

**MINUTES
LAKE COUNTY
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY**

NOVEMBER 17, 2005

The Lake County Local Planning Agency met on THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 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
Sean Parks	At-Large Representative
Keith Schue, Secretary	At-Large Representative
Barbara Newman, Chairman	At-Large Representative
Becky Elswick	School Board Representative

Members Absent:

Nadine Foley, Vice-Chairman	District 5
-----------------------------	------------

Staff Present:

Carol Stricklin, AICP, Director, Growth Management Department
Sanford A. Minkoff, County Attorney
Amye King, AICP, Deputy Director, Growth Management Department
Alfredo Massa, Senior Planner, Comprehensive Planning Division
Shannon Suffron, Senior Planner, 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 9:03 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>
a	Discussion of the Proposed Future Land Use Element and map	4

MOTION by Michael Carey, SECONDED by Sean Parks to adopt the July 21, 2005 minutes as submitted.

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

ABSENT: Foley

AGAINST: None

PASSED 8-0

MOTION by Michael Carey, SECONDED by Ann Dupee to adopt the August 18, 2005 minutes as submitted.

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

ABSENT: Foley

AGAINST: None

PASSED: 8-0

Scott Blankenship, Lake County Zoning Board, discussed commercial design standards. He said design standards contribute to the long-term economic well being of commercial corridors. He discussed the County sign regulations and some problems they create for Code Enforcement.

Mr. Blankenship's first issue was advertising on vehicles. He said advertising on vehicles used for service work, for example, was a reasonable use. However, it was a different situation when vehicles with advertising are parked, unused, for extended periods of time. In those situations, as long as the vehicles are capable of running the County is unable to have them removed.

Mr. Blankenship's second concern was lighted signs, presently scrolling, lighted signs are allowed and only flashing lighted signs are prohibited.

Mr. Blankenship understood the issue of bench signs had already been discussed. His final concern was advertising flags such as the little triangle flags frequently used by auto dealerships. He suggested referencing the U.S. Flag Code to govern the use of the American flag for advertising.

Chairman Newman thanked Mr. Blankenship and acknowledged that he had raised some issues to be addressed at a later time.

Michael Carey agreed that the language in the current regulations is ambiguous and difficult to enforce.

Sanford A. Minkoff, County Attorney, said the small signs such as those advertising subdivisions are allowed for temporary or weekend use.

In response to comments from Mr. Parks, Ms. King explained staff was reviewing the sign ordinance.

Chairman Newman introduced Carol Stricklin, AICP the new Director for Growth Management.

Future Land Use Element

Amye King introduced Julie Salvo, AICP, from Renaissance Planning Group, consultant for the Future Land Use Element (FLUE).

David Jordan raised several questions including the effect of minimum density on population; how to direct densities to implement Smart Growth Policies. He also asked for more information on gross and net buildable acres. He said he didn't see the category of one unit per five acres and he wanted to be sure the Rural Village designation was restricted to specific areas and not used to get densities of two units per acre.

Ms. King asked the Local Planning Agency (LPA) if the Rural Village designation should be allowed only for existing communities in the County, such as Yalaha and Ferndale.

Keith Schue thought this had been discussed previously. He thought a Rural Village was an Urban use within an otherwise rural area, comparable to a non-conforming use or an urban use in a rural setting. He thought only historic communities should be designated as rural villages and he didn't believe more rural villages should be allowed.

Mr. Schue said he had previously suggested language similar to the following: "Rural Village: this designation is specifically intended to recognize existing compact, historically established communities that may have urban densities within rural parts of the County. In order to discourage Urban Sprawl, the County shall not expand or create new rural villages within the unincorporated area".

In response to comments from Mr. Jordan, Mr. Schue thought the existing villages should be identified, the boundaries mapped and its historic character recognized. However, he didn't believe the Rural Village designation should be available for new developments. They agreed vacant property on platted lots within those villages could be developed at two houses per acre. Mr. Schue said that density was suburban density and thought it was misleading to describe them as rural. He thought that two-unit per acre densities should have central utilities and be located within urban areas.

Anne Dupee was concerned that Rural Villages would not be available to develop equestrian and aviation communities.

