LPA was not "dealing with it" at the present time. Mr. Jordan said there needs to be a balance between "being responsible for the planning program" and micromanaging the process. He said he wanted to be sure the LPA does a

good job and, they carry out their mandate from the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). He asked if the LPA would be interested in meeting to discuss how to handle these large amounts of information.

Chairman Newman agreed and said she would like to see the meetings become more efficient.

Mr. Parks asked if Mr. Jordan envisioned each member making their comments and recommendations to staff.

Mr. Jordan thought it was valuable to recognize the talents and expertise of the individual members. However, he thought meetings should stay on topic and, time should be allotted to each member. He said that staff should have a clear idea of the recommendations and, then the LPA members should trust and have faith that staff will carry those recommendations out.

Ms. Foley thought the last workshop had gone well and, the process had been similar to Mr. Jordan's suggestion. She did believe a workshop would be needed to work through the Future Land Use issues.

Mr. Schue thought the workshops had an environment that was more conducive to their work. He said there were times when he struggled with getting all the information provided by staff reviewed in depth before the meetings, especially if it was an area in which he had significant knowledge. He said he appreciated the opportunities he had to meet with staff prior to meetings.

Mr. Carey thought a workshop dedicated to how the LPA should function would be valuable. He said he had learned a lot listening to the public, but he thought staff could possibly be frustrated by the amount of input from the LPA.

Mr. Dunkel thought everyone was doing a great job and, it was "just the nature of the beast;" that rewriting the Comprehensive Plan was a huge job. He said it is a difficult and time-consuming process. He reiterated his concern about coordinating land use within the JPAs, so that future Land Use Plan Amendments are held to a minimum. He reminded everyone the Comprehensive Plan still will be reviewed by the BCC. He added that the FLUM would take a great deal of time.

Mr. Jordan was concerned about individual members meeting with staff and taking up their time. He also said his comments were directed to himself and he didn't have the right to comment on anyone else. He thought the new comprehensive plan is the most important thing in the County right now.

Mr. Parks suggested staff time should be coordinated through Ms. King and time limits should be scheduled so staff can get their work done. He commented on the differences in personal styles of the LPA members. Mr. Parks and Mr. Jordan discussed time limitations for public input.

Ms. Dupee thought the LPA had been charged with accommodating the anticipated population growth. She thought that JPAs encompassed land that would be annexed and would have public utilities; and it should not a method to control land uses in those areas. Chairman Newman asked how many members would be interested in having a workshop dedicated to these issues. The majority of the LPA were in favor of scheduling that workshop and, Ms. King said she would schedule the meeting.

Mr. Schue thought the comments of Ms. Dupee on JPAs should be discussed at some point. He agreed with the value of public input. He thought when larger concepts were on the agenda; perhaps time limits could be reconsidered.

Old Business

Ms. King said that staff is working on the school interlocal agreement. She said the FLUE will probably be presented to the LPA, during the month of September. The FLUE will be reviewed by the County's legal staff, at the end of August.

Ms. King said the concerns of Ms. Fullerton about public participation within the DRI process could be addressed by the inclusion of a DRI section on the website.

Ms. King said the County had been working with as many of the municipalities on their JPAs as possible. She suggested it might be possible to have each municipality scheduled to discuss these issues directly with the LPA.

Ms. King said she thought the LPA was doing a very good job.

Chairman Newman said it might be helpful if there was a way to publicize the tremendous amount of information that is available on the County's website. She suggested maybe a public service notice would be helpful.

Mr. Jordan said many legal advertisements are confusing to the average person. Ms. King said newspapers can choose whether or not to publish public service announcements.

Chairman Newman thought an article would have more impact than an advertisement.

Mr. Dunkel suggested an editorial and Ms. King said perhaps the number of people that read the newspaper was over estimated.

In response to a question from Mr. Carey, Ms. King said at the next meeting staff would be seeking consensus on a vision for the FLUE. She explained the element would be written before the map was drawn and that it would be possible to make changes for some time into the future.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 12:17 a.m.

Donna R. Bohrer
Office Associate III

Keith Schue
Secretary