Mr. Jordan thought it was a good point but it was still an urban use in a rural area. He suggested those communities could be located in transition areas and another category could be used. Barbara Newman agreed with Mr. Jordan.

Sean Parks also agreed and thought the LPA had agreed to limit Rural Villages to those currently existing.

Michael Carey asked if clustered developments would be similar to Rural Villages and if those developments could become Rural Villages. Ms. King said other categories; such as the Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND) could be used for clustered developments. Ms. King said staff has been meeting with representatives from several of these distinctive communities and staff would like recommendations on densities and if this designation should apply only to historically existing communities. Another question was if those communities should be restricted to the Rural Village designation. Ms. King said policy was being written to include more categories for clustered communities, and for town centers or activity centers with associated residential uses.

Mr. Schue said the protection of rural lifestyles had been a recurring theme during their public meetings. He thought these distinctive communities should be recognized, but said that if they had urban densities of two units per acre, then they were not rural. He pointed out that categories such as Low Density Urban had a density of 2.5 units per acre. He said calling that density Urban was a more accurate description for the public. Ms. King asked if he was suggesting dropping the "Rural" part or should those communities be called Urban Villages. Mr. Schue thought including this category in the rural land use series was a mixed message. Ms. King said perhaps they should be called Villages.

Richard Dunkel asked how these designations would be applicable to Developments of Regional Impact (DRIs). Ms. King explained that DRIs must be compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and developers were concerned over possible confusion if they are required to proceed under the current Plan.

In response to comments from Mr. Carey, Mr. Schue thought densities of two units per acre were not protective of rural areas, and calling them "Villages" would be preferable. He suggested including them in the Urban Land Use series.

Becky Elswick thought Rural was more than just a density issue, she thought some commercial uses directed to serving the local residents were appropriate in rural areas.

Mr. Carey concurred and said villages offer services to people who live in rural areas. He did not think Rural Villages were incompatible with the rural designation.

Mr. Dunkel suggested the current rural villages could be listed in the Comprehensive Plan and then not allow any others.

Ms. King explained the Community Enhancement Area Coordinator was working with representatives from these communities. The Growth Management staff is assisting with Geographical Information Systems (GIS) and with planning.

Ms. King listed the issues on which agreement had been reached, the land use should be called Villages and they must be existing, compact communities. She said some Census Designated Places may no longer consider themselves a community and wouldn't be included.

Public Comment:

Mark Winwood, Friends of Yalaha, said they were pursuing the Rural Village designation to protect and preserve their community. He said they are not an urban area.

Rob Kelly said the Friends of Ferndale share the same goals of the Friends of Yalaha. He said the concept of rural lands could be confused with the Rural Village Land Use category. He suggested recognizing only the communities that requested the Village designation. He thought the Village land use of two units per acre should only be applied to existing communities, not to rural areas anticipated to be urbanized. He said rural land uses should surround these villages to prevent further urbanization and no new rural villages should be created. He expressed concern that the low-density urban land use category is being considered a transition to the Rural Village Land Use category.

Peggy Cox didn't believe the rural land use series were truly rural and said Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) might allow for further increases in density. She thought one unit per five acres and perhaps one unit on two or three-acre parcels should be considered rural. She disagreed with locating schools in rural areas without sidewalks, central utilities or adequate roads. She thought one unit per acre should be a buffer between urban and rural. Although growth into the rural areas is inevitable, she did not want the Rural Village category to be justification for subdivisions in rural areas. She added that the Comprehensive Plan is to be periodically reviewed and changes in density could be done later.

Elaine Renik said it was important to avoid the use of the Rural Village category as justification for urban sprawl. She said these distinctive communities are asking for protection and the name used to identify those areas is not material.

Mr. Parks agreed that the name was not important but limiting the number of Rural Villages was important. He said planning zones might have to be used.

Ms. King asked if he wanted to associate Rural Villages with the Community Enhancement Areas that have an active community. Mr. Parks agreed and said their boundaries should be mapped.

Mr. Jordan asked if the two units per acre allowable density in a Rural Village could be

higher than what is presently located there. He said in spite of their best intentions they could actually contribute to the outcome they were trying to avoid.

Ms. King explained these communities have approached the County because they want to have their boundaries recognized and to possibly have policies for these distinctive communities. Not all of these communities desire the same densities.

Mr. Jordan said these communities are really looking for protection and recognition. Ms. King agreed and added that intensity was another issue because some of these communities want to have small businesses to support the community. She said the scale of any commercial uses was another issue for those communities. Mr. Jordan thought density and intensity issues could be addressed through Neighborhood Activity Centers. Ms. King said the consultants could review that suggestion. Mr. Jordan said the communities could have their distinctive designation and the Neighborhood Activity Center could be used to give versatility to each individual community.

Mr. Schue said unless Rural Villages were surrounded by rural lands they could end up being a tiny community surrounded by urban densities. In some circumstances, Joint Planning Areas (JPAs) adjacent to Rural Villages, such as Yalaha would need to have rural densities close to the Rural Village in order for the Rural Village to still be within a rural area. He said he would support Rural Villages as a way to recognize historic villages in rural areas, but he did not want to approve additional ones.

In response to comments from Ms. Dupee, Ms. King said the Rural Village designation would not be mandatory, it would have to be requested by the residents. Ms. King said the analysis on the population allocation was not yet complete. She said there is a list of thirty-three distinctive communities and perhaps they should have the option to be designated a Rural Village although at this time only designate the communities that have requested it.

Ms. King said some communities are seeking preservation of their character and they acknowledged they would not always be surrounded by rural areas.

Mr. Carey said if two units per acre were allowed in rural it would be difficult to cluster development.

Mr. Parks said the number of these communities could be reviewed during the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) process. He suggested each community could have its own plan. Ms. King said staff intends to do that in the Land Development Regulations (LDRs). Then those communities could come before the LPA to address specific issues in their communities.

Mr. Schue said because the Rural Villages were historical in nature, they would not necessarily be clustered communities. He thought clustering was most meaningful in rural areas to protect the environment and two units per acre is really conventional urban single family residential development.

Ms. King said it was the understanding of staff that the one dwelling unit per three acres and the one dwelling unit per five acres will be separated into two categories in the rural land series. Rural Villages will be renamed Historic Villages and they will be existing compact historic communities. A list of the existing Community Enhancement Areas will be included and those closest to being Historic Villages will be mapped, which at this point is Yalaha, Ferndale, Okahumpka and possibly Astor. There was an agreement by a majority of the LPA with Ms. King's synopsis.

There was a five-minute break.

The Urban Land Use Series was discussed next.

Mr. Jordan suggested instead of using density ranges that an "up to" be used.

In response to comments and questions from Mr. Parks, Ms. King said the new land use categories would address newer planning trends, such as TND and clustering. Also, the new rural land use categories will prevent densities of one dwelling unit per five acres being placed next to four units per acre. Ms. King said the new categories would contribute to creating a sense of place.

There was discussion and consensus about allowing densities of one dwelling unit per five acres in JPAs. There was a consensus by the LPA that Chairman Newman would write a letter on their behalf stating this was the position of both the LPA and staff.

Mr. Schue summarized his understanding of the rural densities. He said Low Density Rural would have a maximum density of one dwelling unit per five acres, Medium Density Rural would be one unit per three acres and in High Density Rural the maximum density would be one unit per one acre, with a provision for clustering. The LPA agreed with Mr. Schue's summary.

Mr. Schue thought confusion could be caused in the rural densities because some were based on gross densities and others based on buildable acreage. Ms. King said these policies should be decided by the LPA. Mr. Schue said he would support using net acres to calculate densities.

Mr. Parks agreed with using net acreage.

When Mr. Dunkel asked how that would relate to open space, Mr. Schue said net acreage generally referred to density issues and open space referred to what is allowable in those spaces.

Mr. Carey asked how open space was currently calculated. Ms. King explained that 25% open space is required within a PUD. In a "straight rezoning" there is no open space requirement, at this time the LDRs and the Comprehensive Plan are inconsistent. Mr. Schue said he had suggested language when this was discussed at an earlier meeting. Mr.

Jordan said the LPA should decide on net or gross. Ms. King said another important decision would be what is to be considered open space. Mr. Jordan said they agreed on “net” and now the issue was the formula to calculate the open space. Mr. Parks said a big issue was wetlands and thought those should be defined by Florida statute. He added that if a developer owned property before the statute was enacted the density should be calculated on gross acreage. Mr. Schue said that he supported a determination of net density based on the land area, minus wetlands and water bodies with a credit based on one dwelling unit per five acres of wetlands. Ms. King said that was consistent with the current rules.

In response to a comment from Mr. Carey, Mr. Schue said the first issue was the how to calculate the number of units allowed; the second was how much open space should be required. Mr. Schue thought agreement should be reached on the method to calculate the number of net units; Mr. Jordan thought they had agreed with Mr. Schue’s definition.

MOTION by Keith Schue, SECONDED by Richard Dunkel to agree that calculations for density yield shall be based on the net acreage after wetlands and water bodies are deducted and a transfer of one unit per five acres of wetlands be transferred to the upland property.

There was a brief discussion on the motion.

FOR: Newman, Schue, Parks, Dunkel, Jordan, Elswick

ABSENT: Foley

AGAINST: Carey, Dupee

MOTION CARRIED: 6-2

Open Space

Mr. Schue began the discussion on open space by saying generally the buildable uplands areas were divided into private, individual lots. An alternative is to have smaller lots and to preserve a percentage of the site as common open space. Mr. Schue said the LPA had previously discussed the following: “For all new development, Lake County shall define Open Space as permanently protected undeveloped naturally vegetative pervious areas including natural resource preserves and passive recreation land. Stormwater retention areas may contribute to open space if enhanced as amenities utilizing native vegetation and littoral zones as appropriate. For the purpose of calculating minimum open space requirements for development sites, open space shall exclude water bodies, wetlands, private lots, parking and street right of way, impervious surface, active recreation, including golf courses”. He said they had also discussed considering 50% of golf courses to be allowed as open space. Mr. Jordan said staff was researching the golf course issue.

There was discussion about the possibility of designing storm water retention areas so they could be open space and be suitable for passive recreation. Mr. Dunkel suggested

requiring storm water retention areas to be designed for dual purposes. There was discussion about the percentage of open space and how it is to be calculated.

Ms. King asked for a consensus on the definition of open space, it had been her understanding that perhaps a percentage of golf courses could be considered open space.

The LPA decided to eliminate stormwater retention areas from the open space requirement.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Rob Kelly, Lake County Conservation Council, said in some areas a percentage of water bodies and wetlands are considered open space. Mr. Schue said the LPA was considering not including water bodies or wetland areas in the density calculations. Mr. Carey thought it would be easier to use gross acreage but increase the percentage.

Nancy Fullerton, Alliance to Protect Water Resources, said she was in favor of including open space as it is in the current plan. She thought the definitions of open space, net and gross from the Wekiva Policies were good. Ms. Fullerton did not agree with including water retention areas and water bodies as open space. Ms. Fullerton thought the higher density rural land use was the old suburban land use category with a new name. She questioned the need for transition areas and said she was more concerned with the preservation of rural areas.

Chairman Newman asked for a consensus. There was consensus by the LPA to accept the definition of open space read earlier with the exclusions they had discussed. Ms. King said water retention areas and 50% of golf courses were to be excluded.

Mr. Schue said his intention had been to include only the language up to “golf courses”. He had not intended the remainder to be part of the definition. After some discussion, Ms. King said the last sentence was a condition, not a definition. She suggested it be included elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. King said Mr. Minkoff had asked if all active recreation would be included or only golf courses. The LPA agreed to remove the last sentence from the definition.

MOTION by Sean Parks, SECONDED by David Jordan to remove the last sentence which begins with “clustering in units” from the definition and to include amendments regarding the golf course and water retention areas and to substitute “active recreation including but not limited to golf courses”.

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

ABSENT: Foley

AGAINST: Carey

MOTION CARRIED: 7-1

Ms. King asked if clustering should be mandatory in the one dwelling unit per acre land use category. Mr. Schue said the definition could include a requirement for clustering or overlays could designate areas with mandatory clustering.

Mr. Carey said rural densities of one dwelling unit per five acres makes clustering difficult. Mr. Schue said that was an argument for overlays. Mr. Carey said the calculations for determining net acreage make clustering even more difficult. There was discussion on rural villages and distinctive communities. Mr. Jordan thought that issue was resolved when it was decided to let the distinctive communities determine density. Mr. Schue said overlays could have different open space requirements. Ms. King said clustering could be encouraged at one dwelling unit per one acre and higher densities. There was discussion about including the option for clustering within the definition of the land use category.

Ms. King asked if clustering should be mandatory in the one dwelling unit per one acre and should straight one dwelling unit per one acre be allowed. Ms. Dupee didn't believe in mandatory clustering. Mr. Schue thought landowners should be allowed to revert to the lesser density. Ms. King said staff needed direction on the one dwelling unit per acre. Mr. Carey believed that incentives would be needed before people will be willing to cluster homes. Mr. Jordan agreed clustering should not be required but there should be incentives for clustering. Mr. Parks thought incentives would be more successful than making it mandatory. There was additional discussion on clustering and incentives.

Ms. King said using the net density was close to mandatory clustering because of the open space definition.

Rob Kelly thought there were studies showing the ineffectiveness of transitional densities of one dwelling unit per acre because they don't protect rural areas. Mr. Kelly said the decrease in development costs should be enough incentive and he didn't agree with increasing densities as an incentive.

Elaine Renick agreed there has to be neutral density and that lower development costs should be enough incentive. However, she questioned if the market would support clustering.

Chairman Newman asked for resolution on the one dwelling unit per acre land use. In response to comments from Mr. Jordan, Ms. King said that density was available today within the Suburban category if a project met timeliness and the developer did not want to do a PUD.

MOTION by David Jordan, SECONDED by Richard Dunkel to eliminate the Rural High density land use.

Ms. King explained this was a contentious issue because this density has been requested

by some of the cities and some developers. She said some people thought one unit per acre was the worse type of land use.

Mr. Schue said a quality subdivision could be built at one unit per acre with clustering that would protect open space and provide a transitional density.

Ms. King said the definition of net acreage and the open space requirement would create clustering. She asked if one unit per acre would be appropriate either with or without clustering.

Mr. Carey said the one unit per acre was not eliminated because the classifications would be “up to” number of units per acre.

Mr. Jordan said as he understood it, there would be two to three units per acre, then one unit per acre with clustering required because of the net issue, and then the rural at one unit per five acres. Ms. King said that was the recommendation of staff.

Mr. Jordan withdrew his motion and Mr. Dunkel withdrew his second.

MOTION by Sean Park, SECONDED by David Jordan to keep the one unit per acre land use category with clustering associated with it because of the net, not required.

FOR: Newman, Schue, Parks, Dupee, Jordan, Elswick

ABSENT: Foley

AGAINST: Carey, Dunkel

MOTION CARRIED: 6-2

Julie Salvo, AICP, Renaissance Planning Group discussed the urban land use series. She said they were separated into regional and neighborhood activity centers oriented towards access and future transit stops. The type of center (regional/community/neighborhood) would depend on the market area. The idea is to move away from strip centers and towards nodes. They should be guided by an overall master plan and perhaps share some facilities such as parking and stormwater. Regional centers would be larger; community would be more grocery store oriented and neighborhood centers would be located at intersections.

Ms. Elswick and Ms. Salvo discussed school locations and transportation access. Ms. Salvo said that seeing the centers on a map would be helpful.

Mr. Schue referred to the change in terminology such as TND to Regional Activity Center. He preferred the language suggested earlier because some of these terms are in

the current Comprehensive Plan but with different meanings. Ms. Salvo explained that TND should have been used as the header over these centers and the activity centers were to be subsets under that. She added that after the TND areas were designated, the appropriate subset would be decided when development occurred.

Ms. King said the names could be changed to avoid confusion and additional information will be available at the next meeting.

Rob Kelly was concerned that if community and neighborhood centers with high densities were allowed in the JPAs then they could be placed in rural areas. Ms. King said developers could request any density they desire, these centers are intended to be located around the turnpike interchanges and in the JPAs. Mr. Kelly commented that the JPAs included a lot of rural areas. Mr. Schue said because this land use is an Urban Land Use it wouldn't be placed in rural areas.

Mr. Jordan left the meeting at noon.

There was a five-minute break.

Ms. King directed the LPA's attention to the memo written by Francis Franco and asked for their direction on those issues.

Mr. Dunkel asked about greenprinting the County to avoid conflict with natural lands. Ms. King said greenprinting is being addressed by the Public Land Advisory and Acquisition Council (PLAAC).

Ms. King asked about land uses in overlapping areas of the JPAs. There was discussion on the overlapping JPAs. Mr. Schue thought those areas would interfere with the accuracy of the FLUM. Francis Franco, Senior GIS Analyst, discussed some of the GIS problems created by the overlapping JPAs.

Mr. Dunkel said the cities needed to resolve their differences.

In response to Ms. Dupee, Ms. King explained that the cities' recommendations had not been negotiated by the County. She said GIS could identify the conflicts.

In response to a question from Mr. Carey about communication between the cities and County, Ms. King explained there are ongoing meetings with the planners' forum, school concurrency, plus communication with the Lake/Sumter Metropolitan Planning Organization (L/SMPO). These conflicts had not been evident until staff began to work on the map. Mr. Carey suggested a process be set up to resolve these conflicts.

In response to Mr. Dunkel, Ms. King explained all the cities are concerned over what is happening outside of their JPAs. She said up to this point, the County has not been in conflict with the densities on the outer borders of the JPAs.

Ms. King explained that the FLUM will be a map atlas and this is one of several FLUM versions that will be presented for consideration.

Ms. King explained that it would be extremely difficult to include the future land use designation of the cities on the map because each municipality has different designations, densities and intensities. She suggested the cities' FLUMs could be provided. Mr. Schue and Mr. Franco discussed some of these problems.

Mr. Franco explained that the map he presented was a sample to demonstrate the process and said staff wanted direction or approval of this approach. Ms. Newman and Mr. Dunkel agreed it was the best approach. There was a consensus to have staff meet with the cities to get their input and to make everyone's format closer.

Ms. King explained the County's FLUM will be parcel based while some of the cities are not. She asked if the cities should be encouraged to use a parcel based map or should they just take what the cities provide. Mr. Carey thought parcel based was best but suggested resolving conflicts when possible. Ms. King said in some instances it makes sense to split parcels and some situations may preclude parcel based. There was some discussion on how common those problems were. Mr. Parks agreed with the parcel based. Mr. Schue and Mr. Franco discussed some of the conflicts and challenges with the information provided by the cities and the need to have data that is compatible.

In response to a question from Mr. Dunkel, Ms. King explained the City of Eustis has contracted with the Regional Planning Council to assist them with their Wekiva Policies. She said everyone was waiting for guidance from the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) on implementing the Wekiva Policies. Mr. Schue said the environmental community had recommended that the RPC and DCA prepare a set of model policies.

Ms. King explained the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) had directed staff to work with all facets of the community including the development community and landowners. Landowners were invited to submit their land use requests to staff in writing. She said a cutoff date was necessary so staff would not be continuously revising the development layer. She suggested the end of November and there was agreement on her suggestion.

Rob Kelly said he had been working with several groups that would like to see some rural areas protected. He said they would like to present a vision of where the major rural areas would be and how they could be maintained. He asked for the support of the LPA for him to work with staff to provide information and to perhaps create an overlay of rural areas. In response to a question from Mr. Parks, Mr. Kelly said the total membership of the groups totaled approximately 300 citizens. Chairman Newman affirmed that staff has been receiving input from all interested parties and reminded him of the importance of being timely.

Ms. King said DCA has not given the County an absolute deadline for submission of the Comprehensive Plan and staff continues to work on incorporating new legislation such as

the Wekiva and school concurrency. Mr. Schue asked about the concurrency requirement for water and Ms. King explained because the County was not in the utility business they could only develop conservation policies.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 1:08 p.m.

Donna R. Bohrer
Office Associate III

Keith Schue
Secretary